

HEADWAY

IN WAR-TIME

The Journal of the League of Nations Union

No. 5

FEBRUARY 1940

PRICE 3d.

SWEDEN AND THE FINNS

By W. ARNOLD-FORSTER

Who has returned from a visit to Sweden where he discussed the world situation with high official persons and leaders of public opinion.

FLYING home the other day from Malmö, in South Sweden, I looked back at Sweden, where men still keep the freedom of critical minds; and then I looked south towards Germany, not many miles away in the morning haze, where no man is free. I looked eastwards towards Poland, where freedom has been murdered, and towards Russia, where the dictator suffers no radical criticism to live; and then I looked westwards, to the Danish islands lying white in a pattern of blue ice and water, where men are free still but half-silenced by fear. And I thought of the double war—the war behind me in the north-east, where the Finns are resisting aggression on their Mannerheim Line, and the war ahead of me, where other men are resisting aggression on another line, Maginot's. One war really. And I longed to hear that my country was sending substantial aid quickly, silently, to the Finns.

Two Enemies to Fear

When one is in Sweden one realises Finland's claim, Finland's need, much more vividly than here in England. And one realises something of the Swedish people's passion of sympathy and concern for their neighbours across the Gulf, and something of the bitterness of their dilemma. They have long feared the Russians. They regard the Finns as their brothers, and their partners now in the Northerners' magnificent essay in applied democracy. They realise that the Finns, who have so wonderfully withstood the invasion hitherto, are not likely to be able to go on doing this indefinitely by themselves—four millions against 180 millions. And they reckon that when the

ice melts on the lakes the defence may crack at last, and a million refugees may pour into Sweden. Ought they to go to war on Finland's side?

If the only enemy to be considered were Russia, I expect they would have done so by now. But there is Germany to be reckoned with as well. And so Sweden is a divided country: not divided in the least as to the need for aiding Finland, but divided as to which is the lesser risk—intervention or non-intervention. The Prime Minister, Mr. Hansson, has so far carried the country and Parliament in support of non-intervention by the State; but Mr. Sandler, who was recently Foreign Minister, has now returned to Sweden after a visit to Finland, and may succeed in persuading his countrymen, before long, that it is more dangerous to stand aside than to go in boldly on Finland's side.

Present Aid Not Enough

Meanwhile, the voluntary aid goes on from all the Scandinavian States. It is magnificent in spirit, and astonishing in amount; it can hearten the Finns a lot, but by itself it cannot save them.

Will the right kind of aid arrive, before too late, from anywhere? From Britain or France, who are now preparing for some great ordeal in the western war? Or from America, now shrinking back again from the brink of the decision to take sides effectively against aggression? Or from Sweden, with Norway's help, and perhaps with such help as Denmark can give? That must be an agonising question for the Finns, as the bombs fall and fall, and the defenders are worn down by cold and fatigue, and the ice melts. It is a

question which deeply concerns Sweden, too, and ourselves.

* * *

Collective Defence

As I write, British and French spokesmen are beginning to urge the neutrals to stand together against German aggression. In France there is outspoken criticism of Sweden's "neutrality" in the Finnish struggle. *The Times* (January 19) said that Germany's attack on small neutral States "would tend to drive home still further to the neutrals the lesson that they must stand together or they may fall separately." Mr. Churchill has said the same thing on the wireless (January 20), calling on the neutrals to stand together against aggression in accordance with the principles of the Covenant. Well, supporters of the L.N.U. are not likely to quarrel with the doctrine of "steady and collective resistance to all acts of unprovoked aggression." As Lord Lytton emphasised in the December *HEADWAY*, we have been consistent in support of that policy. But it is not easy for *The Times* to preach that lesson persuasively to the Swedes. Mr. Churchill has a better right to preach collective security than any other member of the present Cabinet; but no spokesman of this Government can obliterate the memory of what Chamberlain and Hoare and Simon have contributed towards the liquidation of the collective peace system. The majority of Swedes do, I believe, support the principle of collective defence against aggression: they loathe the idea of "neutrality" in face of murder as much as anyone. (The International Peace Campaign, which is actively

enlisting support for the principles of the Covenant, has no less than 1,300,000 supporters in Sweden.) But if spokesmen of the present British or French Governments preach collective security to them, the Swedes, remembering the fate of Abyssinia and Czecho-Slovakia, will be inclined to reply, "Gentlemen, you might well have thought of this before." I hope that, if our spokesmen venture to give the Swedes advice as to their perilous choice, they will not forget that they themselves have a reputation to live down, and that the immediate risks would have to be borne by peoples whom we could not easily or wholly protect.

"Above all, we need Sweden." That is what Hitler said to Dr. Rauschnig in 1934.

