

HEADWAY

IN WAR-TIME

The Journal of the League of Nations Union

No. 10

JULY 1940

PRICE 3d.

EDITORIAL

THE DARKEST HOUR

THE cause of the Allies, the cause of the League, the cause of international justice and human decency has suffered staggering blows. The tide of anarchy overflows the Atlantic coasts of Europe and beats now on our own shores; the British Commonwealth stands virtually alone, championing the cause of all civilisation. To some the name of this cause is Christianity; to some, the freedom of the human spirit. To some it is a vague but none the less passionately cherished tradition of human kindness and fair dealing, the good way of life as we have known it. To some it is the vision of social justice and equality; to others, the remote but glorious ideal of the brotherhood of all mankind. And many men, widely diverse in their views and valuations, have found these things represented and summed up—however imperfectly—in the essential spirit of the League; not in any particular article of the Covenant, not in any particular piece of administrative machinery, but in the aspiration which gave it birth and the vision which inspires its leaders.

The dark hour threatens all these things; but under that threat their unity grows clearer. It is not possible to support the League and to stand aside now from the effort for victory. It is not possible to say "We work for peace; what business of ours is this war?" All the resolution, all the thought, all the devotion, due to the League and what it stands for, are due now to the cause through which alone the League can rise again; the whole weight of the League's backers must be thrown into this struggle for the League's ideals.

Six months ago the midnight service ringing out the Old Year broadcast through the frosty darkness that great anthem which crystallises, in a few lines of noble music, the things we fight for:

"Earth shall be fair, and all her peoples one;
Not till that hour shall God's whole will be done;

Now, even now, once more to earth and sky
Rings out in joy man's old undaunted cry:
Earth shall be fair, and all her peoples one!"

Now, even now, in a deeper night and an icier frost, is the time to remember those words and work for their fulfilment.

THE COUNCIL'S CALL TO ACTION

RARELY has the General Council of the League of Nations Union held a more impressive and inspiring meeting than that at the Conway Hall in London on June 19 and 20. It is as well to state this fact plainly at the start for the benefit of those few fainthearts who wondered whether any useful purpose would be served by calling together the Council at this time. From first to last no defeatist or despairing note was heard in the discussions, which reached a high level of resolute eloquence. Our leaders, certain that the Union had an important and definite war-time duty, spoke brave and stirring words. The representatives of Districts and Branches throughout England, Scotland and Wales were at one with them. The Council sounded a call to action which will rouse an eager response in the ranks of the Union up and down the country.

The first antidote to depression was LORD CECIL'S announcement, in his address of welcome, that Mr. Winston Churchill had cordially accepted the Union's invitation to become one of its Honorary Presidents. "We are behind—I hope we are unanimously behind—the Prime Minister in his advocacy of continued resistance to this tyranny," said Lord Cecil. The attitude of the Union could not be in any doubt whatever. "The whole purpose for which the Union exists is to stand for peace on the basis of freedom, truth and justice. And it is these very ideals which are controverted by the philosophy of the Dictatorship countries. With all the many causes of anxiety and sorrow, it is to me a matter of very great consolation that the issue in this war is so clear and definite as it is. That is why

a society like ours, which works for and believes in peace, may yet think that the highest interests of peace are wrapped up in the victory of our country and the defeat of the devilish doctrine against which we are fighting."

Lord Cecil then gave notice of his "urgency" motion on "The Union and the War." LORD LYTTON later emphasised that, in a national situation of the gravest possible kind, there was no use for any organisation unless it was helpful to the national cause. "All the leaders of our movement are engaged in work connected with the war, and I wish to express the hope that this Council will not spend much time in discussing things which, however important in different circumstances, are at the moment wholly undesirable. Our domestic affairs must, for the time being, wait."

The League Not Dead

With his great gift for putting the fundamental issues simply and clearly, DR. GILBERT MURRAY told the Council: "People are saying—even newspapers generally favourable to our movement are saying in their headlines—that the League of Nations is dead. What nonsense! Hitler can bomb the Secretariat, occupy Switzerland, partition it between Germany and Italy, and send all the members of the Secretariat to concentration camps. That does not mean that the League is dead. Our present Prime Minister said several years ago: 'If ever the British Empire is called upon to defend itself, that cause and the cause of the League are one.' The British Empire is defending itself, and the British Empire is not dead. We have been working for peace

for many years, we believed peace could only be got in the first place by the establishment of justice between nation and nation. But at the same time we have insisted that there was no security for any nation excepting collective security. Those in charge of the affairs of Europe, for one reason or another, fell back into isolation or into the miserable doctrine of neutrality, which has really ruined Europe; each nation vainly, desperately hoping that, by saying it was neutral, by saying it was neither on the side of God or the devil, neither on the side of good or evil, it would be spared. They have all found those foolish hopes broken. As Aristotle said: "We are making war in order that we may live in peace." If we win, we mean to create a peaceful world by means of justice and by means of learning the truth and speaking the truth. If Hitler wins, the world is inevitably condemned to war, permanent war, constant war; war brought about by lies, by a sort of worship of lying deceit. The way to peace is hard. We fight to the end, although we hate war, because that is the only way of assuring peace."

