

MR. BALDWIN ON PEACE

THE DROPPING OF SANCTIONS

WAR THE ALTERNATIVE

Mr. Baldwin addressed a mass meeting of several thousands of Conservatives from all parts of North-Lanarkshire at a fête in the grounds of Coltness House, Wishaw, on Saturday. The Prime Minister and Mrs. Baldwin had been the guests overnight of Captain J. F. H. Houldsworth, of Coltness House, who presided.

The Prime Minister said:— I consider myself extraordinarily fortunate in having an opportunity of speaking in the country when the Government have taken a most important decision in connexion with foreign affairs—a decision which must challenge criticism, a decision which ought to be explained to the people, and which I believe will be endorsed by them.

There is a tragic situation in the world, where a powerful nation, in defiance of more than one treaty, has waged war against a fellow-member of the League, and, owing partly to the force of arms and partly to the breaking asunder of the cohesive forces of that small country, the Italians have occupied the capital, the Emperor of Abyssinia is in flight, there is no Government in Abyssinia, and the war against which sanctions were invoked is over. And the question we had to decide, not what the League should do but what our own action should be, was this: Should we at Geneva say that we for our part, while always prepared to support the views of the League as a whole, thought it right to continue sanctions, or should we say that we thought it right to drop them?

THE SANCTIONS DECISION
We think it right to drop them because we do not believe that their continuance, even if all the nations desired it, could serve any useful or effective purpose. Sanctions are put on to stop war. They were not devised for purely punitive purposes. In my view, there is only one way of altering the course of events and they have so far taken place, and that is to go to war. I do not know a single country in Europe that is prepared for that and I am quite certain that I should not cast my voice to-day for that course of action. (Cheers.)

I remember only too well in the General Election the cry against that—you will remember, I do not know whether you had it here, I spoke in many parts of the country—the cry against that was that we were a war-mongering party. People used to stop me at every meeting I went to, men and women alike, and begged me to keep this country out of war. I said to them personally, "You may rely on my doing everything a man can do to that end." And they believed us and they returned us to power. But there were other things we said, and it is on them that I wish to dwell for a time.

REPLY TO LABOUR MANIFESTO CHARGES DENIED

You have seen that the Parliamentary Labour Party have issued a manifesto to the nation. And before you come to hear speeches from the other side about it, as you will, I want to have my say to tell you what I think about it and what I think you should ask as to whether we have done right or whether we have done wrong. Let us each examine what the others are saying and doing, and let the country make up its opinion again as it has

peace by collective action. I have always recognized the possibility of that. I was brought to book over it by the League of Nations Union, but, after all, I have never taken the view that if the League should fail we are to despair. It should merely be an incentive to try to do better next time."

In March in the House of Commons I said:—"The Government are working for collective security. I am telling the House some of the difficulties with which Europe will be faced. It cannot be effectively worked by one nation or by two. That is why Europe and the members of the League will have to consult together, as soon as this present war may end, to realize what is involved in collective security, and if they think fit—as I hope they may—take such steps to see that collective security may be a reality, and such a reality that the need for it may never arise."

Had the League remained a league of all the nations of the world the situation would never have arisen, because the strength of its members, apart from whom the aggressor of the moment might happen to be, would be so overwhelming that that aggression would no longer be a paying proposition. After all, it is a very grave charge that we misled the electorate, and I want you to bear in mind those speeches which I have read to you and tell me if you believe that I misled the electorate at that time or obtained a single vote by false pretences.

THE FORCES

I said in the House of Commons two years ago, and I beg your attention to those words:—"If you are going to adopt a sanction, you must be prepared for war. If you adopt a sanction without being ready for war, you are not an honest trustee of the nation." (Applause.)

And I said in the House of Commons in March last year, speaking on defence:—"What we do ask—and the necessity for which I hope to prove—is that those forces which we have, and with which we are satisfied if the war should come, either to repel an aggressor or to fulfil our obligations under the Covenant of the League, that those forces shall be as well equipped for the purpose they have in view as it is possible to equip them, and that they shall not be called upon either to discharge their duties under the Covenant or defend the Pact when they would be in a position that would make their task infinitely harder and their losses infinitely greater."