Peaceful Change

Some day, unless the worst happens, a collective peace system of some kind will be built up. It will have to be comprehensive, on the one hand; it must, on the other, include provision for such pooling of power and authority as will effectively prevent aggression in the danger zones and enable "peace-

ful change" to be carried through. I believe this is as widely recognised now in Scandinavia as anywhere in the world. Here is part of a resolution passed on January 11 by a conference of delegates of the International Peace Campaign from Norway, Sweden, and Denmark:

"A World Peace Conference, which should include the neutral States, should be convened after thorough preparation, to establish a comprehensive system for the peaceful solution of the world's pressing problems. With the help of the experience gained by the League of Nations, an international order should be established on the surest possible foundations, strong enough to prevent and stop lawless violence. The League of Nations must have enough authority and political power to be able to carry through effectively such solutions of international differences as it finds equitable in the general interest."

That is in line, you see, with L.N.U. policy.

Federal Union

In Sweden, the discussion of Federal Union has begun. Possibly, though by no means certainly, the experience of

this war may lead the Scandinavian States to some kind of Federalism after the war, some actual pooling of foreign policy, of defence, and the budget for these services. Probably, almost certainly, the Scandinavian States will be active in helping to rebuild a comprehensive League of Nations. But I venture the guess that the Scandinavians will be very shy of joining any Federation which includes Britain and France unless it also includes Germany.

P.S. It was stated in Dr. Murray's article in last month's "Headway" that the Scandinavian States abstained from voting on the Resolution of the League Assembly condemning Russian aggression against Finland and calling for aid to the Finns. This was inexact. The Scandinavians did vote for the Resolution; but they thought it necessary to make a reserve as to the principle of sanctions, since they had voted in September, 1938, for a resolution, sponsored by the British, which declared the sanctions obligations to be optional. Having thus contracted out of the obligation in Poland's case, they felt an honourable scruple about invoking it when their own case was involved.

A. F.

POINTS FROM THREE SPEECHES

PRINCIPLES OF THE COVENANT THE SOLE BASIS ON WHICH INTERNATIONAL ORDER CAN REST

MR. R. A. BUTLER, Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, speaking in the Council of the League of Nations on December 14, 1939:

France and the United Kingdom were fighting together for the defence of the principles of the Covenant.

The United Kingdom and France had made a statement to the members of the League concerning the reasons for which they had had to take up arms. The present aggression followed on previous actions of the same kind. The movement of world opinion, the moral and material support which had been given to the Finnish cause, was due in a large measure to sympathy and admiration for the Finnish nation. But the strength of the general feeling in the world derived itself also from the realisation that another blow had been struck with the object of shattering the foundations on which rested the independence of so many nations.

Many States maintained an attitude of neutrality in the major struggle for the freedom now being waged. They respected the attitude of the neutrals, but all those who drew inspiration from the principles of the Covenant must know what principles were at stake in the struggle now taking place. The Council must not act in a spirit of vengeance or from prejudice. The upholding of the principles of the Covenant was of interest to the whole international community. These principles were, in fact, the sole basis on which international order could rest. The defiance which had been shown to the principles of the Covenant gave them the opportunity of showing those principles in all their value. It would be their duty in their generation to make the principles which united them there prevail.

M. DALADIER, Premier of France, speaking in the Senate on December 29, 1939:

The Franco-British union is open to all. But I state categorically that without material and positive guarantees France will not lay down her arms.

Just as I distrust grand theoretical conceptions, so I prefer material guarantees against the return of events such as those which we are suffering from to-day, and so too I conceive that a new Europe should have a far wider organisation than that which now exists. It will be necessary to multiply exchanges and perhaps to envisage federal ties between the various States of Europe.

MR. NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN, the Prime Minister, speaking at the Mansion House on January 9, 1940:

Collaboration between France and ourselves for humanitarian purposes is just another instance of that close, that even intimate, association between us that now covers every aspect of the war—military, political, financial, and economic.

I cannot help thinking that our experience of this association during the war will prove it to be so valuable that when the war is over neither of us will want to give it up. And it may even develop into something wider and deeper, because there is nothing which would do more to facilitate the task of peaceful reconstruction which has got to be undertaken some time.

There is nothing which would contribute more towards the permanence of its results than the extension of Anglo-French collaboration in finance and economics to every nation in Europe, and, indeed, perhaps to the whole world.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

HEADWAY READERS DISCUSS INTERNATIONAL ADMINISTRATION OF COLONIES, NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY, ITALY, RUSSIA

League and Colonies

Sir,—We all desire that—if we must differ regarding the form of a future world organisation—our differences shall be real and not verbal.

Dr. Gilbert Murray has twice written in your columns to the effect that past examples of international government have been unsatisfactory or discouraging. What are the past examples which he has in mind, and do we both mean the same thing when we use the same words?

By international administration I mean an administration which takes its orders from a single international authority, such as the League of Nations is or might become.

Condominium is not international administration, because its administrative officers take their orders from two or more States; that is to say, obey more than one master.

In the case of the Congo, thirteen different sovereign States combined to make a present of an extensive territory to an enterprising gentleman who happened to be a King, and took no precautions to prevent him from treating both territory and people as his private property—with results for ever memorable.

This was not international administration, though some of the officials employed were non-Belgians.

