

HEADWAY

IN WAR-TIME

The Journal of the League of Nations Union

No. 47

AUGUST 1943

PRICE 3d

TO ALL FELLOW WORKERS IN THE UNION

I KNOW you will share with the Executive Committee the great sorrow which we feel at the death of our Secretary, Major Freshwater. He fulfilled his duties so admirably that he seemed born for the post, and so much did we rely on his perfect efficiency that we came to regard him as a permanent and inseparable part of our Union.

He died literally in harness, having completed a full day's work at the Office and an evening of duty with the Home Guard. He had no illness, no weakening of his faculties, no diminution of his tireless energies, and died in uniform in his own garden. For him one can imagine no more perfect ending. But the suddenness of his loss has left us stunned and forlorn. To the sorrow of losing a dearly loved personal friend is added the sense of calamity to our cause by the departure of so energetic and efficient a worker.

I am writing to you not only because we all share this sorrow, but also to beg you not to be discouraged. We must all pass on some day. Let us so use our time here that the task of those we leave behind may be easier through our labours. That is what Freshwater did. We must follow his example. To the sacredness of our cause is now added the wish to provide by our success the most fitting memorial to the colleague we so loved and respected.

July 15th, 1943.

LYTTON.

BRITISH LIBRARY

5 AUG 1943

OF POLITICAL AND
ECONOMIC SCIENCE

MAJOR FRESHWATER

By VISCOUNT CECIL

In the last few weeks the League of Nations Union has suffered two grievous losses by the death of two of its oldest members, Lord Dickinson and Major Freshwater. They were in many respects very different men. But they had one quality in common. They were both deeply and disinterestedly attached to the cause of Peace. That enabled them to give to it single-minded service of the utmost value. Some men have a remarkable faculty for being right. They may not seem to be particularly brilliant. But somehow they reach correct conclusions when others who seem to be more clever go entirely astray. The reason is that if a man is able to concentrate the whole of his mind on the solution of any question and not to allow it to be diverted by any personal consideration, the soundness of his judgment gains enormously. That was extremely true of Freshwater. Anyone who worked with him will agree that he was seldom wrong. His opinion put forward with deceptive modesty was usually the quintessence of good sense and often showed the way out of a difficulty which others had not found.

We shall miss his guidance greatly. Nor is that by any means all that we have lost. His wonderful tact and kindness were assets of great importance. When he took the office of Secretary of the Union was just entering on a period of decline due chiefly to public events. The League, owing to the policy followed by some of its chief members, was losing authority, and a society whose principal object was to support the League suffered. It was a godsend that at that moment we should have had Freshwater as the Leader of our Staff. His intellectual integrity which kept steadily in view the essentials of our policy and did not allow it on the one

hand to weaken in its advocacy of peace through the prevention of aggression or, on the other hand, to embark on the pursuit of attractive Utopias, was just what was wanted. At the same time he infused into the whole organisation that spirit of far-sighted tolerance which "steadied the boat" and helped us to pass through a difficult period with the minimum of loss.

All this is true. But it is quite inadequate. For Freshwater was a man of very exceptional moral gifts. He had not only the faculty of being right and of inspiring others with the friendliness and singlemindedness which he himself possessed. But he had the far more valuable power of creating affection. He was the friend of us all. We all called him "Freshie." We felt that he brought among us that supreme quality which "hopeth all things, believeth all things, endureth all things." He died as he had lived. For such a man, surely, a death like his is just what he would have wished for himself:

*Then with no fiery throbbing pain,
No cold gradations of decay,
Death broke at once the vital chain
And freed his soul the nearest way.*

CECIL.

DR. MAXWELL GARNETT writes:—

Major Freshwater, M.C., T.D., who died suddenly on the evening of 12th July on his return from duties with the Home Guard, was Second-in-Command of his Battalion as well as Secretary of the League of Nations Union. He was always a keen soldier and, after his demobilisation in 1919, he regularly devoted part of his scanty leisure to the training of the Territorial Army which he looked upon as an essential part of "the armed forces to be used" *inter alia* "to protect the covenants of the League.

I knew him best as the most loyal of collaborators. For nearly eighteen years

I had the privilege of working intimately with him, building up public support for the League of Nations and then, towards the end, trying to rally the declining sense of need for a strong defensive union of all countries who felt themselves in ever-growing danger. Never in all that time did any action or inaction, word or gesture, of his cause ill-feeling in any of his colleagues. He had a genius for friendship and we found in him a perfect pattern of

Christianity applied to everyday life. The Union has been fortunate in having him for its Secretary during the last five years. His régime has brought it safely through its darkest days, and he lived to see a brighter light beginning to shine upon the cause to which he devoted the last twenty-four years of his life: that of "a world organisation which," in the Prime Minister's words, "is to be our safeguard against future wars."

MAJOR FRESHWATER

By L. F. BEHRENS

All good men, when they die, leave mourning in the hearts of those that loved them; but there can be few for whom the mourning will be so widespread as it is for Freshwater: it will extend from the public figures who lead us to the humblest Branch member who came in contact with him, either in person or by correspondence. For "Freshie" was not only an admirable and efficient secretary: he was a friend to all who shared his enthusiasm for the League and to many who did not. His enthusiasm never made him narrow-minded; and anyone, who was tempted to be harsh or unfair to those who opposed us, came away from a conversation with him no less strong in their faith, but more humane in their understanding.

He could be indignant, but he was never unfair or malicious. He could be worried by his many cares and responsibilities and by the importunities of those who were tempted to abuse his willingness to help; but he was never out of temper. He seemed always to be conscious that he was the servant, not only of the Union, but of something greater, a movement towards human happiness and freedom, of which we believe our own cause to be a part.

He died because he was too devoted, because he considered himself of no importance beside the cause he served. It

will be impossible completely to replace him, and it will be impossible to forget him. And, just as his presence was always an encouragement and a source of strength, so must we resolve that the memory of him will continue to invigorate and to cheer us in our journey forward. Because we loved him, we shall find our task easier, and the worthy performing of that task will be the memorial which he himself would have chosen as the nearest to his heart.