Keeping Up the Morale

A moving appeal for service from every member of the Union came from MISS K. D. COURTNEY in proposing the resolution on "Plans for the Peace." "We believe," she said, "that there can be no peace unless we do defeat those forces of darkness which are now against us. One of the greatest necessities which is going to arise in the course of the next weeks is the maintenance of the morale of our people. That is a job that we can do. We have got to make people realise that they are called upon to make every possible sacrifice, even of life itself. We have got to make people see that they must

'stay put,' even if it means being killed. What really matters is that our country, and what we stand for, and our way of life, and our ideals should live. We have got to make people see that, and we can if we lift up their hearts to something higher than merely killing, to life itself. The great call has come. This is not a time for idle recriminations nor for foolish fatalism, it is a time for resolve. And because 'we see what we foresaw,' because we stood for the truth and the right, so can we have the strength and the solidity not to be moved or to be shaken, but to show people what we have to do now to win through to the end. Don't let us say 'I told you so'—nothing is more feeble, nothing is really more weakening. The thing is what we have to do now; and our Union has a great part to play. First there are our Branches with their numerous well-trained people and those who have got the confidence of their fellow-citizens and those who are accustomed to speak at public meetings. In every Branch they should rally and resolve that they will do their utmost to maintain and support the morale of the people. Above all, let us not be defeatist either about our country or about the League of Nations. As Mr. Harold Nicolson, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Information, so recently said at a meeting of the Union's L.R.F.: 'Let us have no defeatist nonsense about the League of Nations.'

"The knowledge of the situation, the understanding that the members of our Union have acquired is going to be a tremendous asset in the future," continued Miss Courtney. "In that knowledge, in that experience, we have something very great to offer to our people and to our country. If all our members will stand together and believe

in themselves, we can make a great contribution to the future. Here are some words from Benjamin Franklin. He was feeling as some people are feeling to-day: 'Though the sun has gone down, my friend, and it may be a long time before it rises again, let us make as good a night of it as we can. We may still light candles.' I invite the League of Nations Union to light candles and to keep them burning. And, when I think of candles, I think of another who said: 'Play the man, Master Ridley, for this day we shall light such a candle in England as, by God's grace, will never be put out.'"

Taking up Miss Courtney's theme of Union members playing their part, MR. LEONARD BEHRENS (Manchester) suggested that those who could address public meetings might offer their services to the Ministry of Information, which was coming out very strong in sustaining the morale and cheerfulness of the people of our country.

Using Our Opportunity

The DEAN OF CHICHESTER strongly urged that the present opportunity should be used, not to say, "I told you so," but to bring home to people those things which the Union had been contending for so long. "One of our main theses," he said, "has been that when there was an aggressor there could be no neutrality, and that adoption of neutrality was itself completely the opposite of the League of Nations. They could not exist together, and were mutually contradictory. Though in itself it is impeccable, we have used the word 'peace' too much. We have thought in terms of peace when we ought to have thought in terms of order and law. If you attempt to pursue peace, you will certainly not get it. Peace is a by-product of doing what is right, and if we had kept that

clearly before us we should have got a great deal further than we have done. It has been said that young people have been hoping that they might be spared the suffering of the previous generation. That was not the appeal made to the youth of other countries, which inspired the Hitler Youth and the Giovinezza—but a call to suffering and to death and glory. The cause to which we are called makes exactly the same demands for the true glory, the glory of God in the hearts of men. If we believe that there is a divine purpose running through even this evil world, that divine purpose will in the end justify itself—but only if it is able to summon to its assistance people whose dedication is so profound that they care about nothing else except doing the will of God."

Presenting the *Annual Report* for 1939, LORD LYTON informed the Council of a cleavage of opinion within the Youth Groups on the Union's attitude towards the war. As it was impossible to allow a section of the Union to propagate views hostile to those laid down by the General Council itself, the Executive had decided for the time being to suspend that part of the constitution dealing with the committees and councils drawing their authority from the Youth Groups.

Turning to "the hard facts of finance," MR. H. S. SYRETT thought that the situation was quite satisfactory in the circumstances. The Union was holding its own, and had succeeded in reducing its debt. This year, up to the end of May, over 51,000 members had paid subscriptions. This was a great tribute to Branches up and down the country.

With the decision not to discuss other items on the agenda not immediately relevant to the issue of winning the war, the Council ended, as it had begun, on the note of Service. L. R. A.

Message from the Executive Committee to all Members of the League of Nations Union

July 4th, 1940.

When the actual battle front was far distant it was possible for us who live far behind the lines to occupy ourselves with many problems that will become important as soon as the fighting ceases. But to-day the war has come to our very doors. The Battle of Britain has begun. We are all in it. We are the very last outpost in Europe for the defence of freedom. There is no such thing as "behind the lines" to-day. The only subject therefore for our Branches and Members to discuss at the moment is "How can we help to win this battle?"

In the dark days which lie ahead of us, there is one thing that is going to be decisive—the conduct of our civil population. We know that our fighting forces will do everything that is humanly possible to achieve victory. But their ability first to defend our country against the attacks of the enemy and afterwards to attack him in his own country depends upon the equipment with which we can provide them. We have greater ultimate resources from which to make good our present deficiencies in equipment, but long before we can take advantage of those resources the enemy, which has the superiority to-day, will try to prevent our overtaking him, to cripple our production, to break our hearts and to destroy our will. Whether or not he will succeed or fail in this will depend in the last resort upon ourselves—the civil population, the man-in-the-street, the woman-in-the-home.