Medieval examples, such as the Palestine of Godefroi de Bouillon, are not relevant, because the conception of the national state had not then come fully into existence.

The only international administration of which I am aware is that of the Saar territory under the League, before the Plebiscite; and I understand that that was not unsuccessful.

Is this accepted? If not, I must find another word, in place of international, to express my meaning. New plans must not be prejudiced by unfortunate verbal associations.

JOHN MAYNARD,
18, Gilston Road,
London, S.W.10.

Leaguers and Federalists Mean Different Things

Sir,—HEADWAY provides a good illustration of the confusion of thought which exists regarding the meaning of "national sovereignty." In general, "leaguers" and "federalists" mean quite different things when they use that term.

To the former, it merely denotes a nation's claim to be final judge in its own cause vis-à-vis other nations, as opposed to a willingness to accept some sort of third-party judgment in every dispute. National sovereignty in that sense would be abandoned if the General Council's proposals for "World Settlement after the war" were adopted by governments.

But to supporters of federal union absolute national sovereignty means quite a different thing. It consists in the claim of national states to exercise sovereign power in all matters over all their citizens. It would be limited only if

power over the individual in certain fields was transferred to a federal government. The General Council's proposals would do nothing whatever to limit national sovereignty in that sense.

W. L. ROSEVEARE.

Prestatyn,
Flints.

Why No Mention of Italy and Russia?

Sir,—In practically none of the many letters and articles which have been appearing in *The Times* and other papers about war aims, peace aims, etc., does one see among the proposed terms of a post-war settlement any mention of the restoration by Italy of Abyssinia's and Albania's independence, or by Russia of the independence of Poland or of the various Baltic States and Finland, who are now, in actuality, in the process of becoming mere protectorates or appendages of the U.S.S.R.

Is this "diplomacy" because we fear to offend Italy just now? Or is it excessive realism and practicalism (at the expense of idealism), because we feel we could never oust Italy or Russia from those countries? Or merely that convenient "short memory" for which we are rather famous (or infamous—according to the angle from which we are judged)?

But whatever the reason, surely the fact weakens our moral position tremendously in the eyes of the world, and must also, once more, kindle an inevitable flame of resentment in Germany at yet another sort of "Versailles Treaty injustice," in that they alone should be compelled to disgorge their share of the spoils which have been won in the last few years by force or the threat of force.

Nor in such articles does one often, if ever, see any hint that France should have much say in the terms of settlement. Surely, if either of the Allies has a right to settle terms, it is France, for it is always she who has to pay a much heavier price than we for resistance to Germany's periodical attempts to dominate Europe. Many still feel that it was British lack of imagination and sympathy with France's intense desire after 1919 for permanent security above all things which led to the divided counsels and vacillating policy which gradually weakened the League of Nations and gave Germany her chance to recover her old predominance, which is always Europe's menace.

HERBERT KEALY.

Oxford.

The Only Socialist and Democratic State

Sir,—I resigned from the League of Nations Union on the day the practically dead body of the League was dragged out in indecent haste by its very murderers, for the purpose of fantastically expelling from its midst the only member which (as historical records show) had ever really and sincerely worked for peace and disarmament.

I joined the League in the hope that one day it might become something better than a packed committee for furthering the imperial projects of France and Britain.

If you will excuse my speaking in a vulgar fashion, HEADWAY for January makes me sick, because one thing which has always had this disastrous effect is—humbug. It would have been more decent if Dr. Gilbert Murray had passed Mr. Butler's speech over in silence.

England and France refused to allow the League to be used for any small or weak nations—China, Abyssinia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Spain, Albania called in vain for help.

Neither our Government nor that of the French objected in the slightest degree to Hitler's aggression—on the contrary, they aided it in every possible way—until Hitler made it clear that he could not face fighting the only Socialist and democratic State in the world.

He then threatened the British and French empires and so they started the second imperialist war, which was, we understand, not allowed to be mentioned at the League Council meeting.

The Soviet quite naturally and rightly refused to be present. She deals in actual realities—not in the coming to life in a death chamber of a group of whited sepulchres.

If the League, as Dr. Murray remarks, felt itself to be again "the hope of the world," one can only feel "what a remarkable world!"

I have written at length and strongly—because I feel most strongly, and I have found many others who feel equally strongly, but may not take the trouble or be able to find the time to write.

Please do not send me HEADWAY again.
(Mrs.) A. DE Z. ELLIOT.

St. Helens,
Isle of Wight.

The First Requirement

Sir,—May I draw attention to the article in HEADWAY, "Building a Better World," which quotes the report of the Second Committee on Economic and Financial Organisation of the League to the Assembly.

What is this "new" and "better world" that is to be built? Mr. Eden has said, "We must build a new world through war." Why through war? And what kind of new world does he envisage? The people are not again going to leave it to the financier-politicians to draw up the peace terms. Not this time.