MEMORIAL SERVICE

A Memorial Service was arranged by the League of Nations Union for Major Freshwater, at St. Martin-in-the-Fields, on July 20. It was attended by a very large congregation—most eloquent testimony of the love and devotion which he had inspired among the host of his friends and fellow-workers throughout the country.

The service was simple, as Major Freshwater would have liked. It was conducted by the Dean of Chichester, and the Dean of St. Paul's and Dr. S. W. Hughes (Secretary of the Free Church Federal Council) took part.

Lord Lytton, who gave the address, spoke of Freshwater as the embodiment of what the League stood for, and of the "Freshwater spirit," as the ideal atmosphere in which problems should be solved. The best memorial would be an increased effort to bring about a genuine international society after the war, and the kind of world which he had worked for.

"Nimrod," the most lovely of Elgar's "Enigma" Variations, was chosen as the concluding organ voluntary.

VICTOR CAZALET

By Mrs. EDGAR DUGDALE

Since HEADWAY last appeared the League of Nations Union has suffered two very grievous blows through sudden death. Every reader of these pages is sharing the sense of personal loss which came upon us when we heard that Major Freshwater would be amongst us no more. Colonel Victor Cazalet was less intimately connected with the L.N.U. though not only his colleagues on the Executive Committee, but all who ever heard him speak on our platforms (and these are many), must feel that another gallant fighter has fallen from our ranks.

Cazalet's life was cut short in its prime, but every minute of every day of his years was crowded with interests, grave and gay, and not one of them was selfish. He was a giver, in every sense of the word, and like all such he knew how to take. He joyfully accepted all the many good things that came his way, gratefully, not as of right, and most of all he prized the love of his friends. To say that Victor Cazalet could not bear to cause anybody pain would be far too negative a description of his attitude towards people. He was not satisfied unless he was actively adding to their happiness. I remember a characteristic incident when we were together in Palestine a few years ago. A long day's motor trip had been planned among the Jewish farm settlements in the Galilean hills, and, of course, we lingered too long in these wonderful places. When we came down into the plain the quick dark was falling, and it was too late to stop at the last village, where we knew a welcome had been prepared. Victor was miserable. Long afterwards, in London, he returned to the matter again. "We disappointed them," he said, "I cannot bear to think of it."

The capacity for saying "No," the power to take a firm line, does not always go with such quick sympathies, such readiness to respond to any call. But Cazalet's sweet, easy temper concealed bed-rock standards of right and wrong, and his moral courage was as outstanding a quality of his public life as the indifference to physical danger he displayed in two wars. A loyal Conservative, on the

progressive wing of his party, he was no more uninterested in his career in the House of Commons than any normal man who makes politics his profession, but that never stopped him from espousing any cause in which he believed, and though he took no joy in controversy, he never hesitated to make sacrifices for his beliefs. These are a few of the reasons why all those who have worked alongside of him, and been encouraged by his faith, must mourn his loss to-day. We in the League of Nations Union are among that number. Victor Cazalet never spared himself in the cause of international peace. Nor in the cause of justice on which that peace must be founded. No picture of him, however incomplete, can leave out his services to two nations, besides his own, among whom his name will never be forgotten—the Jews and the Poles. His work on behalf of Jewish refugees was interrupted by the journey with General Sikorski, from which he never returned. That work was stimulated by recollection of his own family history—for the Cazalets are of Huguenot extraction, and found safety and welcome in England when fleeing from persecution three hundred years ago. But Victor's interest in the Jewish National Movement was of older date than his efforts to get something substantial done by his own country for Jewish refugees. His Zionism, his faith in the Jewish future in Palestine, struck the deepest chords in his nature, and more and more he was making that cause his chief political work. This war, and his appointment as liaison officer with General Sikorski, brought him in contact with a gallant army and a noble-minded chief. From them he got, and to them he gave, much that is precious in human relationships and in understanding between one nation and another. On active service with them he died, in the aeroplane crash which deprived Poland of her leader. Victor Cazalet's body lies buried on the Rock of Gibraltar. If others can carry through, in his spirit, the work he tried to do, the new world which he has not lived to see will be more as he would have wished to see it—for it will be a world of less suffering and more happiness.

PARADOX OF PEACE

By MILES JUVENIS

Wise men beware of the phrase: "a war to end war." It is dangerous to raise hopes too high, it is unpleasant to rake over the ashes of disillusionment. And yet we have this time a phrase no less paradoxical, no less inspiring, no less true: "a war for peace."

The British can hardly be said to enjoy war—seldom has a war roused so little elation and so much regret—and yet we are all out to fight and win. Our terrible mistake in being found so ill-prepared in September, 1939, is also irrefutable proof that the war was none of our making; and our sequence of ignominious failures to appease is sufficient to show that we accepted war only when no other road lay open to honourable peace.

Is it reasonable, then, to fight in order to live in peace? Or is it a simple fallacy? Who can say? And yet we believe it to be possible, and risk our lives in that belief.

I went back again to Aldous Huxley to see how his "Ends and Means" had stood the shock of war. Strangely, it was less outrageous, less startling; there are phrases that can be interpreted in two ways, and there is little to commit the author to specific views. The principles of conduct are stated, but deductions are not drawn in terms of action. And words are unexplained, unannotated. "Good ends . . . can be achieved only by the employment of appropriate means. The end cannot justify the means." What would be called appropriate means, and in what way need they be justified? Who is to judge and who is to justify? We are not told. And we continue to believe that if our aim is pure our conscience is undefiled.

This modern age is full of paradoxes; the war for peace is only one. There is the paradox of planning. The British admire personal initiative and private enterprise; they mistrust too much centralisation. But how to ensure the survival of private enterprise against the ravages of industrial monopolies? Only by planning the new world as we want it; only by controlling the economic

forces that threaten the smaller units which we wish to preserve.

How best defend the individual's place in the new society? Only by persuading him to co-operate in the maintenance of the whole. Individualism requires co-operation. How best preserve the national culture of the smaller peoples in this age of large industrial units? Only by teamwork between the nations and the spirit of sacrifice. Nationalism requires internationalism.

Discipline and Liberty

And why do so many of us in time of war submit ourselves to the rigours of discipline, if indeed we fight for personal liberty? Because liberty will perish without discipline; and we, who hate compulsion, would rather be compelled than lose the future's freedom.