I have two more, and I have finished. In the House of Commons in October, just before the election—I think the last speech I made in the last Parliament—I ask you to pay particular attention to this, because I touched on it in my broadcast:—"I am all in favour, and the Government are all in favour, for they see no other course of adopting as the policy of this country so far as the League can carry it out to-day, the policy of collective security; and I am convinced that the country is behind that policy, but I warn the country there are risks of peace—and I say this deliberately, that while I am prepared to pursue that policy with all my heart and soul, I will not pursue it, and I will not be responsible for the conduct of the Government of this country, the present Government, which have accrued since the War in our defensive services."

And in March of this year I said to the House of Commons—and I shall explain this at a little greater length in a few minutes:—"Therefore you are brought to a very terrible conclusion and that is that if the countries in Europe desire to stop an aggressor, whoever he may be, by making that aggressor realize that his actions will bring all the other members of the League down upon him at once, the countries in Europe—and as I say, it is a terrible thing to have to say—they will have to be much more ready for war than they are to-day."

Collective security (I said only two months ago before my constituents and a month after those observations in Parliament)—collective security will never work unless the nations who take part in it are prepared simultaneously to threaten with military sanctions, and, if necessary, to fight. Let us, at all events, in working for collective security know what we mean and understand what it involves. It means that we should be prepared to do whatever people may say and however much

mind to go to war with somebody for something. And you don't make up your mind to go to war until you are ready to go to war. The gradually, all the other nations of the League see what you are after, and they say they will impose sanctions to stop you going to war. They may perhaps put on some economic sanctions first, or they may try some very stringent sanctions at once.

Now, if you were in the frame of mind I have indicated, what would you do? Would you sit still and let sanctions work and then wait for some more and say, "I am very sorry; those sanctions are very unpleasant. What would you like me to do and I will do it?" Not a bit of it. You will hit the other fellow in the eye and hit him hard. (Laughter.) Remember, the aggressor is ready for war by the fact that he is an aggressor.

DETERRING AN AGGRESSOR

And now you will see what I meant by those extracts I gave you from one or two speeches I gave this year. It is perfectly obvious that no aggressor will be deterred unless he knows that ultimately there is a force that will be stronger than his. Now, how are you going to get that force? Mere numerical majority does not necessarily count for much. As I pointed out at Westminster, a country united in itself, with good communications of its own, well armed, organized for the production of war material, all speaking one language, trained to go under one command, is, to begin with, in a very striking position against forces speaking different languages, under different commands, perhaps with no reserves of war material, and, as has been the case in this last year, not ready for war even if they had the will for it.

Military coercion is impossible in that case. Everyone who takes part in it has got to be ready, and that is what the countries in Europe have got to make up their minds on. They are ready to contemplate that? And you come up against that awful fact that I put before the House of Commons a few months ago—that to get peace by collective security the first step means more war preparations. It is the horrible irony of the situation, and yet you can't get away from it. It is an extraordinary thing.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE

Most of us have read this manifesto, extracts of which I have given to you, and you read what happens in Parliament. We have been abused by our political opponents. We have been mocked by them and by Mr. Lloyd George, too—for what? Because we have scuttled? Because we have run away? What do those words mean? What do you scuttle from, and where do you run away to?

Do those words mean anything unless they mean we have run away from the Italian Navy? Can they have any other meaning? In other words that we have run away from war? And people lightly say that and vote against every aeroplane for the Air Force, and vote against every proposal in the House of Commons for the production of an extra shell for the Navy, and the men who say that realize that if they were in power, if the day comes when they want to put sanctions on against a really great Power, don't they know that the first thing that would happen would be the raiding of the east side of England from the air? And what are they going to do? Are they to refuse to increase our Forces until they can meet those Forces? Are we going to go on not encouraging men to undertake the defence of our coasts, not encouraging men to produce what is necessary for the defence forces, and yet at the same time to go about saying the people of this country must take the risk of collective security? The thing seems too fatuous unless there is no limit to the fatuity of this kind of political attack.