If, indeed, a new era of civilisation is to be built it must be built upon the fundamental truth that the first and greatest requirement of man is a sufficiency of the abundant fruits of the earth. To establish this the monetary system must be reformed, so that world price-gaps are closed and kept closed—the price-gaps between the remunerative price to the producer, and the accessible price to the consumer, down to the lower income groups of the peoples.

The policy and demand of "close the price-gap" is common to all humanity and must be made effective. Is that not so?

E. H. BAZELEY,
Ottery St. Mary, Devon.

On The Way to a World State

LEAGUE AND FEDERATION

PROFESSOR S. BRODETSKY, of Leeds University, Member of the Executive Committee, L.N.U.

The fundamental question is the direction in which we wish to go, for we cannot decide upon the next step until we know what is the path of which this step is the beginning.

We who believe in a world order based upon an international authority which will limit the scope of sovereignty of individual states are aiming at something in the nature of a World State.

It is to be hoped—as has indeed been adumbrated both by the Prime Minister of this country and by the French Premier—that the present wartime collaboration between Great Britain and France may be extended into the peace and develop into a confederation of the British and French Empires. This would be a step towards real federalism between these two empires, leading towards federation of a wider character, and ultimately towards a world federation which could be called a World State.

But when the present war comes to an end, and representatives of the nations meet in order to make the peace, their first task must be to ensure that such a war catastrophe shall not occur again by making aggression impossible in the future. This must be done immediately and cannot wait for the acceptance of the federal idea and the development of a world federation. In fact, the very essence of the federal idea makes an immediate arrangement for the prevention of aggression essential, for federation can only take place between states that have some basis of common interest.

Those who work for the League of Nations need have no fear of Federal Union, and those who work for Federal Union need not act in antagonism to the League. The collective result of various contributory conceptions will lead to a really permanent peace system.

THE problem of maintaining world peace cannot be made to depend upon a single formula. Each one of us must therefore avoid the danger of concentrating upon some formula which happens to be attuned to a particular phase of the peace problem in which he is interested, for this must lead to dispute and disruption within the peace movement itself. There is an element of truth in almost any formula.

A League of more or less sovereign states, a Confederation of independent states, a Federation of united States, a World State.

These are the four conceptions which are mainly prevalent to-day, and each has its contribution to offer to the establishment and preservation of world peace.

The fallacy under which many labour is in considering these conceptions of a new world order as being mutually incompatible and contradictory, whereas in reality they represent component parts of a united constructive policy. The fundamental question is the direction in which we wish to go, for we cannot decide upon the next step until we know what is the path of which this step is the beginning.

Not an Immediate Result

We who believe in a world order based upon an international authority which will limit the scope of sovereignty of individual states are aiming at something in the nature of a World State. But clearly we cannot think that this World State is to be achieved as the immediate result of a Peace Conference after the present war. A World State can only be the result of a long evolution. It cannot in fact be a State in

the ordinary sense, for the larger the area over which statehood is claimed, the more devolution there must be in regard to the problems of a more localised character. Hence we must conceive of the World State as representing a final goal of thought, striving and evolution, in the form of an international machinery for dealing with the large problems affecting the whole world.

The conception of Federal Union is a decisive step in the direction of a World State. It is not the same as a World State, because under federation the individual states would still have a measure of independence in regard to many important matters which are bound to influence international relations. But Federal Union represents the evolution of a wider democracy, which goes beyond the boundaries of the individual state, and which aims towards the widest democracy of all, in which each human being is a citizen of the world.

An Inevitable Development

Federalism thus represents an inevitable development along the path leading to permanent peace. But it would need generations of evolution, beginning with Federal Unions of a limited character, like a Federal Union of states representing the various races and nationalities in Central and East Europe, a Federal Union of the democratic states of the North-West of Europe, a Federal Union of the British and French Empires, etc. In each case the aim would be to maintain so far as possible the independence of the component states, and at the same time to combine for the purpose of military security and freedom of economic exchange and development.

Confederation is a less advanced conception. It does not involve a democratically elected super-government for a number of states, but rather a co-operation between the governments of such states, these governments delegating to some joint body certain functions of a collective character like defence, currency, customs relations, etc.

Prime Minister's Pledges

The elements of such a confederation exist in the present arrangements for war purposes between Great Britain and France, and it is to be hoped—as has indeed been adumbrated both by the Prime Minister of this country and by the French Premier—that the present wartime collaboration between Great Britain and France may be extended into the peace, and develop into a confederation of the British and French Empires. This would be a step towards real federalism between these two empires, leading towards federation of a wider character, and ultimately towards a world federation which could be called a World State.

But when the present war comes to an end, and representatives of the nations meet in order to make the peace, their first task must be to ensure that such a war catastrophe shall not occur again, by making aggression impossible in the future. This must be done immediately and cannot wait for the acceptance of the federal idea and the development of a world federation. In fact, the very essence of the federal idea makes an immediate arrangement for the prevention of aggression essential, for federation can only take place between States that have some basis of common interest.

