

causing offence. Is having a navy twice as big as any other navy in the world, power politics? Is having the largest air force in the world, with bases in every part of the world, power politics? Is having all the gold in the world, power politics? If so we are certainly not guilty of these offences, I am sorry to say. They are luxuries that have passed away from us.

We go farther; we define our position with even more precision. We have sacrificed everything in this war. We shall emerge from it, for the time being, more stricken and impoverished than any other victorious country. The United Kingdom and the British commonwealth are the only unbroken force which declared war on Germany of its own free will. We declared war not for any ambition of material advantage but for the sake of our obligation to do our best for Poland against German aggression, in which aggression, there or elsewhere, it must also in fairness be stated, our own self-preservation is involved.

This is from a speech delivered by the Right Hon. Winston Churchill in the House of Commons on January 18, 1945.

Nothing can be done to avoid foreign wars until men change their hearts, because we shall always have strife between nations as between individual men and women. No one knows when those changes are to come. The only direct way is for the British empire and the commonwealth to stick together on a common policy for the reasons which I have given. The only hope I see for the world is for Britain, the United States and Russia to carry on in peace, as I believe they can do, with the same spirit of cooperation and coordination that they used during the war. We had most harmonious conferences with the United States and Russia during the war. I believe they can be continued in peace in the future. But I believe in facing realities, in seeing the picture as it is. To-day politicians, in the light of these circumstances I have mentioned, and in spite of the failures of all other policies, content to follow rather than mould the views of the people, are determined once more to set up a world organization by means of which they seek to eliminate war and by a system of collective security achieve at long last the brotherhood of man. Well, it will not come. I have named three league failures already, and I believe the fourth failure will come later. First at Dumbarton Oaks and later at San Francisco they strove to hammer out a world order which would give effect to these high purposes, but only among the smaller nations, who will have nothing to say about the future. In the same way the various parts of the British empire will have nothing to say about the future unless we remain in the empire and hang together and with Britain remain a

first-class power. On July 2 of this year President Truman sent a message to the senate in favour of—

... a general international organization based on the principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

That is the resolution now before us. He went on to add:

What I am now presenting to the senate carries out completely this expression of national and international necessity.

There were many speakers in the senate, and the attitude with which these proposals were looked upon in Washington was one of cynicism and apology for the charter. Senator Eugene Millican of Colorado said that the charter reminded him of what was said after the Lisbon earthquake, although he also said he was going to vote for the resolution. Following that earthquake men went about selling what they called earthquake pills. When they were asked if those pills were guaranteed to cure earthquakes the vendors replied that although they could give no guarantee, the pills were the best offered on the market for a cure. So that was what they thought in a cynical and illusive way of this resolution in the United States Senate. To get down to the real facts, the united nations cannot rely upon any world organization to obtain and maintain security if that interferes with their own affairs. It has been said that someone changed the name of the conference from San Francisco "the Sham Fiasco". A great English writer, Arthur Page, a member of the British House of Commons and one of Mr. Churchill's great supporters who coined that phrase, has asked if it is not about time we got back to the old power system which saved the mother country for so many years. Everyone wants peace and no more war, but all these other policies have been failures. We should stand by the mother country first, and as an empire act as an economic unit, adhering to the policy I have enunciated. Mr. Page goes on, in the *National Review* to say:

Is it not time that our "futurist" politicians refrained from drafting fantastic "plans" for international control abroad and state control at home? On October 2, 1934, Mr. Attlee, the parliamentary leader of the Labour party, propounded the new doctrine as follows:

"We have absolutely abandoned any idea of nationalist loyalty. We are deliberately putting a world order before our loyalty to our own country. We say we want to see put on the statute books something which will make our people citizens of the world before they are citizens of this country."

Was there ever, as Lord Castlereagh said of the Holy Alliance, such "sublime mysticism and nonsense"?