KEEPING BRITAIN AWAY FROM WAR

"THE END OF CIVILIZATION"

They dare not look facts in the face, and it is because we realize what is involved in these things that we are making every attempt, whatever people may say and however much

any other to live in, and that there is something precious, the loss of which, if this country were in danger, would be a loss to the world.

RISKS OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY

And that should be the security function, and never forget that collective security without dangers to yourselves. If you won't face the danger, say so and have done with it. But you cannot have security, collective or limited liability, by any system of collective security, every nation is in it to the hilt. And let the advocates of collective security who are unwilling to provide a single aircraft, or a single ship, or a single Labour Party think that, believe, as they do, that the nation will undertake the risks, that they will work for it. But don't let your heads to this: that, at all events, if risks have to be taken, if we ever have to fight again, that our own people at all events have to fight with in quality, and that no risks are taken might fairly be assumed by a seeing nation.

Replying to a vote of thanks, Mr. Baldwin expressed his pleasure at the presence on the platform of the Secretary of State for Scotland (Sir Geoffrey Cope). He said:—"During these anxious days I have always been convinced of the necessity of all us, whether we belong to the Tories—or sticking together at a time like this in the whirlpools and vicissitudes in which we are manoeuvring."

Mr. Baldwin expressed his pleasure at the presence on the platform of the Secretary of State for Scotland (Sir Geoffrey Cope). He said:—"During these anxious days I have always been convinced of the necessity of all us, whether we belong to the Tories—or sticking together at a time like this in the whirlpools and vicissitudes in which we are manoeuvring."

"A WRONG DECISION"

LORD CECIL ON DUTY TO REVERSE IT

Lord Cecil, president of the League of Nations Union at Scarborough on Saturday, said he felt sure a wise, courageous, and honest policy to have consistently enforced sanctions, at any rate for a few months more.

"I still think," he continued, "that the decision taken by the Government was a wrong decision. I still think that it is our duty to say it is a wrong decision, and it is our duty to do all we can to reverse it. Until the policy of the British Government has been definitely accepted by the Assembly of the League at Geneva it is possible for that policy to be reversed."

Lord Cecil was speaking in support of a resolution, which was carried, regretting the Government's intention to abandon sanctions without their having been fully tried out, and urging the use of all constitutional means to obtain the reversal of the decision. He regretted the Government's action, because he thought that it struck a serious blow at the confidence which the public would feel in the declarations of policy made by Ministers.

Anything that weakened the adherence of this country to the League was likely to add greatly to the difficulties and to endanger the unity of the British Empire. No one who read the Covenant could doubt that the Government's policy was profoundly inconsistent with that Government. He was not at all satisfied that the insistence on the enforcement of sanctions would produce no effect. The great probability was that they would produce a very great effect.

NOT PREPARED TO MAKE WAR

When he was asked by Sir Paul Latham, whether he would be prepared to go to

MR. CHURCHILL'S SUPPORT

MAKING BRITAIN SAFE

Mr. Winston Churchill, speaking at Rolls Park, Chigwell, Essex, on Saturday on the sanctions decision, said he would support the Government in the debate in the House of Commons to-morrow. He said:—

"Six weeks ago, after the collapse of the Abyssinian defence, I told my constituents at Chingford that the abandonment of sanctions against Italy was necessary. I found myself in full agreement with Sir Austen Chamberlain that the policy of sanctions out of mere revenge and without any prospect of materially benefiting the Abyssinian tribesmen, could not be justified. After six weeks of hesitation the Government have now reached the same conclusion, and I shall certainly support them when the issue is raised in the House of Commons next week."

"I am well aware that the decision to which the Government have at last come will cause great distress to many good people in the constituency, and, indeed, throughout the land. I share that feeling, and the policy towards Italy has been handled in the last nine months. It has been impossible for anyone to follow the chops and changes, the advances and retreats, which have led us to what Mr. Baldwin himself describes as 'a bitter humiliation.' The results are disastrous in many directions. The Italian Dictator has had an amazing triumph. The Abyssinians have been conquered and annexed. The prestige of Britain has fallen throughout the world, and especially in the Mediterranean."