Democrats and Dictators

Protagonists of federal union continually emphasise that they want a federation of democratic States. Now the immediate danger to Europe is not a quarrel between democratic States, but a quarrel between democracies on the one hand and tyrannical aggressors on the other. The essence of the problem lies in the difference in conception as between democratic States and the totalitarian States; in the difference between the ideal of peace and liberty of the former, and the ideal of war and citizen slavery of the latter; in the false contrast between the "have nots" and

the "haves," etc. We therefore must have an immediate machinery for preventing war between States whose ideals are different, whose interests cross and clash, and who have different views of how to behave internationally. For this purpose nobody has yet proposed any other machinery than a League of Nations. It must be added, however, that it is now clear that such a League must be endowed with real power to reach decisions quickly and to enforce them with success, and not be dependent upon the hesitations or particularist motives of any State member of the League.

If the problem of peace is looked at in this way, then those who work for the

League of Nations need have no fear of Federal Union, and those who work for Federal Union need not act in antagonism to the League. It is the collective result of the various contributory conceptions mentioned that will lead to a really permanent peace system.

From League to World Rule

To sum up, the stages by which world peace can be safeguarded are the following:—

1. A reconstructed League of Nations, with the necessary authority and power to take its decisions quickly and to enforce them effectively.
2. The development of a Confedera-

tion between such groups of States as Great Britain and France, Scandinavia and the Low Countries, the small States in Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans, etc.

3. The development of real Federal Unions between larger and larger groups of States, that decide to pool their international interests and to entrust them to a super-government, democratically elected by the populations of all the States voting together.

4. The gradual covering of the world by a system of world federalism, which will place all important world interests under the control of an internationally recognised and elected authority.

TO STAND STILL IS TO FALL BEHIND

"Headway" is the organ of the League of Nations Union. It offers, within the necessary narrow limits of its space, opportunities to every section of Union opinion for the statement of its considered views. All the more readily when those views are critical. Mr. Street is a loyal worker for the Union.

Sir,—From its formation the League of Nations Union has served to give expression to the desire of its members for the organisation of a peace system which would prevent a recurrence of the World War of 1914-18. From the setting up of the League of Nations our Union has urged the application of the Covenant principles in international affairs. We have sought to point out how, when, and in what measure the actions of the various Governments, and more particularly our own, have violated or endorsed the declared principles of the Covenant. We have endeavoured to educate, interest and gain the support of the public for the work that it was hoped the League would perform.

But the war which the League of Nations Union sought to prevent has broken out. Starting in 1931 it has now spread until it involves our own country. Thus for the second time the League of Nations Union sees the country at war and international affairs in a state of anarchy. For basically similar reasons the Union again expresses its support for the action of the nation in conducting war. It justifies the war on the grounds that it is waged in defence of League principles; that it is necessary if we are ever to have a new World Order. It puts forward the main principles of the Covenant as the basis of the new World Order—this is our statement "World Settlement after the War." Our plan is essentially similar to that which the founders of the Union urged upon the world in 1918.

Questioning the Union's Policy

Nevertheless, in the period since the first World War, great developments have taken place. We have the twenty years' history of the League experiment to take into account. It is impossible for us to evaluate the present or to put forward a realistic plan for the future unless we have fully appreciated the lessons of the post-war period.

Does the history of the League cast doubt on the fundamental validity of the Covenant concept as a basis for the evolution of Peace? The nations have exhibited an inability to conform to its requirements. Does the acceptance of the Covenant presuppose certain world conditions which do not yet exist? Is the Covenant wishful thinking unrelated to the practical realities of the world in which we have advocated its application? In its origin can we regard the League system as a natural development of post-war World Society, or was

it a product of that society in the face of world-wide social revolt? Does the Covenant presuppose the social revolution which it served to check?

The League of Nations Union now reiterates the immediate conditions which must be fulfilled if the League system is to be re-established. The economic, political and moral structure of World Society will determine whether or not such conditions can be fulfilled. Are we advocating the super-structure for world organisation without a thorough understanding of its foundation?

Present Activity

We must face the fact that since the war began there has been a reduction in all the Union's propaganda work. Self-righteousness ("we told you so"), and an attitude of mind which looks to the future rather than the present ("after the war, when a new World Order will have to be built"), both damp any real sense of urgency in our work. Furthermore, in considering the influence of our Union, we cannot ignore the fact that it is intimately associated in peoples' minds with the League of Nations as an actuality.

Only by questioning and by study can we achieve the revolution of thought which is necessary if we are to go forward from our present position to one of leadership in the struggle for Peace. Only if we apprehend the history and experience of the last twenty-one years can we escape a mechanical carrying forward of our principles into the present situation. Are we prepared to examine, understand and explain the economic, political and moral bases of Peace; to put forward our principles historically, not mechanically? This is the challenge of the war. We may easily become the unconscious accessory of another world deception, or we may so expose the very roots of the League's frustration as to create that enlightenment before which the forces of war and social injustice will be for ever impotent.