It is a terrible truth that the conduct of a war against Fascism involves the acceptance of certain Fascist practices. The State is given temporary powers over our lives and our property of such a kind that, were it peace, we could hardly call ourselves a free country. We have allowed a vast expansion of the central machinery of government, and we have let the reins run loose through our fingers. That great bastion of democracy, the right to a general election, we have solemnly surrendered. And yet we know that we are free; the British temper, the highest bastion of all, will never be surrendered.

This we know. But is it known equally by the other nations of the world? There is an urgent need to make it clear to all men that much of what we allow in war would never be allowed in peace, and that our aims remain the same: Freedom, Truth, Justice and Peace.

To forget our aims is to betray our cause. It is for us to show that our acceptance of the needs of total war is temporary, conditional; that Huxley was wrong when he wrote: "In the heat of conflict all scruples are thrown to the winds, all the habits of forbearance and humaneness, slowly and laboriously formed during generations of civilisation,

are forgotten. Nothing matters any more except victory." For us, as Basil Matthews says, "the root difference between victory and defeat depends on whether we think of the war as an end or as a beginning."

What is the lesson of this? Simply that while we fight the war to a finish, and when at last we build the peace, let

us worship our aims as they deserve. If we are forced to compromise, let us acknowledge the compromise. If we cannot at once create the international society we desire, let us not forget to give expression to our desires. If we accept paradoxes in the cause of peace or freedom, let us tell the world what are the means and what are the ends.

WORLD AFFAIRS IN PARLIAMENT

By OWEN A. RATTENBURY

"Destruction" and "Construction" have gone almost together in the recent debates in the House of Commons. In point of time, the Foreign Secretary's expected statement on the result of the Hot Springs Conference preceded the discussions on Economic Warfare. Here, however, it will be convenient to deal with them in the reverse order.

Working of Blockade

Mr. Dingle Foot described the policy and proceedings of the Ministry of Economic Warfare, to which he is Parliamentary Secretary, in an interesting but controversial survey. His tone was belligerent, for is not his Ministry in its essence belligerent? Historical instances from the days of Queen Elizabeth onwards were adduced to illustrate his contention that economic warfare was a natural British weapon, that we had always used the blockade. But Germany's overrunning of Europe had made it more difficult and, to cope with the situation, Dr. Dalton had invented the system of "compulsory navicerts, by which control was transferred from the seas to the quays."* Mr. Foot described the means by which Japan and Germany, as corresponding members of the Axis, were kept apart by the Navy and the Air Force, and how, at the present time, it had been possible to intercept 90 per cent. of the Japanese craft bringing rubber, tin, tungsten and such commodities to France, while Ger-

*Lord Cecil, in a letter to "The Times" on July 13, drew attention to the use of this form of blockade in the last war, and an interesting correspondence ensued.—ED.

man shipments of machine tools, etc., to Japan had been similarly frustrated. He then claimed that the Ministry had been responsible for supplying the information which enabled Bomber Command effectively to bomb the Ruhr, with the incidental result that Germany had had to remove some of its important manufactures to occupied France. Anticipating criticism regarding the effect of all this on our Allies in occupied Europe, he claimed that the effect on the inhabitants was not so bad as had been thought. He gave comparative figures of deaths of children under one year old in Belgium during the war years to show that there had been no appreciable increase.

"Why should there be?" demanded Mr. R. R. Stokes (Ipswich, Lab.). Young men—and it was in the main young people who produced children—had been taken from Belgium. He thought that, if the Minister were to compare the figures for children between one and five, the story would be different.

Obvious disquiet about the effect of the blockade on our friends in Belgium, France and other European countries manifested itself in the debate. It was easy to point out, as Mr. Molson (High Peak, U.) did in an able speech, that succour could not be sent to these people without Germany being helped. But was it not worth the risk? asked Mr. Harvey (English Universities, Ind.), Mr. Loftus (Lowestoft, U.), Mr. Stokes and Miss Rathbone. Sir T. Moore (Ayr Burghs, U.), too, doubted whether our help to occupied Europe would arrive in time. "One cannot," he said, "feed a corpse."

A Difficult Choice

Anybody who contemplates the sufferings of the present, and equally the necessity that the future of Europe should be in the hands of healthy people, cannot but be disturbed by this question of vital food necessities for the civil populations. The choice is not between good and evil, but which is the lesser of two evils. War itself is, of course, the greatest tragedy, the economic end of which is as bad as the actual brutal suffering from weight of metal and explosives. And, although this was not directly mentioned in the debate, pestilence may be expected to follow, or to coincide with the later periods of the war. One noticed the point made by Mr. Foot, and again by Mr. Molson, that it was Germany's duty under international law to provide for the nationals of the countries conquered and occupied by her, and, if she did not do so, it was a breach of "Queensberry rules"—to apply the same simile as Mr. Hore-Belisha used in the Civil Aviation debate the previous month! But the fact remains that, when the Axis have gone out of their way to trample all international undertakings underfoot, that sort of argument does not get us much further; and many are thinking that we should long ago have ceased to regard this holocaust as a nice little prize fight.

Hot Springs

On Hot Springs, Mr. Eden said that the Government had now had an opportunity to consider the work which the Conference had achieved. First he wished to congratulate the United States Government, which had convened the Conference, on the successful outcome of this first experiment in comprehensive international discussion of post-war matters. It was impressive that, in the midst of war, representatives of more than 40 like-minded nations could meet together and achieve general agreement on so many fundamental principles.

Widely differing physical, political and economic conditions had had to be taken into account in drawing up the resolutions, and the application of them by the various countries would depend upon those differences. For their part, the British Government had no hesitation in

accepting the resolutions and the obligation to give effect to them in so far as they applied to conditions in the United Kingdom. Further, they would gladly co-operate with other Governments in seeking ways to implement those which called for concerted action, and would commend them to the Governments of the Colonies, Dependencies and oversea territories.

"Freedom from want of food" was described by Mr. Eden as the main aim of the Conference. Despite the inevitable difficulties which the war entailed, the British Government intended to press on with the task of increasing food resources and improving the diets of the people. But he added the timely reminder—similar to that made during the discussions at the L.N.U. General Council recently—that freedom from want and a higher standard of living could only be achieved against a background of international security.