P.T.O.

In this task of keeping up the courage, patience and discipline of the civil population, we of the League of Nations Union have a tremendous opportunity for service. We have exceptional facilities for helping in this vital matter. We are an organisation covering the whole country, with branches in almost every town and village. Moreover, we have been trained for this work, no less than the fighting men have been trained for theirs. We have a long experience of educating opinion, and we have a knowledge which makes us stronger than those who are without it. "Knowledge," says an Eastern writer, "has two wings, Opinion only one. The Bird of Opinion soon falls in its orphan flight, but when Knowledge receives it on its two wings it flies like Gabriel." We know that in this war more is at stake than our lives, our liberties or our homes. We have foreseen what we are now seeing. We know that no peace can come out of our defeat. We know how this war might have been prevented. We know that another war to follow this one will be made either inevitable or unlikely by the use we make of our victory. It is just because we have this knowledge that our strength should be greater than that of others and our example stimulating to them.

Benjamin Franklin's words in an earlier crisis may serve as our motto to-day, "Though the sun has gone down and it may be long before it rises again, let us make as good a night of it as we can. We may still light candles." That is our war work; whatever other candles may go out, ours must be kept burning, and by their light our people will find and follow the road to victory.

THE COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS

1.—THE UNION AND THE WAR.

The General Council of the League of Nations Union desire to assure H.M. Government that

They warmly support the continuance of our utmost efforts to defeat Germany and Italy as announced by the Prime Minister; and

They will do all in their power to secure the success of that policy.

2.—PLANS FOR THE PEACE.

The General Council

Convinced that it is the duty of every member of the Union to do everything possible to secure an early victory of the Allies in the present war;

Welcomes the Conference of the Union and the French Society and thanks the Conference for its labours in preparing the statement in Appendix D and the Executive for its statement in Appendix E;

Commends these statements to the consideration of the Districts, Branches, and Youth Groups of the Union; and

Requests the Executive, when the situation permits, to pursue with the French League of Nations Society their consideration of these matters.

3.—WAR REFUGEES.

The General Council of the League of Nations Union

Recalling the splendid services rendered by Dr. Nansen through the League of Nations in the cause of war refugees,

Expresses its admiration of the noble way in which the French people are making efforts to provide for the millions of war refugees now in their country, but feels strongly that the burden should not be borne by them alone.

The Council recognises also the great services which are being rendered by the International Commission, the Red Cross, and other organisations, but believes that all this help should be co-ordinated and developed by the League of Nations.

4.—CHILDREN IN DANGER FROM WAR.

The General Council of the League of Nations Union

Warmly welcomes the offers made by the Dominions to receive children who are in danger from war; and

Expresses its satisfaction that H.M. Government has taken prompt action to give effect to the proposals, and hopes that it will encourage other States remote from Europe to make similar offers.

CORRESPONDENCE

We regret that, owing to great pressure upon space in this issue, we are compelled to hold over the publication of readers' letters.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX D.

PLANS FOR THE PEACE.

(Statement adopted at a Conference held in London on March 9th and 10th, 1940.)

The British League of Nations Union and the French League of Nations Society, at the first of their conferences to define their common peace aims, declare that in opposing the German policy of enslavement the Allied Governments of Great Britain and France are not themselves seeking to dominate Europe, but only desire to secure for other nations the same freedom which they claim for themselves.

They recognise that, when the victory of the Allies has been obtained, every effort must be made to establish by agreement a new order, and in doing so to be influenced neither by illusions nor feelings of revenge which are alike productive of future wars.

They are convinced that it is neither just nor moral that an aggressor should gain by his aggression. The wrong done to the people of other States by an act of aggression cannot be obliterated by the mere defeat of the aggressor. Experience has shown the necessity for concerting effective measures to make future aggression impossible.

Finally, they are satisfied that their common peace aims can only be accomplished by successive stages.

First must come a definition of the conditions in which the Allies would be prepared to terminate hostilities with Germany. Next should follow the conclusion of peace between the belligerents; and finally the conditions essential for the general organisation of peace should be defined after discussion at a conference in which States that have not been engaged in the hostilities should take part.

I.—CONDITIONS OF ARMISTICE

These can only be defined in so far as the military situation leaves the Allies with the power to enforce them. They are fighting against the destroyer of more than one State, who but for their resist-

ance would certainly attempt the destruction of many others. A murdered individual cannot be restored to life. A murdered State fortunately can, and the liberation of Hitler's victims of yesterday would be an essential condition of any Armistice.

To be precise, the Allies should require the restoration of the right of self-determination to the peoples of Austria, Poland, and Czechoslovakia as it was before Munich, in those parts of their territory now occupied by German troops, and adequate provision for the exercise of that right without any external pressure. For this purpose German troops would have to be withdrawn from these territories and replaced by other forces sufficient to maintain order and resist any external aggression; national Governments would have to become responsible for the administration in those countries, and their representatives must have the right to sit at the General Peace Conference, together with the representatives of the Allied countries and Germany.

Guarantees for the enforcement of these conditions would be determined by the Allied Governments.