H. E. STREET, B.Sc.,
Secretary, Wood Green and Southgate Branch,
League of Nations Union.

INVITATION SONG RECITAL, by Kathleen Ewart, at Trinity College of Music, Mandeville Place, Wigmore Street, W.1, Wednesday, February 7, 2.50 p.m.

COLONIES AND PEACE AIMS

By SIR JOHN HARRIS, Secretary of the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society, Member of the Executive Committee of the L.N.U.

January Headway contained an article by Sir John Maynard, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., D.Litt., on the International Administration of Colonies. Sir John Harris now deals with the same great problem. He is known throughout the world as a foremost expert on Africa.

THE close of the war will present the British people with a challenge from almost every one of the 80 to 85 Dependency territories. There has never been a time in our Colonial history when British statecraft was confronted with such a formidable list of demands—political, administrative and economic—affecting vitally as they do the well-being of the 60 million British subjects and British-protected foreigners. As some of us see it, this is far less a moment for the imposition of novel policies and forms of government we would never tolerate for ourselves, than it is for getting back to the foundations of those Colonial aims and practices under which these millions of overseas people were led to come so joyously (in most cases) under the British flag.

In the first place, we are confronted with the gravest challenge to Colonial policy since Fowell Buxton in 1823 tabled his bold resolution demanding the abolition of slave-owning.

Committed Up to the Hilt

A review of British Treaties, of British Proclamations to native rulers, of statements in Imperial Conferences, shows that we were committed up to the hilt and in the most solemn manner to eschew any form of racial discrimination.



Craven 'A'
HAVE THE REAL
TOUCH OF QUALITY

10 for 7d. 20 for 1/2 25 for 1/5
50 for 2/11 100 for 5/10

MADE SPECIALLY TO PREVENT SORE THROATS

Carreras Ltd.—150 years' Reputation for Quality

C.A. 754

- 1 Your throat is safe with as many as you will, and smoothness make pleasure.
- 2 Craven 'A' never vary—their particular merits are always the same. Wherever you buy cork-tipped cigarettes have the real touch of quality.
- 3 Freshness too, is essential if your smoking is to be really satisfying—that's the reason why Craven 'A' are sealed fresh, sold fresh in moisture-proof 'Cellophane.'

Within recent years we have been compelled to witness, particularly in Africa, a steady decline from these ideals. In several territories, and not merely in the African Continent, the "Colour Bar" policy is now firmly rooted. We have witnessed the passing of legislation providing for forcible colour segregation in industry, disabilities in religious and educational activities. A discrimination based on colour is of the worst possible kind. One curious fact is that its complete application would ultimately bring about its own ruin, apart from the disruption of the British Empire. It is extraordinarily difficult to impose without manifold injustices, and it hits the coloured colonial just where he most resents it. The "Colour Bar" has nothing to do with social customs; whether they be of whites marrying half-castes, or mixed racial dinner parties, these are social matters between the persons concerned. The "Colour Bar" is the infliction of a legislative or administrative bar upon British people of colour solely because of the colour of their skin. There is no question of criminal taint, capacity or incapacity of the victim; it has nothing whatever to do with moral character—if a person has any "colour in his blood," then he is by Colour Bar law put outside the circle of civilised man.

The question for the British people is, whether they are prepared to demand that we get back to the Treaties and engagements into which we entered when these areas were incorporated, and declare once again: "There shall not be in the eye of the law any distinction or disqualification whatever founded on mere distinction of colour, origin, language or creed, but the protection of the law in letter and in substance shall be extended impartially to all alike."

When the Peace Conference assembles the coloured races intend demanding citizenship regardless of colour, and it is certain that reconsideration will have to be given to the question of trusteeship and the whole mandatory system. At this Conference, Britain should be prepared to give a lead to the nations. The admitted weaknesses of the mandatory system will need to be eliminated, and the actual mandates brought under review. The Colonial Powers will certainly be confronted with a demand for self-government in their own and in the mandated territories. This is just where some of the novel schemes for Colonial administration fail us. Most of them envisage a kind of permanent international control, whereas Colonial peoples are looking for less external control and far more internal development. It is not enough to make the phrase "self-government" a kind of "shibboleth"; the day has gone by for anything of the sort. Colonial peoples are demanding, just as India is demanding, explicit commitments with regard to self-government, and the nations will be failing in their duty if they do not provide, not merely for a definite advance in self-government, but an undertaking that existing Governments will immediately set about the task of preparing Colonial races for an increasing share in the actual administration of their own territories.