As regards the establishment of the Interim Commission, to carry on the work of the Conference, and to prepare a plan for a permanent organisation in the field of food and agriculture, the Government intended to take a full share in this work. It was a source of satisfaction to them that one of the tasks of the Commission would be to draw up a formal declaration or agreement, by which Governments would recognise their obligation towards their respective peoples, and to one another to collaborate in raising levels of nutrition and standards of living.

Lastly, Mr. Eden referred to the question of production, bearing closely on the relief of peoples living in the countries now occupied by the enemy. Although the Hot Springs Conference had not been concerned with the actual organisation of relief supplies, due attention had been paid to the necessity of increasing supplies of basic foodstuffs in the period when territories liberated from the enemy would need help from outside. "His Majesty's Government," concluded Mr. Eden, "are much impressed by the urgency and importance of this problem, and are determined to do all they can for their part to give effect to the resolutions of the Conference on this subject. They earnestly hope that other Governments will do likewise."

CONSIDER THE FUTURE OF SOCIETY NOW

By MAURICE FANSHAWE (Head of the Intelligence Section, L.N.U.)

The conditions which may obtain at the end of the war no one can foresee. But this fact is no more a reason for failing to do all we can to plan for peace in advance and now, than ignorance of the precise way in which peace may be broken is an excuse for our being unprepared. We can only win the fruits of peace if we are prepared for it, and have our plans ready. The broad lines of policy, in fact, require immediate attention; details may be left to a later date.

This being so, it is a matter of good fortune and high importance that there should be now available a Report by a special League of Nations Committee set up as far back as January, 1938, to study the prevention or mitigation of economic depressions.* This Committee worked steadily during the months preceding the eve of war, and right through the arduous conditions of war itself, up to the present time. Inevitably the scope of their enquiry has had to be enlarged owing to the scale and march of unprecedented events; so that it has come to embrace nearly the whole field of economics. The intricate history and background of economics and economic policies between the two wars, the harsh impact of the present war in many directions, have been fitted into constructive examination, buttressed with the evidence of the Reports issued from time to time by the Economic, Financial and Transit Department of the League, and based on continual contact with social and economic thought in all the United Nations to-day.

A second Report will cover longer-range policies. But it can be said straight away that readers will find this Report goes far to satisfy what has been felt to be a definite and immediate want. For it offers a coherent explanation of—at the same time correlating and implementing—the prin-

*THE TRANSITION FROM WAR TO PEACE ECONOMY. Report of Delegation on Economic Depressions. (Allen and Unwin, League of Nations Publications, 4s. 6d.)

ciples of the Atlantic Charter, the Anglo-Soviet Treaty, the Lease-Lend Agreements, the Hot Springs Conference recommendations, the UNRRA plans, the British and American schemes for an international currency—in fact, all that series of vital pronouncements by the United Nations on post-war settlement, which strike the novel note that the welfare of the people is a major concern of international relations. In so doing it serves as a guide to a real New Order.

Why did the Committee issue the Report now? Their own answer is worth noting. The war, they point out, by creating economic changes and upheavals, will result in widespread instability. It is therefore imperative to devise policies in advance for lessening the risk of depression and unemployment, which otherwise are bound to lead to opposite policies of intense economic nationalism all over the world. If the United Nations really mean to carry out their social and economic plans, they can only do so by devising beforehand means for maintaining in peace-time the high level of production and employment achieved in war. Independent action by each country, say for unemployment, simply defeats itself. *The vital thing is that national policies shall be co-ordinated on the basis of an agreed international plan.*

This First Report is mainly concerned with how to make a smooth transition from war to peace economy, in which private enterprise may flourish. No assumption is made of the degree of the State's share or supervision in economic life which may be desired by various countries. It is, however, postulated throughout that an effective system of collective security be established.

Post-War Economic Aims

What should be the objectives of this transition period policy? The Committee's list is comprehensive and inspiring. They must assure the fullest use of the resources of production, human and material, to

maintain a stable economy and rising living standards; as far as possible employment for every man and woman able and willing to work; above all, the provision of goods and services to meet the needs of all classes in food, clothing, houses and medical care; the broad distribution of insurance against loss of earning power among society; promotion of equal education opportunities. Finally, each country must be free to share in world markets, and have access to raw materials and manufactured goods on those markets, by means of both progressive removal of obstructions to trade and courageous international measures of reconstruction and development.

Control and Demand

A second chapter deals directly with transition problems of countries with plenty of raw materials or the money to buy them. Immediately after the war, immense demands will arise, with their twofold risk of a runaway price boom and subsequent collapse and unemployment. To meet this, countries must continue those measures already taken to control prices and effect equitable distribution of supplies both to consumer and producer: to be gradually relaxed only when shortages cease. A survey is made of every type of control and demand—with the main aim in view of getting men re-employed and production re-directed towards consumers' needs as rapidly as possible. A marked characteristic of this transition period is bound to be the shift from Government to private demand.

Background of Agreed International Plan

Most important of all is the third chapter which deals with the *international problems of transition*, emphasising the need for Government action and international co-operation. The lack of any international plan for getting business started in war-stricken areas ruined the years following 1918. This must not recur. Many countries in the direst need of food and raw materials, and capital goods to build up their economic life, will not have the means of making payment abroad. This is plainly an international problem, and must be solved if there is to be any security for economic relations between countries.

Take, for example, the problem of Relief: It is not enough to feed and clothe starving populations; they must be enabled to produce and to exchange their produce so as to feed and clothe themselves. *Relief and Reconstruction, in short, are really one problem.* To make relief proposals effective, it is urged that there should be an international understanding regarding changes in rations and maximum prices for rationed goods, in early post-war years. Further, to prevent a scramble for raw materials, shipping, etc., Governments should continue or create machinery for the purchase and international distribution of these products.