II.—PEACE BETWEEN THE BELLIGERENTS

The Treaty of Peace between the belligerents should be concluded as soon as possible after the Armistice. The terms of this Treaty should be settled after discussion in a conference in which all the interested parties, *i.e.*, the belligerents and representatives of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Austria, would freely take part.

III.—THE GENERAL PEACE SETTLEMENT

The Conference summoned to negotiate the general peace settlement should be attended not only by the States recently at war, but by others whose participation would be necessary to the establishment of the new world order. It should, if possible, take place at the Seat of the League of Nations.

The delimitation of frontiers not previously fixed would be negotiated at this

Conference. The problems of national, racial, linguistic and religious minorities, and in general the problem of guaranteeing fundamental human rights, would also be considered.

The main purpose of the Conference would be to consider how future wars of aggression can be prevented, it being the fixed determination of the Allies who are now at war with Germany to save future generations from the necessity of experiencing a repetition of the sacrifices which have twice been imposed upon them by the same nation.

For this purpose the establishment of an effective international organisation is essential. Whatever form the ultimate organisation may take, this feature must be found in it—such limitation of national sovereignty as may be necessary for (1) the maintenance of the supremacy of law between nations, (2) the organisation of collective security, and (3) the reciprocal interchange of common interests between the nationals of different States.

Every member of the organisation must therefore accept the obligation:—

(a) To submit to third party judgment its disputes with other States whether justiciable or not, and to refrain from the use of force except with the sanction of an international authority.

(b) To undertake a share of responsibility for preventing and resisting aggression.

(c) To reduce its armaments progressively to an agreed limit and to accept the supervision of such limitation by an international authority.

The two Societies believe that if there is to be a satisfactory outcome from such a Peace Conference there must be a League of Nations as universal as possible and operating with a measure of publicity comparable to that of a democratic parliament, and within its framework an association of States or groups of States. This association should be based on the principle that aggression is an international crime and should therefore provide for a common policy and common action for the purpose of making

precise and fulfilling effectively their obligations as Members of the League to prevent and resist aggression. It should also provide the opportunity of developing the social and economic welfare of their peoples. As the basis of such association the present Anglo-French co-operation should be continued, developed further, and opened to other States. So that by its continued growth, it will tend to become the necessary instrument for European co-operation.

It is important that the international organisation referred to in this statement should be brought into operation as speedily as possible in order to take over from the Allied Powers the provision of such effective guarantees as the experience of the war may have caused to be inserted in the Peace Treaty.

The two Societies are convinced that, in order to give vitality to the idea of peaceful co-operation between all peoples, it is necessary to create without delay closer ties between those nations which are already drawn together by common principles of civilisation.

When the security—stressed in this statement—has been assured, it will become possible to go further in—

the removal of causes of friction between nations, in particular by the peaceful adjustment of differences; the development of such benefits as individual liberty of action and movement, the maintenance of high standards in public health, conditions of labour, education and social services on which the happiness of the individual citizens in all States depends; the removal of trade barriers; and finally the encouragement of free flow of thought and knowledge between nations.

APPENDIX E.

SUGGESTED FOUNDATIONS FOR THE ORGANISATION OF PEACE.

The British League of Nations Union and the French League of Nations Society, having at their first Conference defined their war aims and indicated the nature of the International Organisation

which they hope may result from a General Conference summoned to consider a new World Order after the war, propose to devote their second Conference to a more precise definition of the form and powers of such organisation and its relation to the problem of disarmament and collective defence. The British League of Nations Union submits the following propositions:—

The first object to be aimed at is to make the League of Nations as nearly universal as possible, in order to secure the co-operation of all States in that vast field of economic and social activities from which all people wherever they may live are benefited. This is essential, as in these matters the sphere of the League's activities is the whole world.

The existing machinery of the League for the modification of treaties, the peaceful adjustment of differences and the promotion of human welfare, for all those who are willing to make use of such machinery, does not call for radical alteration but only for further development. It has become apparent, however, that a universal League cannot in all cases be relied upon effectively to fulfil the narrower and specific function of securing the respect for law without which those activities cannot be made operative.

The problem of dealing with deliberate breaches of the peace and the attempted coercion of States by war or threats of war is of paramount importance. To deal with it effectively the provisions of the Covenant need to be supplemented in regard to certain areas. The procedure of the Covenant for dealing with this problem was based on the expectation that all peace-loving States would combine to restrain an aggressor. This expectation was not fulfilled in practice. Experience has shown it to be one of those illusions which must be avoided in the future. The unwillingness of States to go to war or to incur the risk of war to preserve peace has frustrated the operation of the Covenant, and this fact must be recognised by those who seek new means of dealing with this problem.

Aggression is an act of violence which can only be restrained if those who have sufficient force to prevent it are prepared, if necessary, to use that force to do so. It is therefore suggested that the League should delegate to such States as may be willing to undertake it, the responsibility for resisting any attempt to effect change by violence or threat of violence. As Mandates have been granted to some Powers to become responsible for the administration of certain areas "as a sacred trust of civilisation," the same principal might be applied by constituting certain States as guardians of the law in certain areas "as a sacred trust on behalf of the whole body of Members," but in fulfilling that trust they should be able to count on the moral and economic support of the whole League and its refusal to help any declared aggressor with whom they may be at war. Neutrality is incompatible with organised international action for peace.