THE FOREIGN SECRETARY

"But I think it would be very unfair to throw the blame of all this upon our young Foreign Secretary, who has at every stage acted in agreement with his colleagues. I do not agree with those who clamour for his resignation. We have had already three Foreign Secretaries in nine months. It is wrong, it is cowardly—I believe that is the fashionable word—to clamour when things go wrong for the sacrifice of subordinates. What our country needs, especially in foreign affairs, is leadership. While this is lacking at the summit the tasks of departmental Ministers, difficult enough in all conscience, become almost impossible. Without it the cause of Parliamentary Government will be at a woful and perhaps fatal disadvantage compared with the glittering and formidable dictatorships which have arisen in so many powerful countries."

Mr. Churchill added that last Thursday Mr. Lloyd George, unconquered by the weight of 74 years, made one of the most brilliant speeches he had ever heard. Unhappily neither his facts nor his logic were on the level with the rhetoric. What could be more absurd than for him to say that the danger of war through the continuance of sanctions was less than it was when the Italian-Abyssinian quarrel began a year ago? Everything in Europe was a year ago. We had had another year of German rearmament at full blast. Italy was far better armed and stronger than she was, especially in the air. On the other hand, the Liberal and democratic countries were passing through a phase of unusual weakness. In many countries Communism had reared its snaky head.

WEAKNESS OF DEFENCES

Amid all these growing and gathering perils to our safety and our freedom, Mr. Churchill grieved to see that Britain remained weak, careless, and seemingly incapable of realizing the awful degeneration which was taking place around her, and the consequences which it might bring to her prosperity, her Empire, and even her

NEW LIBERAL PARTY ORGANIZATION

NATIONAL FEDERATION TO END

A special meeting of the Council of the National Liberal Federation was held at the Kingsway Hall on Saturday to accept the new constitution endorsed by the Liberal Party Convention on Friday. A resolution was carried that the federation should no longer continue its separate existence, but should be merged in the organization of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Ramsay Muir, the president of the federation, said that it was not winding up because it had anything to be ashamed of, but because it had done yeoman service, but the time had come when it must be strengthened and reinforced. One of the ill-effects of the National Government was that it had won in the minds of unthinking people a distrust of party organization. It had led to the attitude of mind which said that to serve a party was a kind of disloyalty to the country. That was nonsense.

They had been living under a Conservative dictatorship. If the National idea had had any effect it had been to intensify the natural tendency to dither which resulted from the operation of a number of people who had never before been in the habit of working together.

"SHAMEFUL HUMILIATION"

The danger had grown until finally the Government was ashamed of itself. He hoped that soon the pretences would disappear, and that they would have a recognized Tory Government. That would at least mean that the country would have a policy, even if it were a bad policy. All Liberal-minded people would then have to see that the affairs of the country were guided in a manner to save them from the shameful humiliation and blunders of the policy into which they had been plunged.

Mr. Muir expressed the view that the future lay in a combination of the Left Centre—a combination of those Liberals who for various reasons, had drifted into the Conservative Party or the Labour Party, and those who had always known what they were. "We must," he said, "avoid all acrimony we can, apart from the anger we naturally feel with those who are betraying the national honour." He had profound sympathy with the good Liberals who were "rattled" into supporting the National Government in 1931. He would like to make it as easy as possible for those people with whom they had said they would have nothing to do to come back. He was not thinking of the Simonite leaders. He was thinking of the rank and file.

Mr. Arthur Brampton, vice-president of the federation, who moved the acceptance of the new constitution, the winding-up of the federation in its present form, and its merger with the new organization, said they were entering into a wider, more useful, and fruitful life.

The resolutions were accepted. A presentation was made to Mr. Ramsay Muir, and tributes to him were read from Sir Herbert Samuel, Mr. Lloyd George, and Sir Archibald Sinclair.

The meeting ended with an appeal by Mr. Muir that all the delegates should telegraph to their members of Parliament a protest against the Government's handling of the situation.