Commercial Policies

But the Report issues a very clear warning here. In the past, it is pointed out,* there has been a tragic failure to understand that *Commercial Policy is, by and large, inseparable from Economic Policy as a whole*, and can be liberalised only as part of a general solution of national economic problems. The contribution, therefore, of an International Clearing Fund to the restoration of trade depends fundamentally on whether Commercial Policies run counter to the governing factors in the balance of payments situation. Here, however, indispensable service can be rendered by an International Body with authority to help Governments to devise commercial policies conducive to economic stability. Its business would be to study and analyse the facts of trade developments and interdependence, and price movements; to advise on the means of promoting trade, and clearing trade bottlenecks or blocked channels; and to mediate, at request, in the case of direct disputes between States, or on wider issues such as Customs Unions.

Two points are emphasised in conclusion. Means must be found for co-ordinating the policies of the various international organs which will be needed. Economy policy must be correlated with political. Military security cannot be devised in an economic vacuum, nor economic security in the face of recurrent threats of war.

* See the admirable Report by the League's Economic, Financial and Transit Department, *COMMERCIAL POLICY IN THE INTER-WAR PERIOD*. (Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.)

UP AND DOWN THE COUNTRY

July, in normal times a slack period for L.N.U. activities, this year showed little diminution in either the number of meetings arranged by branches or the number of speakers supplied to other organisations.

Miss K. D. Courtney, Vice-Chairman of the Executive, addressed another Regional Conference, this time of the NORTHAMPTONSHIRE FEDERAL COUNCIL. Her subject was "World Organisation—America's Part, Now and in the Future."

Our MONTAGUE BURTON BRANCH at LEEDS, continuing its series of large-scale lunch-hour meetings with eminent speakers, had a visit from Sir Ralph Wedgwood, who spoke on "Unemployment—an International Problem."

The LONDON REGIONAL FEDERATION, at its monthly Buffet Lunch in the Y.W.C.A. lounge, struck a novel note in inviting Lord Perth, formerly Secretary-General at Geneva, to come along to answer "any questions on the League."

At the next L.R.F. lunch, which will be at 1 p.m. on Tuesday, August 10, Dr. Liba Ambrosova will give a talk on Czechoslovakia.

Dr. Vaclav Benes addressed Union meetings at BOURNE and SLEAFORD. At DULWICH, Major-General J. W. van Oorschot took as his subject "A Dutch General Speaks of His Country."

When Mr. E. Colban (Norway) and Mr. A. Michalopoulos (Greece) spoke at the meeting organised by our COVENTRY DISTRICT COMMITTEE, both stressed the need after the war of an international peace organisation with abundant force behind it. Mr. Colban made the personal suggestion that an Allied Supreme Council should be its nucleus. Mr. Michalopoulos thought that the chief thing was to remove fear from the world, and this could only be done if there was strength to guarantee security.

A clarion call for the people to arouse themselves was sounded at the "coming-of-age" annual meeting of the CLAPHAM BRANCH; when Mrs. M. Gladys Stevens gave an informative resumé of the work of both the League and the L.N.U. Mr. E. Cotterall, hon. secretary and treasurer, spoke of the importance of having a

unified body of public opinion which could demand that the principles for which the Union stood should be carried out.

Alderman Pike, O.B.E., J.P., presided over the well-attended annual meeting of the EAST FINCHLEY BRANCH, when Mrs. Stevens gave an interesting and inspiring address on "Our Part in World Order." New members were enrolled.

The CHRIST CHURCH (COCKFOSTERS) BRANCH, at its annual general meeting, heard the good news that a few losses in 1942 had been made good by the addition of new members. The Rev. B. C. Hopson, Branch President, opened a discussion on the present position of the League. There was unanimous agreement that planning for the future should be undertaken now and that the League's machinery and experience would make it an invaluable factor in rebuilding a better world.

Mr. John T. Catterall's engagements during the month included a tour of the Isle of Wight, in the course of which he addressed meetings at SHANKLIN, NEWPORT, COWES and RYDE. He also paid visits to WOODBRIDGE and LEOMINSTER, and had a keen, attentive audience at the annual meeting of the CHISWICK BRANCH.

Another "International Brains Trust" was organised at SHEFFIELD, the members being Mr. Drzewieski (Poland), Mrs. Trostler (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Mavrocordatos (Greece) and Mr. Eyrie (France). Questions put to the KINGSTON BRAINS TRUST were answered by Miss Hebe Spaul (Russia), Professor A. Newell (U.S.A.) and Dr. Maxwell Garnett (Great Britain).

Other Union meetings held during July included the following: BARKING Central Hall (Colonel Loftus and Mr. K. Y. Khong on "Stopping Aggression; How is it to be Done?"); PINNER (Rev. A. Allon-Smith on "World Settlement After the War"); CHURCH END, FINCHLEY (Mr. Leslie Aldous on "Freeing Europe from Bondage"); LAMBETH (Miss S. Teichfeld on "Poland"); WIMBLEDON (Mr. Robert Kull on the U.S.A.); BEDFORD annual meeting (Mr. Leslie Aldous on the present work of the League and the Union—in place of Major Freshwater); STEBBING (Miss B. Barclay Carter on the U.S.A.); BUCKHURST HILL (Mr. Jaya Deva on "The New

League of Nations"); and WEYBRIDGE (Mrs. Riley, Fighting France).

ROTARY CLUBS which had visits from L.N.U. speakers included: ST. PANCRAS (Mr. John T. Catterall on "Foundations of World Co-operation"); WEST HAM (Mr. Jaya Deva on "The Far East"); ROCHESTER (Madame Langhorne); ST. ALBANS (Mr. C. W. Stokes on Canada); ENFIELD and BARNES (Major-General J. W. van Oorschot on "Holland"); and STREATHAM (Mr. Leslie Aldous on "Hot Springs and After").

The LAMBETH R.A.C.S. had a talk from Mrs. Riley (Fighting France).

WELLINGBOROUGH BRANCH'S drive for members has had most satisfactory results. Ninety entirely new members have been recruited and a dozen former members have rejoined. Against this, some half-dozen old members have been lost through death or removal. Heartly congratulations to Mr. J. Hampson, the hon. secretary, and all his fellow workers!

EASTBOURNE BRANCH impressed upon three local newspapers that our General Council Meeting was news and secured the publication of reports in all of them. Wisely, each report contributed, while covering the essentials, was different from the others, so that each paper had its own exclusive story.

