

From Press and Platform

Current Public Opinion on Our Policy

COLONEL CHARLES LINDBERGH

(Extract from speech in Berlin, "News Chronicle," July 23rd)

Aviation has, I believe, created the most fundamental change ever made in warfare. It has abolished what we call defensive warfare. It has converted defence into attack. We can no longer protect our families with an army. . . .

As I travel in Europe, I am more than ever impressed with the seriousness of the situation which confronts us. When I see that within a day or two damage can be done which no period of time can ever repair, I begin to realise that we must seek a new type of security—a security which is dynamic and not static, a security which rests in intelligence and not in force. I find some cause for hope in the belief that power united with knowledge is less dangerous to civilisation than power which is barbaric.

Our responsibility for the creation of a strong destructive force will be heightened by the knowledge that we have united this force with reason, and that we have separated force from ignorance. The union of force and reason—that is the responsibility and the task of aviation.

THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON

(Extract from London Diocesan Leaflet, "Western Morning News," July 2nd, 1936)

Collective security is the secret of order in every nation, and in order to effect it we have policemen, but if they are to secure order, policemen must have truncheons. . . .

Now in our well-meaning generosity soon after the war the policeman laid aside his truncheon hoping that everyone else would do the same. Unfortunately, not a single nation followed our example. . . . This (war) the policeman, having laid aside his truncheon, has been powerless to prevent, hence the necessity of his getting hold of it again and using it to effect the peace of the world until those nations "which delight in war" find it does not pay, as the burglars in England now in Pentonville find that burglary does not pay, and will learn at last that collective security is really best for burglars as well as other people.

SIR STAFFORD CRIPPS, K.C., M.P.

(Article in "World Review," July 1936)

My first proposal then as the objective at which we must aim is a world confederation of nations based upon economic co-operation in the utilisation of their own natural and manufactured resources, and in the development of the world's backward areas for the benefit of the backward peoples. . . .

Although the primary basis of unity would be economic, there would, too, be worked out a common programme of defence. So long as aggressive fascist and imperialist powers remained, it would be essential to provide protection for the new peace system against their possible attack. . . .

A co-ordinating General Staff would be the first step to the effective combination of defence forces, which might reduce the necessities for national armaments in each individual country. This would be followed by an amalgamation of the national defence forces into a single defence force for the group, just as to-day the States of America have pooled their defence forces.

MR. ST. JOHN ERVINE

(Extract from speech at Lyme Regis, "Western Morning News," June 20th, 1936)

The mind of the world is coming rapidly to the conclusion that the League of Nations must have the power behind it to put down the wrong-doer. . . .

Behind the policeman is authority, and that authority is force. Is the League of Nations to be a sentimental amiable body of people passing pious resolutions or is it to be a police force with authority to arrest the wrong-doer?

MR. F. GLASIER FOSTER

(Letter to the "Skipton Pioneer," July 17th)

The solution of the problem of war demands, in the first place, a consideration of the place and purpose of force in the national organism as distinct from the international sphere. The extreme pacifist must persuade himself as to whether or not he agrees that force has a place in the constructive as well as in the destructive affairs of mankind, and what function it has to perform in the work of ensuring peace and progress.

If the law of civilisation is to supersede the law of the jungle in international affairs, it can only do so as a result of the universal conviction—i.e. by the will of the common peoples of the world—that war is a crime against humanity, and that the war-maker must be subject, as is any other criminal, to whatever penalties and restraints the offence may warrant. . . .

A law court not backed by powers of compulsion would be a farce. A constable prohibited from using physical force, say against armed bank robbers, would be equally farcical. Of what avail would it be to send a Civil Servant, postman or other official to effect the arrest of a criminal? When Sir Robert Peel instituted the Metropolitan Police Force in 1829 he harnessed force to the chariot of justice, and laid the foundation of the great work of safeguarding the community from acts of lawlessness and disorder. . . .

Collective security and world policing, moreover, involve more than merely placing restraints upon an aggressor. You cannot build the future peace upon *status quo*. Justice must precede compulsion as security must precede disarmament.

MR. ROBERT BOOTHBY, M.P.

(Extract from letter to the "New Statesman and Nation," July 4th)

What are the lessons to be learnt from the events of the last six months? First, that the only effective Sanction is force; second, that this force, under existing conditions, cannot and will not be applied by all the member States of the League; and third, that these member States are far from being equal. . . .

The ultimate political solution must lie in the creation of an International Air Force. In the meantime I find it difficult to share your belief that a complicated system of military alliances within the present framework of the League is likely to diminish chances of war. . . .

MR. E. L. MALLALIEU

(Letter to the "Huddersfield Examiner," July 17th)

The second part of the lead should be a concrete suggestion for the perfecting of that part of the League's machinery which deals with the redress of "non-justiciable" grievances, by the setting up of an equity tribunal capable of scrapping obsolete treaties and generally doing justice on equitable lines.

The third part of the lead should be a concrete proposal for the endowing of the League with permanently existing machinery—a permanent general staff—for the purpose of upholding international law and the decisions of the equity tribunal. This staff would dispose at first of the national forces of those who "came in" on the proposed settlement; but in time, no doubt, it would be found practicable and more efficient to have a permanently organised international force.