KEEPING ORDER AT MEETINGS

CALL FOR CONSERVATIVE "DEFENCE FORCE"

The suggestion that a group should be organized to act as a "defence force" seeing that Conservative speaker

PRU DUB I.R. FR. Becal Irish R. tions w any I.R to-day. the a attracts from n On t ment a process that parade order. cancell keep a would any un town. hundr also a helmet equip head. The but in the Ci being candidi. orderl object was ti and it Civic "Eve charg speak drove speak escap through three the Mr. Kear RU. S

107197

occurs a statement to which I shall give some... I am speaking at Bewdley—I do not know whether any of you have heard of that place...

Now just pay attention to this:—“If that path should fail, I know it has often been said that would be the end of the League of Nations.”

STRENGTHENING THE LEAGUE

I went on:—“I would never take that view. I would say rather that if this first attempt of the world to secure peace had failed, let us see whether our machinery, whether our work, may have been at fault.”

NO ISOLATED ACTION

I said in the House of Commons four days later:—“No man who believes in peace can ever stop”—I meant stop trying, it is clear in the context—“that no man who believes in peace can ever stop, and if we fail this time, peace can ever stop, and if we fail this time, peace can ever stop, and if we fail this time, peace can ever stop.”

There I have stressed no isolated action—all to share the burdens and the risk. And in opening my campaign for the election a few days later at Wolverhampton, I made the position perfectly clear once more. I stressed the difficulty caused by the action of Germany, Japan, and Italy at that moment.

If we should find, I went on, “that our efforts and the efforts of our friends in the League on this occasion failed all the high hopes many of us held, never despair; sit down and consider how you can make your machinery more effective in the future.”

INCENTIVE TO DO BETTER In the House of Commons just before Christmas, after the election, I said: “I have at times said things that have brought upon me the indignation of the League of Nations

and of Great Britain playing her part in that “curious”... Now I think that chain of extracts makes my mind and purpose perfectly clear to you.

THE OIL SANCTION

WHY IT WAS NOT PUT INTO FORCE

When this manifesto of the Parliamentary Labour Party goes on it speaks of the ambiguous policy of the Government at Geneva, and says that we only made the military success of Mussolini possible by the continued supply of oil.

Quite a useful question to ask anyone who speaks on that point is how he would have prevented oil coming from the United States to Italy and Abyssinia.

The Government, it goes on, is advocating the limitation of the sanctions of the League. If they are, it is the first I have ever heard about it. That statement is not a statement of fact.

This manifesto goes on: “Stop the drift to war.” If there is one way to drift to war, and doing nothing to encourage recruiting of men who are wanted to man the searchlights and anti-aircraft guns if the time should ever come when this country is once more raided from the air.

“We earnestly appeal to all men and women of good will and certain organizations to rally in their millions.” What to? To the Army or the Navy? No—to the defence of collective security. Ask for an explanation how collective security can be defended by any other means than strengthening your own defence forces.

THE MEANING OF SANCTIONS

We have talked a great deal about sanctions and collective security. Those are two subjects which a few years ago were not discussed much in this country, and those two phrases were not much used. Let us try and understand clearly what is meant by them. A sanction—it is a technical word—is some power to enforce a law. If policemen is a sanction, prison is a more stringent one, and the gallows is the scaffold is one thing to talk about sanctions and the other is another thing to talk about them when you are not responsible.

We have to translate sanctions into action, and we have to consider what that action may involve. I want you to remember this, which I pointed out to the House of Commons only the day before yesterday: when the Government proposed the use of these economic sanctions with an unarmed Europe. That is to say, the losing Powers after the Great War were practically disarmed, and the hope and belief of everybody was that the rest of Europe would, in a few years, follow suit.

When you are dealing with sanctions to-day you are dealing with a fully armed, or very nearly fully armed—at any rate, so-called armed—Europe, a very different proposition. Now imagine yourselves, any one of you, an

League nations will come in with us, away from the perils and horrors of modern war in Europe. If that fire is ever lighted again in the Continent, the first thing I ask that I, for one, am going to take for my country so long as I have any control in the Government. (Cheers.)

Collective security is worth trying to get. I repeat, it is incredibly difficult with the nations that are outside but we shall try. I wish that we could get the countries outside the League back into it. If they would come collective security could be worked to-morrow—if we have Japan, the United States of America, and Germany.