HANDSWORTH BRANCH'S Summer Party and "Bring and Buy" Sale in aid of the children of China exceeded even the expectations of Miss Godwin Salt, the tireless organiser. A target of £50 was set, but that sum was exactly doubled. This effort, it is stressed, is the direct result of the Executive's appeal last autumn to Branches to do something special for China. The result is as gratifying to the L.N.U. as it is to the Save the Children Fund, through whom the money is being passed to the proper quarter.

At a garden meeting arranged by our HASTINGS AND ST. LEONARDS BRANCH in the grounds of Hollington Rectory, Mr. Hsiao Chien, a distinguished Chinese journalist, gave a talk on Modern China, and Councillor Ford, who was in the chair, spoke on the L.N.U. About £15 was raised for the Aid to China Fund, and some new members joined the Union.

We regret to learn of the death of Mr. H. Wainwright, treasurer of the WORCESTER BRANCH, after a long illness. His last wish

was that, instead of flowers, donations should be sent to the L.N.U., in response to which some £10 was received.

A BRANCH COMPETITION

The MADELEY, IRONBRIDGE AND COALBROOKDALE BRANCH recently organised an interesting competition for the best ten-minute talks on "The Future of the League of Nations," to be given by the youth of the district at a public meeting. Entrants were in two classes—Juniors, aged 14 and 15, and Seniors aged 16 to 20; five entries in each class made speeches. The judges were the President of the Branch, the Member of Parliament for the Wrekin Division, and the Headmaster and the History Mistress of the Coalbrookdale High School. Points were awarded for knowledge of the subject, style and delivery, use or otherwise of notes. Book tokens for the Seniors and H. A. L. Fisher's History of Europe, and Philip Guedella's "Life of Mr. Churchill," for the Juniors, were the prizes.

From the speeches it was obvious that the competition had stimulated a good deal of thought and reading. Although there was considerable divergence of views, all were sure that the weakness of the "Geneva League" was the voluntary system of sanctions, and demanded that the decisions of any future League should be backed by armed force of some kind—an international police force, most of them wanted. They also demanded an International Law Court, and one or two wanted education to have a more definitely international trend. One speaker, declaring the headquarters of any community of nations must be easily accessible, preferred Paris to Geneva. Several candidates, attributing war to economic causes, wanted to see an international economy in the future.

Mr. A. Colegate, M.P., addressing the meeting, stressed the responsibility for moral leadership that victory would bring to the United Nations. While warning the young orators against too ambitious schemes for the future League, he urged them not to lose faith in the gradual rebuilding of some such international body.

V. L. T.

AUSTRIA'S POST-WAR POLICY

By J. KOESTMAN

(The author of this article is a representative of the "Young Austria in Great Britain" movement. We gladly publish his views as an indication of the way in which many of his fellow countrymen are thinking about post-war problems.—ED.)

When at the end of the last world war the Hapsburg Empire—in consequence of its German alliance—collapsed, and the Austrian Republic came into being, there was no traditional foreign policy to be pursued, nor was there, amongst the new statesmen, any clear vision of the future. Only one course, indeed, seemed to be open—collaboration with the newly-formed national States in Central Europe, particularly with the Czechoslovak Republic. I do not underrate the difficulties in the way of such a policy at that time, but the task could be undertaken by bold statesmanship. Moreover, notwithstanding all difficulties, it was a realistic policy with every prospect of success, if only the Austrian Republic had made it clear from the beginning, once and for all, that never again did it intend to serve as a spring-board for Pan-German aspirations.

Unfortunately, the obvious did not happen. Even the Social Democrat leaders, on whose decisions everything at that time depended, after paying lip service to Central European collaboration chose the *Anschluss* as their line of foreign policy, thus immeasurably complicating the position of Austria.

A turn for the better did come with the end of this phase of Austrian foreign policy. Austria was admitted to the League of Nations. Seipel and Schober went to Prague to meet Dr. Benes, and a new basis of Czechoslovak-Austrian relations was provided with the conclusion of the Treaty of Lany. Of all the pacts concluded by Austrian Governments, this was the only one to last until the end of Austria. Moreover, it was the only one to receive almost the universal approval of the people—a very rare occurrence in connection with Austrian foreign policy. It expressed the natural desire of the Austrian people for close relations with the neighbour Republic.

Austria, alas! was never to reap the full fruits of this treaty. Instead of following it up, the Austrian Government embarked upon a detrimental policy. There was the episode of the German-Austrian Customs Union proposal, brought forward by Curtius and Schober in 1930. Clearly its objects were more political than economic. From an economic point of view the Union was senseless and even perverse. Only about 20 per cent. of Austria's import and export trade was with Germany. By the abolition of customs, Germany stood to gain the Austrian market for her industrial products, giving little to Austria but the ruin of Austrian industry. The main Austrian market was and would remain Central and South-Eastern Europe, where Austria was Germany's main competitor for industrial products, and stood in the path of limitless German economic expansion. Thus, from an economic point of view, the German-Austrian Customs Union was a farce. Politically, it was a deliberate provocation, and started Austria off along the stormy path which culminated in the *Creditanstalt* crisis.

The Austrian Government, instead of returning immediately to Central European collaboration, embarked on new adventures. The country became part of a revisionist *bloc* with Italy and Hungary under the Rome protocols—a step for which there was not the slightest justification. Austria had no revisionist claims except those expressed by the few who still cherished dreams of a restored Hapsburg Empire. Participation in the revisionist *bloc* could and did only put Austria into bad odour with her Czechoslovak and Yugoslav neighbours. It made the security and independence of Austria entirely a German-Italian affair, with all the implications we now know too well. Under Italian pressure Austria was cajoled into the German-Austrian pact of July, 1936 (the first Berchtesgaden

agreement between Hitler and Schuschnigg), which was only the precursor of the ominous Berchtesgaden pact of February, 1938, and the consequent annexation of Austria by Germany after the appointment of the Quisling Seiss-Inquart had opened the gates for Hitler's armies.

From all this the lessons for the future are plain; and full advantage can be taken of them by those who will be charged with the task of reconstruction and leadership in a free Austria.

The main lessons are:—

The Austrian Government must conduct its foreign policy on the basis of collaboration within the framework of international unity, and such international organisation as is clearly visualised by the Anglo-Russian Treaty.