Illusion About Riches

A few days ago, Dr. Goebbels declared once again that Germany was entitled to "share the riches" of Colonial territories. It is this kind of demand which makes one realise the abysmal ignorance of large numbers of people upon Colonial matters. The riches of Colonial territories are

measured by the energy and sacrifice which we are prepared to devote to them. Too often people speak of the fabulous riches of the South African mines, regardless of the fact that they only pay capital a return of 4 per cent.! Others tell us of the privileged position we occupy in the Far East in the production of rubber, ignoring the fact that the industry after all owes its origin to the single Englishman who risked his life in order to obtain four sacks of seeds from the malarial forests of the Amazon, and that the later production of rubber is due as much to the energy of German, Dutch, American and Belgian subjects as to British subjects. Thus, at the present time, we are confronted with a demand not only in British Colonial territories, but in those of Portugal and France, for new industries and public expenditure on a vast scale, if we are to give to these Colonial territories that measure of modern prosperity which their people are entitled to expect. Amongst many illustrations is the whole question of irrigation, which can only be carried out by international agreement and co-operation and with international capital. The loss to the African Continent alone is prodigious through the outpouring of wealth into the ocean by the great rivers of Africa. It is accepted as one of the fundamental causes of economic poverty of the Southern States of America that the Mississippi alone pours into the ocean every year over £70,000,000 of fertilising agencies. This figure gives some idea of the enormous losses accruing to the African Continent by the far greater outflow of the riverine systems of the Niger, the Zambesi, the Congo, the Ogowe and other rivers.

Ruin Now Threatened

It may be too much to expect that the Peace Conference will enter into detail upon the great question of the economic development of Colonial territories, but it will be deplorable if, in view of the clamant demand from all the Colonies of the world for capital development, the Peace Conference

does not face up to the problem with which this situation will confront them, and set up some form of machinery to consider what can be done to deal with the ruin which is now facing several large Colonial territories through the ever-increasing ravages of uncontrolled erosion.

It may be that, in addition to these problems which are now right upon us, the Peace Conference may have time to embark upon a consideration of such problems as international government as distinct from international control, but if they do so, two of the questions they will certainly ask is, what will the native people say to these proposals, and, secondly, who is going to pay for them? These two questions, put again and again, have never been answered.

WARTIME IS MAPTIME

Wartime is maptime. Once again, as in the grim years from 1914 to 1918, unaccustomed eyes are searching atlases to find the strange places, of desperate happenings, and to learn, if possible, something of their reason and their significance. But now understanding is more difficult. The direct, dramatic quality has gone out of war. Navies, air forces, armies are employed not first to break down by arms the resistance of the opposing forces but to apply a continual pressure to the enemy country so that its resources may be sapped and economic exhaustion may drive it to surrender.

In a manner impossible to follow without expert guidance war has extended into every quarter of the globe. Wherever there is iron or tin or copper or nickel, rubber or wool or cotton, wheat or meat, coal or oil, such essential supplies are the object of ceaseless belligerent activity. Either to secure them for one's own side or to deny them to the other, or, if possible to do both. Every weapon, military and diplomatic, is brought into play. The resultant complications are too subtle and too far varying for even the best informed observer to keep them in view and in perspective without the help of many maps, up-to-date in their facts and drawn for that very purpose.

Exactly such help is offered in the monthly issues of their Serial Map Service by George Philip and Son of Letchworth, Herts. The charge for a year's supply, which will not be less than several maps once a month, is 17s. 6d.

A MORE GENERALISED SYSTEM OF MUTUAL HELP

Sir Ronald Campbell, the newly appointed British Ambassador to France, in an address to the American Club in Paris:—

We do not ask: "What are you going to do about it?" No responsible Englishman has been, and I hope none will be, guilty of the impertinence of putting such a question. Your position is not ours. What it may become is for you alone to judge. What you will do now or later depends on the will of your people, and on that alone.

But let me say that what you think about the matter does concern us very deeply. For the good opinion of the instructed American citizen we have a high regard. And I beg you, do not, as far as your influence goes, allow it to be thought that this is no more than just another war. "Here are these British and French. We helped them out of a mess twenty years ago, and now they're in just such another."

This is not "just another war." It is not dynasties, nor markets, nor the

balance of power that are at stake. It is a war of principle. And the issue is a very simple one. It is a struggle between right—to use Lincoln's words—"as God gives us to see the right"—and wrong. And as to where the right lies and where the wrong, every citizen not only of the United States but of the whole civilised world may properly be asked to make up his mind.

The primary war aim is to win the war—win it in the sense of destroying the enemy's military power. For only in an atmosphere free of further threat can we hope to give our minds to the task of building a new order in Europe.

What form this work of reconstruction will take, it is too early yet to foretell. But at least we can say that the new order must be raised on wide foundations of co-operation and of mutual help. In the benefits accruing from it all nations which are ready to play their part in good faith may expect to share.

It may be that the agreements concluded between the British and French

Governments, by which they go a long way to pooling their resources, may prove to be the first step on the road of a more generalised system of mutual help.

We must not be content merely to put back the clock. We must not be content to leave civilisation where it was when it was challenged by the demoniac forces now let loose on a suffering Europe. To aim at this, and no more than this, would be to sap our own courage, our own resolution.

We must believe in our own ability to ensure that these forces shall never be let loose again; we must believe that all the sufferings still to be borne by millions of mankind are but the foundation of a new and better civilisation.