After all, however difficult the situation looks, whatever the perils of the future may be, whatever may be the ambitions locked up in the breasts of the dictators, they know—they must know as well as we know—what another war in Europe would mean. It is a truism to say it would be the end of civilization as we have said it publicly and repeated it here what I believe might happen—such a thought cannot be from the minds of any rulers, whether they be constitutional or dictatorial.

REVOLT OF THE PEOPLES

I believe the horrors of another modern war in Europe might lead to the revolt of the peoples against all their leaders, and that you might soon find Europe in a state of completely barbarous anarchy from end to end.

There, as you can trust us, I think, to do all that we can, and believe me when I tell you that this thought of peace and the securing of peace by any and every means is one that is with us and has been with us day and night during this last few months. And I hope, indeed, that one result of this agitation, which the Labour Parliamentary Party do hope to stir up on these questions, may be that that party itself may gain some education in the process. Because the time may come when they will be in power, and I tremble to think what the result of that might be in the world to-day if they tackle these problems with the want of knowledge and understanding, and indeed with the levity, with which they tackle them to-day in Parliament and in the country. (Hear, hear.)

I have nothing to apologize for. We are keeping straight on our course, and we are now beginning to consider how we shall tackle these problems in the autumn in Geneva; and I await with equanimity and with confidence the result of any campaign that may be carried on against our action in the country and any attempt to weaken our hands.

MR. EDEN

And I would ask you in this great meeting to feel some sympathy for Anthony Eden, our Foreign Secretary, in these difficult days. (Cheers.) He has been accused of throwing over all he has believed in. Not a pleasant accusation. He has thrown over nothing, and I have seen, as many a man of great courage. He has seen, as many a man of great courage. He is going to pursue them without loss of heart and without loss of courage.

In this country—Great Britain—and at last, I am glad to think, Scotland, for you have been through a hard time and it has come later to you, the increasing work and prosperity of the South, but it is falling your to-day—your unemployment, your increasing numbers of your trade are good. But there is no country in Europe which is prospering like this country.

Now I do not say all that to take credit that I should not take for the Government, or to boost ourselves that we are better than other people. I record it as a fact that I am proud and foundly thankful for. But that that prosperity can never have a real firm foundation until commercial progress is seen in all the countries of Europe. Now that cannot be seen so long as Europe is restless, uneasy, and frightened, and you come back once more to the need of peace and the removal of the terrors that are hanging over Europe.

One other thing. We sometimes think and hear, and perhaps not unjustly, that there are many things we stand for to-day, that the world could not live without. We preserve our freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of conscience, freedom of civilization which we look for and hope for improvement, but yet with all its drawbacks we would not exchange it for that of any

as a consequence of carrying out our obligations under the Covenant, Mussolini makes war on me, then I shall be prepared to resist. Answering other speakers, he said in Germany enormous preparation for war in Germany. If Hitler's demands were granted he would have a war machine to enforce them. This has a frightful danger which it would be folly to recognize. “How is it to be met?” asked Lord Cecil. “Is it to be met by bringing it to Mussolini? I cannot think that. That is not the way to deal with dictators. To have the appearance even of being afraid to resist him is absolutely fatal. We must take our courage in both hands and do what is right and what we are bound to do under the Covenant.”

A speech by SIR PAUL LATHAM in favour of the abandonment of sanctions caused an uproar.

The Council also adopted a resolution urging the Government not to recognize the annexation of Abyssinia or to allow credits or other financial assistance to Italy and to aim at similar action by other League members.

LORD E. PERCY ON RESTORING PEACE

Addressing a demonstration of the Broxtowe (Nottinghamshire) Conservative Association at Bestwood Park on Saturday, LORD ESTACE PERCY, M.P., said that economic sanctions must always operate too slowly to prevent an aggressor from winning a war in one campaign. In the last War the blockade of Germany could not have stopped her from reaching Paris in 1914. Our people had now to decide for the future how far they would guarantee law and order in what part of the world. Wherever they did guarantee it they must be ready to support it by force of arms. This should make us very careful for the future. The keeping on of sanctions would never reverse Italy's conquest of Abyssinia. Therefore do not let us keep them on just to save our face, or try to send Italy “to Coventry” so that we might have a nice feeling of virtue. There was no alternative to war and peace.