In thus delegating its authority for action, the League would not relinquish its responsibility for deciding that circumstances had arisen calling for such action, but the Powers which had received the League's authority to act would proceed to do so without further reference to the League.

The formation within the League of a group or groups of States especially charged with its authority as guardians of the law must necessarily be gradual. But there exists already a foundation on which it should be possible to build at once. This foundation is provided by the Anglo-French Entente, which has been established in the present war and which the two Societies at their first Conference agreed should be further developed and continued after the war.

The first step in the formation of such an Association should be the consolidation of the Anglo-French Entente by the creation of a common Secretariat to advise the Governments of the two countries on all matters affecting their international obligations and a common General Staff to advise them on all mat-

ters affecting the use of their armed forces. It is essential, however, that this co-operation, which should be as complete and definite as possible, should be regarded as only the nucleus of a wider Association to be created gradually by the progressive adhesion of other States which may be willing to accept the same obligations and concert their policy and action to fulfil them. Ultimately it may be possible to secure the adhesion of all or nearly all the States of Europe, so as to constitute a Confederation willing and able to maintain the peace and security of every European State. With this object in view the Anglo-French Entente should from the first make it clear that their object was not the domination of Europe, the curtailment of the liberty or independence of any other European State, or the promotion of British and French interests at the expense of any other State, but merely the preservation of peace, the maintenance of law, and resistance, by force if necessary, to all attempted aggression—and that the adhesion of any State willing to share their responsibilities would be welcome.

The European group of States, the nucleus of which could thus be formed immediately, should undertake to resist aggression by any European State on any other, whether in Europe or not, and to maintain a combined armed force under a single command sufficient for the purpose. This group would necessarily be small to start with, but it is hoped that it would be increased gradually by the adhesion of other States as experience showed it to have used its powers uniformly in the service of the Covenant and not for the promotion of merely national interests.

It must be no function either of the League of all Nations or of the smaller Association within it to preserve the *status quo* either politically or territorially. All complaints against actual conditions, all grievances whether of whole States or of minority communities, all demands for change and all disputes between different States should come before the whole

League to which belong the functions of conciliation and arbitration.

It is hoped that on the model of the European group other groups may be formed in course of time to fulfil similar functions in other parts of the world. The Pan-American Union, for instance, might form such a group for the maintenance of law on the American Continents. A group might be formed for Asia, either by the Powers represented on the Institute of Pacific Relations or by the signatories of the Nine Power Treaty of Washington. A special group for Africa does not appear to be necessary at present, as aggression on that Continent could only be made by a European Power and such aggression would be dealt with by the European group.

The essential condition of any such Security Organisation is that the members composing it should have a clear understanding of their obligations, that they should mean the same thing, and should concert their policy and prepare their plan of action in time to make that action effective.

The problem of disarmament remains to be considered. General disarmament by international agreement is another feature of the Covenant which was contingent on a system of general collective security, but without such collective security it can never be achieved. If the responsibility for resisting aggression is to be entrusted to a group of States, it is obvious that the members of that group must have sufficient armed force for the purpose. General disarmament must therefore wait until general collective security has been made effective.

Those who have shown that they recognise no law but the interest of their own State, who glorify war as a national aim, and train their people from childhood to hate their neighbours and to be prepared to kill them, must accept the consequences when those whom they have threatened and attacked acquire the power to deny them the means of repeating their crimes.

The New Peace must be built on a social

(Continued at foot of page 16.)

CARRYING ON

By MAURICE FANSHAWE

ANYONE who doubts whether the spirit of the League still lives has only to read, on an earlier page, the account of the General Council meeting of the Union. But the League itself, as an active organism? . . . There is no use in glossing over unpleasant facts. The great international civil service built up over twenty years has been shattered, its headquarters stand almost empty. Impotent now to check the war machine, the League has been crippled for the performance of tasks which it still could carry out—the constructive technical services which, in a sane world achieved by the winning of its main objective of international security, would have been its positive task. What remains? How far is this mutilated organism capable of carrying on, and how far can it be reconstituted?

As to the second question, one cannot say. The rather indecently defeatist obituary notice appearing in a recent number of the *New Statesman* assumed that reconstitution was impossible. But the nuclei exist, not merely in the paralysed Geneva centre, but elsewhere; and they are active. A new Committee has been created with wide independent powers and some extra-League membership, to centralise and put in better order the League machinery for handling, when peace returns, the human problems so drily known as "technical"—problems of food, housing, jobs, schooling, trade, health, taxes, farming, transport, the safety and well-being of children. It is not complete: places are left vacant for important countries unable or unwilling to co-operate now. But the body of the Committee is ready to meet this

month. At Singapore the League's Health Bureau still keeps up the key health service of informing ships at sea of the prevalence of disease in ports. The work of supplying international biological standards to almost every country in the world is still going on in London and—according to the latest available information—from Nazi-occupied Copenhagen. It was the League's health organisation which provided sera from all over the world to combat epidemics in earthquake-stricken Anatolia. League Commissions are at work in the heart of China to stamp out plague, typhus and smallpox at their source. Health and social committees on the problems of evacuation and the care of refugees are helping to deal with the fearful problems raised by the invasion of the Low Countries and of France. The League Drug Committee met in May, and its machinery is active and geared to any emergency; and China has recently informed the League that by this year there will be no opium cultivation in any part of the country not under foreign occupation. The Governing Body of the I.L.O. has met; and, though the annual conference has been postponed, the programme of a whole year's work has been adopted, with full co-operation of League members and the United States.