Austria has to stop regarding herself as a "German" State. No good can come from plans for the establishment of a "South German" State, including Austria and Bavaria. Such an unnatural merger will only prevent Austria from

playing her vital role in Central Europe and make her into a German State, which she clearly is not.

Austria has to work to achieve close collaboration with her non-German neighbours, and particularly with the Czechoslovak Republic. Czechoslovakia is the ideal partner for useful Austrian collaboration. She is on the best of terms with both Great Britain and Soviet Russia. She will be a strong link in European unity after the war. By structure and interest, she is the most similar State to Austria. Yes, their close collaboration holds out the best prospects for the future.

Such is the course that should be followed by an independent Austria. As to the much-talked-of plans of Federation, let us not start with the roof before the walls stand firm. Let a few years of collaboration pass, then questions of closer unity will be clearer. To-day such plans only create diversion, suspicion and divergence.

BOOKS OF THE MONTH

SHOULD NABOTH HAVE A VINEYARD?

Geo-politicians as well as blue-printers who think history is all running to a fire say that the small nations are dead. Sir John Marriott in his *FEDERATION AND THE PROBLEM OF THE SMALL STATE* (Allen and Unwin, 5s.) will have none of this, but heartily endorses the late H. A. L. Fisher's words: "Almost everything which is most precious in our civilisation has come from small States."

This is a most excellent little book, in the main a diagnosis of the effects which mechanisation and concentration of power in the case of a few big States on the one hand, and the growth of industrial specialisation and internationalisation on the other, can be said to have produced on small nations and their right to live. One chapter lists the various past proposals for international peace. Another analyses the League of Nations, for whose shortcomings the spinelessness of statesmen seems to blame. When the occasion

for action arose, national sovereignty, in the critical first instances, failed to provide a solution. But Sir John does not go on to diagnose this weakness as inherent in the system. Still less does he welcome a rush to Federalism, with whose failures in the judicial sphere he is deeply impressed. The crucial instance in any federation is the Supreme Court, and it is inconceivable that the friction which has actually attended its operations, even where conditions were favourable, should not be dangerously increased where, as in the case of Europe, they would be the reverse.

Coming to cautious prescription, Sir John recommends the self-organisation of groups of smaller States, small voluntary federal unions, beginning perhaps with confederations, in which powers of central government for foreign policy as distinct from home affairs are delegated by the States (and not at first through the

people as with federation proper). The book closes with an excellent little bibliography, which should be of the greatest use to students.

No doubt a second edition will soon be forthcoming. The dates for Hungary's and Germany's entries into the League (1922 and 1926, and not 1923 and 1925 as given), and the statement that Danzig was "governed" by a League High Commissioner, require correction. It is to be hoped, too, that the statement (p. 65) that if there had been recourse to action in the Italo-Abyssinian conflict the whole onus would have fallen on Great Britain—which Viscount Cecil exploded once and for all in the House of Lords on June 23—will be allowed to lapse; as also the version of the so-called Peace Ballot (p. 72), which, to say the least of it, is unhistorical.

FIELD-MARSHAL SMUTS: SOLDIER AND WORLD STATESMAN. By Wm. F. Burbidge. (John Crowther Ltd., Bognor and London. 1s. 6d.)

The most fitting praise that can be given to Mr. Burbidge is that he has done full justice to a fascinating and compelling subject. His lively appreciation of one of the truly great figures of our times can be read without effort at a sitting; yet, within the compass of some 50 pages, all the salient facts about Smuts's career are recounted with a simple eloquence that somehow brings out all the mental vigour and, at the same time, the homely charm of a unique personality. From his earliest days Smuts added to a brilliantly first-class brain equally rare qualities of political insight and imagination. "Speaking a language large and free as are the winds that wash his *veldt*," he was always outstanding in any company. His vision, which saw a "wholeness" in mankind and all its institutions, made his creed one of expanding loyalties. From his conception of a United South Africa followed naturally his faith in a greater British Commonwealth and the development of a wider League of Nations. In the peace to come no less than in this war against tyranny and aggression—this is Mr. Burbidge's concluding note—the world will need the counsel of the Greatest South African.

THE BRITISH WAY. Pamphlets No. 7, 8 and 9. Various authors. (Craig and Wilson, 70, Bath Street, Glasgow C2. 1s. each.)

The first five pamphlets in this series were heartily commended to HEADWAY readers in March of this year. Here are three more, with promise of further good things to come. OUR LANGUAGE, by Dr. James M. Clark, is of special interest because it touches upon the "international language" controversy which in recent months has aroused some animation in our correspondence columns. The author, by the way, comes down on the side of neither Esperanto nor Basic English. In SCIENCE AND THE FUTURE, Dr. A. E. Trueman frankly faces the way in which man's inventive genius has in many respects outrun his capacity for organisation. Increasingly large numbers of scientists, in fact, recognise that mankind's failure to develop morally or to acquire wisdom as rapidly as it acquires knowledge imposes special responsibilities upon them, and they are taking a greater interest in the social implications of their work. The effective development of a plan for the future will certainly embrace the using of scientific discoveries more fully but more wisely than hitherto. This, it may be added, has always been a principle of the League's technical activities. Guy Hunter writes on THE BRITISH WAY IN LOCAL RULE.

"N.B.C.," in American radio, stands for broadcasting on a big and imaginative scale—whether the Toscanini concerts or first-rate instructional programmes. "For This We Fight" is the title of a series of discussions on post-war issues, which the N.B.C. is presenting every Saturday evening in co-operation with the Commission to Study the Organisation of Peace.

We notice among the broadcasters many names familiar in League of Nations circles. During July the speakers included Mr. Clark M. Eichelberger; Dr. Frank Boudreau (now Chairman of the U.S. Nutrition Board) on "Food and Health in the Future"; and Mr. Carter Goodrich (Chairman of the I.L.O. Governing Body) on "World Problems of Labour."

Mr. Sumner Welles is to be the star speaker on August 28, when the subject will be "The Rôle of the United States."

FROM HEADWAY'S POSTBAG

Union Finance

Sir,—The Executive Committee has been asked by the General Council to investigate the question as to how the Union shall be financed after the war.

This is a matter of importance which concerns the branches and district committees as well as the Union Executive, and I trust they will give it their consideration and let the Union Executive have any suggestions.