The resources of the Empire should be placed at the disposal of all nations. This was the only way to meet Germany's agitation for a restoration of her colonies. Let us make the largest contribution to the restoration of peace and yet be determined that if peace proved beyond our grasp we were strong enough in arms to defend our people at home and throughout the Empire.

FACING FACTS

SIR KINGSLEY WOOD, the Minister of Health, speaking at Eltham on Saturday, said the world situation called for clear thinking. In the recent debate in the House of Commons the word “cowardice” had been banded about. The worst and most ignoble kind of cowardice was a refusal to face the facts, not to have the courage to look at the truth, and to fail to make difficult and often unpalatable decisions. Failures and disappointments there had been. They could be surmounted, but by further efforts in the light of experience and trial.

A NEW LEAGUE NEEDED

MR. LANSBURY, M.P., speaking at a peace rally at Dorchester on Saturday, said that what was needed was a new League of Nations cut adrift from the Versailles Treaty and prepared to tackle questions of territory, raw material, and the use of the resources of the world. We must have a League whose primary duty should be to remove the causes of war rather than to hide them. Let us reform on the lines of justice and cooperation. Let us forget the past and put behind us all the mistakes made since 1919.

THE GOVERNMENT'S “BETRAYAL”

MR. ARTHUR GREENWOOD, M.P., speaking at Wakefield, Yorkshire, last night, said:—“Britain has been dishonoured through its Government, which presents a lamentable spectacle to the country and the world.” The people, he said, had been shamefully betrayed. Not only had the Government betrayed the electors, but they had struck a grievous blow at the prestige of the League and given direct

had been allowed to fall. Errors, teetotalism, vacillation there had no doubt been in the foreign policy of the Government, but the provident neglect of our defensive strength years when every other great nation was arming sternly and resolutely.

If the people of this country could be made to realize where they stood in relation to the armaments of Europe and their responsibilities in so many parts of the world, there would be an overwhelming demand for a supreme endeavour at all costs to make our country safe, and a high resolve to use the majestic power of a revived Britain to sustain and to enforce the reign of public law and justice among the nations.

WORLD PEACE CONGRESS

LORD CECIL'S MANIFESTO

Lord Cecil has issued a manifesto on behalf of the International Peace Campaign in which he states:—

“Thursday's debate in the House of Commons shows that the world faces a crisis of the first magnitude. Decisions to be taken shortly by the Council and Assembly of the League of Nations cannot but affect closely every member of every community, civilized and uncivilized, as well as the lives of their children and grandchildren. The mobilization of public opinion in support of the League is now urgent.”

Recalling the British Peace Ballot last year and how later spontaneous popular protest led to the Hoare-Laval proposals being dropped, Lord Cecil adds: “A similar demonstration, but of world-wide magnitude, is now called for to show conclusively how great is the popular demand for the assured peace that we all desire. No feasible alternative is in sight, least of all one which gives no one security, but, on the contrary, greatly enhances the danger of war.”

The manifesto urges all organizations to send strong delegations to the World Peace Congress to be held in Geneva from September 3-6. By such steps alone could what threatened to be a world disaster be converted into a magnificent demonstration of the peoples' will to peace through the League.

MR. MORRISON'S ATTACK

MR. HERBERT MORRISON, M.P., speaking at Woolwich on Saturday night, attacked the Government, which, he said, had become a danger to the security of the nation and the world. It was a Government of weak men and cowards, of whom the great Tory statesmen of the past would have been heartily ashamed. Mr. Dooley's declaration of the League of Nations policy meant the virtual destruction of the League for all effective purposes, for it meant its transformation into a mere debating assembly and fling office.

Speaking at Leeds yesterday Mr. GREENWOOD said:—“I do not admit sanctions have failed. They have put on the screw, and Mussolini is on the run. I believe that the available economic and financial sanctions could kill war for ever.”