All this is not enough. Compared with what might have been it is pitifully little; and to pretend that all is well would be merely silly. But it shows that international co-operation has power to survive the cruellest blows, whether inevitable or gratuitous: the flame smoulders low, but it is still alight.

ENTER SECOND MURDERER

"WE know where we stand." So Mr. Vernon Bartlett said in his wireless comment on France's demand for an armistice. So might we all have said on that day, a week earlier, when the jackal State of Fascist Italy declared war and thus staked a claim to a share of the carrion. We know where we stand. But have we not always known it, in this matter? Accusations of treachery are natural, but completely beside the point. Italy's conduct is ugly; but it is entirely in keeping with her past record, and does no more than sweep away, none too early, a wholly artificial distinction between the super-bandit Hitler and an accomplice equally, though less formidably, addicted to banditry and contempt for obligations.

Fascism's International Début

For what is Italy's record? Less flamboyant than Germany's, it is only less black in the sense that Public Enemy No. 2 is a lesser figure than Public Enemy No. 1; and, as Italian Fascism is of longer standing than German Nazism, so the dossier extends over a longer term of years. The whole ethos of totalitarian politics is contrary to the ideas of international law, collective security, and decent dealings between peoples generally. "The Fascist conception of the State is all-embracing; outside of it no human or spiritual values can exist, much less have value." Thus Mussolini himself; and his whole record as a peacebreaker and international menace confirms, and is implicit in, these words. The story goes back to the very earliest days of Italian membership of the League and allegiance to that scrap of paper the

Covenant. It was in 1921 that the Italian bombardment of Corfu—in defiance of the Covenant's provisions—first gave the world an earnest of Fascist methods, and the negotiations which followed demonstrated clearly enough the Italian determination to minimise the League's part and to avoid the creation of any precedent establishing its practical competence. During the years which followed no overt clash took place, but a constant campaign of denigration in the Press and petty trouble-making at the Council left little room for doubt as to the incompatibility of the League and Fascist ideas. In 1932, as De Bono makes clear in his book *Anno XIII*, Italy was already preparing the subjugation of Abyssinia—a fellow-member of the League, whose entry had been sponsored by Italy herself—and in 1935 the invasion duly took place.

Abyssinia

We need not dwell on the disgusting features of that invasion and its sequel—the use of poison gas (in contravention of the Geneva Convention of 1925), the deliberate bombing of the Red Cross (equally, of course, forbidden by international law), and the wanton massacres of civilians which accompanied the Italian occupation. These were the incidental accompaniments of murder. But it is worth recalling that quite apart from the general obligation, under the Covenant, to refrain from aggression, Italy also violated by her invasion of Abyssinia the Tripartite Agreement of 1906 whereby France, Britain and Italy undertook to respect Abyssinia's integrity; the assurances given in 1925 and 1926 on the same subject; and the Treaty of Amity, Con-

ciliation and Arbitration concluded with Abyssinia as lately as 1928—an ample wastepaper-basket full.

“Non-Intervention”

Hardly had the Italians established themselves in Abyssinia when the Spanish Civil War broke out, and the long farce of Non-Intervention gave further evidence of the quality of Italy's respect for her undertakings. “Unknown” submarines in the Mediterranean sank merchant ships without warning—inspiring Paris wits to rename Boulevard des Italiens *Boulevard des Inconnues*; Italian planes bombed British seamen on their lawful occasions in Spanish ports; Italian legionaries — “totalitarian volunteers” — ravaged the soil of Spain. We need not reopen the question of whether “non-intervention” was itself compatible with international obligations under the Covenant. What is certain is that Italy disregarded her pledge to non-intervention as blatantly as she disregarded the Covenant itself.

The Gentleman's Agreement: Albania

The Civil War ended; and with cheers, parades, speechmaking and decorations the totalitarian volunteers came home. Italy's withdrawal from the League meanwhile merely ended what had long been a ridiculous anomaly. Followed the Chamberlain-Mussolini Gentleman's Agreement, ensuring—on paper—the preservation of the *status quo* in the Mediterranean, the restoration of garrisons to normal, and abstention from hostile propaganda. Italy treated the Agreement with the degree of respect which might have been expected. The Bari wireless nightly exhorted the Near East to rise in revolt against British domina-

tion; Italian agents and Italian money fomented trouble in Egypt and Palestine; time dragged on and the swollen Libyan garrisons remained at their posts. As for the *status quo*, it was maintained just so long as Italy thought fit to maintain it. On Good Friday, 1939, more scraps of paper joined their predecessors in the dustbin. Italy's alliance with Albania, dating from 1921, bore its final fruit in the invasion and subjugation of that country. The bandit's dossier was complete.