Notwithstanding the fact that we had a substantial excess of income last year, that would not be sufficient to carry on our work on pre-war lines.

Connected with this question is that of the organisation of the Union: Before the war we had a number of regional representatives appointed by and responsible to headquarters. Should they be re-appointed or should we consider having a number of regional committees with their own organisers similar to that of the London Regional Federation?

These would be financed partly by a proportion of the subscriptions and partly by special contributions.

If this could be arranged it would probably not be necessary to have so many district associations.

It would be interesting and useful to have the views of branches as to the advantages or otherwise of this suggestion.

Hampstead.

W. T. PRITCHARD.

Sir,—Interesting and helpful as is the July article, "A Look at the International Horizon—I," are we quite sound in accepting it as accurate regarding federation?

The British Empire countries would not federate because they were already one family, and it would have been both superfluous and tiresome to bother to do so, but Hitler has just federated a previously disunited Europe before our eyes, and the question facing us is not whether to advise federation but whether to advise defederation after the war. In any case, the Allied statesmen in London have decided on certain pseudo-federations already.

Had we not better start building up in our minds a picture of the future World League strengthened by at least some regional federations, just as the article in question almost suggests in its penultimate paragraph?

WILLIAM WELSMAN.

Member, Bath and Brislington Branches.

The League's Constitution

Sir,—At the recent Council meeting a motion was passed at the instance of the Wallington Branch requesting the Executive Committee to consider various points of

view, one of which was that the League should possess a more democratic constitution. The Wallington Branch have since met and have requested me to make the suggestion which follows.

The question of the manner of appointing the members of the Assembly lends itself to more than one solution, and it is very doubtful whether one method can be agreed upon with a near approach to unanimity. It might, therefore, be preferable for the Union to put forward alternative methods rather than to attempt to agree upon a single plan which would be reached by a compromise between opposing views, and which, like many compromises, might not be satisfactory even to its authors. The setting out of alternatives would be analogous to the submission of majority and minority reports by Royal Commissions and similar bodies, although in this case it would of course only be necessary to include different alternatives in the single statement of policy.

Wallington.

J. GEE.

Sovereignty

Sir,—Your correspondent, R. A. Price, points out that if national sovereignty is to be restored after the war nations will have the right to their own armed forces, and is puzzled as to what the relationship of these would be with an international force.

But he should not have stopped with merely a reference to armed forces. A sovereign Power retains the right to decide for itself whether it will do, or refrain from doing, anything and everything—including the right to spurn the wishes of a majority in a League of Nations. That, of course, is what sovereignty means, i.e., to be a law unto oneself.

We like to persuade ourselves that we are democratic, but there is nothing democratic in each State having the right to act in disregard to the wishes and interests of others. This is international anarchy.

The great masses of people of all nations desire nothing better than to live in concord together, but they do not yet appreciate the fact, in sufficient numbers, that science has now made nations so interdependent that harmony is impossible if each one does as it likes.

A new League of Nations cannot expect to be more successful than the last unless (a) it has authority to legislate on prescribed matters of international concern and to take action on a majority vote of its members, and (b) has the force to ensure that its decisions will be carried out.

PUBLIC OFFICIAL,

and therefore anonymous.

L.I.A. AND "FOOD FOR ALL"

MR. RICHARD LAW, Parliamentary Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and other distinguished speakers, attracted a large and representative audience to the Livingstone Hall for the London International Assembly's Conference on "Freedom from Want: Food for All."

MR. LAW spoke of the deep impression which the Hot Springs Conference on Food and Agriculture had made upon him. Nothing less than the birth of the United Nations was what had happened there, he declared. It was a great deal more important than it had seemed at the time, or than most people in this country yet realised. Great and small Powers had been able to work together in perfect harmony and perfect understanding. In the common pooling of ideas questions of national prestige had scarcely entered at all, and the potential conflict between producer and consumer countries just "didn't happen." Yet it was one thing to bring a child successfully into the world and another to see that it survived. Hot Springs was only the beginning of a beginning of a solution. The construction of an orderly international society depended upon three elements—the military, the political and the economic. None of these could be solved on the purely national plane, but only on the international. It was only if we were able to create a genuine international society that we should be able to create a genuine peace.

After DR. ALEXANDER KUNOSI, on behalf of the L.I.A., had given a very clear explanation of the Memorandum presented by the General Purposes Committee to the Interim Bureau established by the Hot Springs Conference, SIR JOHN BOYD ORR discussed the practical possibilities arising out of the Hot Springs decisions. A definite food policy of this kind would be a means to realising that "fuller life" which Mr. Churchill had promised. Incidentally expansion of agriculture would lead to industrial progress to enable agriculture to become efficient. Thus we had a "self-starter," to pull the world out of post-war depression. Sir John stressed that the work had been in progress at the League of Nations before the war started. It was a tragedy that the war had temporarily stemmed progress, but now it could be carried on vigorously again.

MR. PAUL VAN ZEELAND (former Prime Minister of Belgium), M. MARJOLIN (a French delegate to Hot Springs), M. LYCHOWSKI (a Polish delegate to Hot Springs), SENHOR ALENCAR (Brazilian Chargé d'Affairs), and PROFESSOR ARTHUR NEWELL (U.S.A.), contributed to a useful debate. LORD CECIL commented from the chair that Mr. Law had given the impression that, at Hot Springs, he had stepped into a new world of international co-operation. If he had been at many League meetings, he would have found such co-operation by no means a new experience.

MAIN CONTENTS

	PAGE
To All Fellow Workers in the Union. <i>By the Earl of Lytton</i>	1
Major Freshwater. <i>By Viscount Cecil</i>	2
<i>By Dr. Maxwell Garnett</i>	2
<i>By L. F. Behrens</i>	3
Victor Cazalet. <i>By Mrs. Edgar Dugdale</i>	4
Paradox of Peace. <i>By Miles Juvenis</i>	5
World Affairs in Parliament. <i>By Owen Rattenbury</i>	6
Consider the Future of Society Now. <i>By Maurice Fanshawe</i>	8
Up and Down the Country.	10
Austria's Post-War Policy. <i>By J. Köstman</i>	12