FLAGS FOR THE CORONATION

The Silk Association of Great Britain and Ireland has written to the President of the Board of Trade, asking him to take steps to ensure that flags and other decorations for use in connexion with the coronation celebrations should be entirely of British origin or manufacture, to the exclusion of foreign flags or decorations. The letter states that it has been reported to the council of the association that a consignment of 250 cases of silk flags from Japan has been advised, and urges that special regulations should be imposed which would ensure a substantial measure of employment to the silk and rayon weavers of this country.

DISCHARGED WITH IGNOMINY

Sentence of six months' imprisonment with hard labour and discharge from the Army with ignominy was promulgated at Aldershot on Saturday on TROOPER JACK HILL, 24, of the Queen's Bays. Hill was found guilty of enlisting in the regiment without disclosing that he had been discharged with disgrace from the Cameronians (Scottish Rifles), and also of deserting. He stated at the trial that

he presided at a conference of members from the Metropolitan, Home Counties, and East of England areas at Cannon Hall, Westminster, on Saturday.

LORD BAYFORD said there had been bigger attendances at conferences this year than had ever seen before, and wherever he had been he had found the right spirit prevailing. Referring to the Government's foreign policy, he said he admitted that in Ascot Week the Government backed a loser. The wise man would cut his losses: the less prudent man tried to get them back on the next race. What certain distinguished representatives of other parties were counselling at the present time was a different course. If he understood a certain speech that had attracted a great deal of attention in the last couple of days, the advice of the gentleman who put it forward was to put more money on the loser as it crawled past the post among the “also-rans.” There was no guarantee for peace equal to an England ready to defend herself, and he believed that the rest of Europe recognized that. If this Government was given a sporting chance he would undertake to say it would not let the country down.

AN AID TO FAIR HEARING

Referring to the Peckham reverse, Lord Bayford said it had been exceedingly hard for Conservative representatives to get a hearing. There were many stalwart young fellows in the clubs who only wanted organizing. They should organize a body of defence force, which would go round to the meetings, and if there was no order in the meeting they would know the reason why and the disorder would not be on the one side only. He did not want to see opposition meetings broken up, but he did want to see order maintained in their own meetings. So they should organize a gang to go round at a contested election and see that at a Conservative meeting the Conservative side got a fair hearing.

Mr. RICHARD L. RELIANT announced that the percentage of London clubs which subscribed voluntarily last year to the funds of the association was the largest of any area of England or Wales, 92 per cent. having sent donations.

Among numerous awards the association's political challenge banner was presented to the winners, Beaconfield Conservative Club, Derby. Making the awards, LORD BAYFORD said their recipients included three who had each done at least 35 years' continuous service and a 156 number for 30 years. Mr. DOUGLAS HACKING, M.P., chairman of the Conservative Party, said an attack would undoubtedly be made during the coming fight at Derby on the Government's policy to end sanctions, but to twit the Government for changing its mind when conditions had changed was mean and contemptible.

Mr. O. J. LING, president of the Beaconfield Club, mentioned that in 1911, the occasion of its silver jubilee, this club was one of the League of Nations jubilee, they received it again. He urged that the Conservative Party should not attach sufficient importance to the value of municipal representation and expressed the hope that the Government would make their awards not on a basis of wealth and position but in honour of service and merit. Mr. W. A. REID, M.P., also replied on Derby's behalf.

BEST GUARANTEE FOR PEACE

FIELD-MARSHAL SIR ARCHIBALD MONTEGOMERY-MASSINGHAM, who recently retired from the position of Chief of the Imperial General Staff, speaking at a British Legion rally at Scunthorpe, Lincolnshire, yesterday, said there was no more dangerous doctrine than that to join the forces—Regular or Territorial—was encouraging war. He believed that the strengthening of the British Forces would be welcomed all over Europe and the world, and was the best guarantee for peace. The Secretary of State for War was not exaggerating when he said that the state of the world to-day was as dangerous as in 1914.

PROPOSED JEWISH DEFENCE FUND

An appeal for £10,000 as a defence fund to counteract anti-Jewish propaganda was made by the Jewish Board of Deputies in London yesterday, when protests were made against what were described as the “vilely vicious, slanderous, and libellous attacks on Jews.” Mr. FRED COHEN said that attacks had been made not only against them as a community but individually. “How long is this to con-

The Times 22, 7 June 1936
A week old