The Moral

We know where we stand. It would have been better to have realised it earlier, 1939 was too late; 1937 was fully late enough; clearer vision in 1935 might have changed world history; already in 1921 our eyes should have been opened. It is not now that Italy is branded with the stigma of the lawbreaker, the bandit, the assassin with the stiletto. The stigma has been flaunted over many years for all to see. Now, even in the midst of the international ruin to which Italy has so malignantly contributed, it is not too early to resolve that, whatever form world or European co-operation may take when the struggle is over and the goal of victory attained, no such signs shall in future be thus misread.

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

REFUGEES IN FRANCE

By LADY PEEL

IT is with deepest anguish that the whole world is following the events which are now overwhelming the Allies. We have lived so long on the brittle crust of complacency that it is with relief that one turns to the unremitting work so magnificently done by the Friends in alleviating the distress amongst the never-ending stream of refugees. We had, of course, heard of all that they had done in the post-war past from 1918 and again for the Spanish refugees on both sides, but it had never become a reality to me until a few short weeks ago when I arrived at Angouleme late at night.

“Where is Lucy? What has happened?” Lucy had left before nine that morning with her car, and thirteen hours later she was still carrying-on, and when Lucy finally materialised from her hundred-and-one errands of mercy she seemed to be surprised anyone had worried about her. It was only next morning that I realised for myself the problem that the admirable Lucys of this life were up against, and how absorbing and constructive was the work that was being done and planned.

In this particular instance the Comité Internationale d'Aide aux Enfants de France was co-operating whole-heartedly in setting up needed Social Services and rebilleting the half-million evacuees from the first zone of Alsace Lorraine. These people had to leave their homes at half an hour's notice. Many came from big industrial towns where wages were high; they come to the poorest part of South-West France, sparsely populated, with totally inadequate Social Services.

After overcoming initial difficulties,

plans under the enlightened guidance of doctors from the Strassbourg Medical School were getting under way; plans that were of twofold importance—the short term and the long term. The short term programme was to give assistance to the millions of refugees pouring in from the North, but the long term programme included defending the health not only of the refugees but of the people of France because of the danger of epidemics caused by the intense congestion of the population in areas of refuge.

A Tidal Wave

A masterly survey of the ten refuge departments of South-West France was carried out by Dr. Audrey Russell; a survey of the clinics to be set up, of hospitals to be modernised. If these plans had materialised they would have been of lasting value to the old race of Langue d'Oc; if the magnificent work already begun by Mrs. Crawshay and the Comité had been able to continue, the benefits to the future of France would have been immense. But the horrors of Hitlerian war have overtaken France like a tidal wave bringing with it the flotsam and jetsam of millions more refugees. I understand there are 30,000 Dutch and 2,000,000 Belgians now in France, to which must be added the ever-increasing millions of French, first from the Northern battlefields, then from Paris, and now from the East and the Centre. May I quote from a letter received from one of these, a woman escaping from Cambrai:—

“I had only just time to escape. . . . I was waiting to catch the train when. . . . Alarm. . . . Two minutes later

German planes were bombing the station, which crumbled—300 casualties—I managed to salvage my bicycle, and stepping over the dead lying about in heaps, I took to the road. . . . I left with a number of poor people all escaping in haste . . . poor women pushing their children in wheelbarrows, old women carrying tiny bundles. . . . I had been riding for a quarter of an hour when three German planes dived very low to machine-gun us. We had only one chance, to throw ourselves into the ditch and wait until the end of the bombardment and the butchery. We were bombed in this manner during three days. . . . The planes dived low even for three women that we were at one moment . . . or for one old woman milking her cow. I saw in a field a poor mother with her six children riddled with bullets. . . . I could go on telling you of many terrible things I witnessed. . . . It was hellish. I cycled from Cambrai to Rouen avoiding the main roads and the burned-down villages. . . . All the soldiers we met on the way encouraged and helped us. They all had wonderful courage. It was very comforting. . . .”

Stranded Children

Another letter from the Service Social tells me of the hundreds, probably thousands, of stranded children who are being rounded up and cared for by them. It states:—

“You cannot imagine what sad things we see in the midst of these millions of evacuees who had to leave their towns, villages, or small houses. . . . On the roads are whole populations grouped, fed, looked after. . . .”

“Will you allow me to arrange with the schools of which you gave me the names, the adoption of children lost during the evacuation; we are gathering them at the moment in a castle at Dracy-le-Fort (Saone and Loire).”

“Suzanne Grosvern. . . . Coming from Liege: Found May 25, 1940. Age 9½ years. Father lost during a bombard-

ment; mother killed on the lorry at Abbeville—a sister of 6 stayed with the father.”

“Martha Haest. . . . Coming from Hallaar. Found May 24, 1940. Age 12 years. Further information: Took refuge under a bridge during a bombardment—father, mother, the elder brother and an aunt were killed. The two little girls were in danger of being lost in Paris.”

Danger of Epidemics

The overwhelming problems of feeding, clothing, housing, great though they are, are overshadowed by the dread spectre of epidemics so that inoculations and medical assistance are more than ever needed. I hear that hospitals in refuge areas are filled with wounded women and children. Some of those women and children who have escaped the “Kultural attentions of German bombs and machine-guns” are bound to suffer from shellshock and demoralisation if they are not provided with work and schools of every type so as to keep their sanity. In all this work the Friends are taking their full share. When I was telling His Eminence Cardinal Hinsley about the work done by them in France he said: “The Quakers are good people; they really do work for the love of God.” He was voicing what was in my heart. I have now seen their work and realise that they work magnificently in the same way that Catholic nuns do, selflessly and for the glory of God.