For it is not the case that this is "just another war"; it is not the case that every war sows the seeds of another. We English, you Americans, and the French—your Allies in the past, ours in the present—are a living and happy proof to the contrary.

THE L.N.U. AT WORK

THE Union's Lending Library is functioning again. That is the outstanding piece of news that comes from Headquarters this month. The restoration of the library service will be invaluable to branches, study circles, and discussion groups, to the University and College branches, to adult education classes, and, no less, to the individual member of the Union.

In past years, with the generous aid of the Carnegie Endowment, the Union has been able to build up a great collection of books and documents covering the whole field of international affairs. This lending library earned the reputation of being one of the finest on its subjects to be found anywhere in Europe—probably the best, with the exception of the League Library at Geneva.

Library Saved

What to do with its library was one of the big problems which confronted the Union on the outbreak of war. It would have been tragic to break it up completely. Yet it was by no means certain that the Union would still be able to employ a librarian, or, for that matter, keep the library up to date. Further, there was no room to house it in the new and smaller offices to which the Union moved in St. Martin's Lane. The Executive Committee came to the conclusion that, in the very difficult circumstances, the best policy was to try to preserve the library for future use. They were not uninfluenced by the fact that Government Departments and important business firms were moving their documents and records from London for fear of immediate and devastating air raids. Hence the decision to store the Union's library in a place of safety somewhere in the country.

A friend in need was found in Miss B. M. Baker, Head Mistress of Badmington School and Chairman of the Union's Junior Branches Sub-Committee. She volunteered to provide free accommodation for the library at her school. Books, documents, and filing cases were packed in vast railway containers and transported from Grosvenor Crescent to Bristol.

Books Can Be Borrowed

And now, much sooner than the Union dared to hope, the library is coming out of "cold storage." Thanks to the willing

co-operation of Miss Baker, the Governors of the School and other friends of the Union, including a generous benefactor, it is once more possible to open a full lending service, operating from Bristol. All applications for books should be addressed to

League of Nations Union Librarian,
at Badmington School,
Westbury-on-Trym,
Bristol.

Individual members of the Union may borrow single books. Branches, schools, and other groups may borrow boxes of books and keep them for three months. The only charge, to Branches and members of the Union, is for postage or carriage.

Borrowers may apply for particular books they wish to read, or ask the librarian to send them one or more books on a given subject. The librarian will always be glad to advise readers in their choice of books and to select for discussion groups a collection of books and documents on the subject they are studying.

Discussion Group Syllabus

Discussion groups are now going ahead in many different parts of the country. Mr. W. Arnold-Forster has prepared a syllabus for discussion groups on "War Aims and Peace Terms," which is being issued by the Union in seven fortnightly parts. In January, a specimen copy of the first part was offered free of charge to inquirers. More than 150 branches and individuals wrote in for the sample, and already some 80 of them have asked for the whole series to be supplied.

The Head Office is constantly urging branches to hold public meetings; they are advised to rely whenever possible upon speakers who live not far distant from the place of meeting. The number of branches which are arranging their own series of meetings, sometimes with assistance from Headquarters, is most encouraging. In some places, such as Leamington, West Hampstead, Bournemouth, Harrow, and Streatham, monthly meetings are best suited to the local conditions. Elsewhere it is practicable to arrange meetings more frequently. Birmingham's weekly lunches are attracting a great deal of attention. At Green Lane, Coventry, meetings of a more serious character alternate with

social evenings enlivened with films, play-readings, and music. In connection with the Women's Royal Naval Service, lectures are being given on "The Background of the War" to different groups (numbering about forty), who attend for a course of training at the W.R.N.S.'s depot in Kensington. Hull has set up a "War Aims Inquiry Commission." At the Montague Burton Branch where a speaker addresses about seventy people at lunch the talk is broadcast to the 6,000 employees in other rooms.

What Youth Thinks

All the present activities of the Union's Youth Movement are working up to the climax of the National Youth Conference, to be held at the Burlington Galleries, Piccadilly, London, W.1, on March 2 and 3. The object of the conference is to discuss Peace Aims. Among the speakers will be Sir Richard Acland and Mr. P. J. Noel-Baker. Plenty of time will be left for free and frank discussion.

The ground has been prepared by a series of regional Youth Conferences, which, on the initiative of the Executive Committee, have been organised throughout the country. The subject of these has been the Union's statement, "World Settlement After the War."

B.U.L.N.S.

Early in January the fourteenth annual Council and Conference of the British Universities League of Nations Society was held at the Training College, Lincoln. The decisions reached at the Council meetings were probably the most important ever taken by the Society. After full discussion of the financial position and other factors, it was decided to do everything possible to continue and strengthen the work of the B.U.L.N.S. in order to unite all students who were seeking to play their part in planning and working for a new and better world order. Every effort will be made, also, to arrange a summer conference to replace the annual Geneva Conference, as a focus for the year's activities.

The first meeting of the Union's new Educational Council took place midway through January, under the chairmanship of Dr. Gilbert Murray. An important statement on the work of the Council will be issued shortly.