Under the present conditions, the refugee problem is perforce an emergency one. We must look to the future as the field for action in every direction. It is hard to visualise this future during the present nightmare. But we must all be worthy of our cause—the freedom of humanity, and try to take to heart Emerson’s message: “*The lesson of life is what the centuries tell us, not the hours.*”

BOOKS OF THE MONTH

FEDERAL EUROPE, by R. W. G. Mackay. (Foreword by Norman Angell), Michael Joseph, 10s. 6d. pp. 323.

FEDERAL UNION. A Symposium, Edited by M. Channing-Pearce. Cape, 10s. 6d. pp. 336.

Europe has not suddenly been faced with the problem of how to avoid its own self-destruction. To any genuine student of its affairs that problem has been present with all its poignancy for many years. But the war has perhaps brought it into the view of some people whose past blindness is largely responsible for the grim present—not leaders only but the public which gave them its confidence. Will such people be prepared to accept a federal solution when, and if, the opportunity comes at a new peace conference? These two books, and the several others being produced in these months, are inspired by the belief that now is the time to prepare them. Meanwhile events may be carrying on the same work. Already nine separate sovereignties have been combined under Nazi control.

Mr. Mackay does not really answer the question whether federal union must be based on democratic units in order to prove workable. To say that a union of this kind would be confronted by a non-democratic alliance and possibly have to go to war with it is not enough, for that may be true of any union short of a world-State. Yet he envisages a process of free election to the European federal legislature, in which Franco’s Spain and Mussolini’s Italy would participate.

In his interesting and valuable contribution to the present discussion of this vitally important problem of federal Europe Mr. Mackay introduces several original ideas. For his European Parliament, for instance, he does not propose

two chambers like those of the U.S.A. and Switzerland. He demands a single House elected on a population basis. But the federal senate has been the customary method by which the claims of sovereign States to equal rights have been met in the past. His answer is that their equality of internal self-government are sufficiently guaranteed by the federal constitution and judicial safeguards. Clearly he is right in his belief that the bicameral system creates delays, is cumbersome, and therefore to be avoided. But would States be satisfied with this kind of safeguard? That is the practical question.

Mr. Mackay is more in agreement with the current doctrine in the executive machinery he proposes. He favours a President and Government elected by, and responsible to, Parliament on the Anglo-French pattern. There is much more in his book; especially to be remarked is the early section in which he deals with the different methods of international government—the British Commonwealth and the League, and his draft constitution.

The twenty-two contributors to Mr. Channing-Pearce’s volume include the Secretary of the Federal Union Society as well as others well qualified to speak. Undoubtedly this book will be constantly taken up for reference on the many subjects involved in the current issue of federalism. Federalism and Culture (by J. B. Priestley) and Education (by the late Miss Grace Hadow), Federation and the Colonies, Communications, the League (by Dr. Maxwell Garnett), Socialism—these are some of the subjects treated.

But the contributions are extremely unequal in value. It is impossible in a short review to do justice to them or

to deal with the many interesting points they raise. Some people will regret, however, that more attention was not devoted to the pre-conditions of federation, to the history of federalism in its many aspects, from which the most valuable lessons as to the practical requirements and conditions can be learned. What in the past have been the motive forces of federation and through what instrumentalities have they been carried into effect?

More enlightenment on the economic aspects of federalism would also have been welcome. Professor L. Robbins discusses these in some eighteen suggestive pages. This is surely an underweighting of the gravity of the subject. We are left with so many unanswered questions in our minds, the connection between federal control of migration and State control of labour conditions and social services, for example. If the

federal government should regulate inter-State trade ought it not to have power to compensate for loss of economic advantage? It is not always clear whether Professor Robbins is making his proposals on economic or on political grounds. Internal free trade within the federal area is of obvious long-run economic advantage. So would the federal public works, federally controlled economic services like the post, railways, air, and federal social organisation of labour, health and so on. But on what grounds do we decide to adopt some and reject others? Professor Robbins answers, according to the probability of political friction resulting. But this can hardly be settled on economic grounds. This is truly a fruitful and interesting field of discussion that is opened up by Professor Robbins.

H. R. G. GREAVES.

APPENDICES

(Continued from page 9)

foundation. The International Labour Organisation, with its special function of securing the promotion of better conditions internationally, must be retained and the essential importance of its work recognised and extended.

It is also essential that the Permanent Court of International Justice and the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation should continue in existence.

It is hoped that another document dealing in greater detail with those functions of the I.L.O. which in the opinion of the two Societies should find a place in the post-war settlement will be considered by correspondence. When agreed, this document should be incorporated with the reports of the two Conferences.

NOTE

Recent events—notably the surrender of France—have modified the circumstances on which the policy of collective security through an international organisation, recommended to the consideration of members of the Union, was based (*see Resolution 2 on p. 5 and Appendices D and E, pp. 6-9*). We are, however, of opinion that the fundamental principles of that policy remain unchanged, and that it is on them that any enduring peace must be based.

CECIL
GILBERT MURRAY
LYTTON
KATHLEEN D. COURTNEY
HERBERT S. SYRETT