

PRESS CLIPPINGS

286211

Office of
The Prime Minister

Name of Publication..... MONTREAL GAZETTE

Date..... JUN 2 1941

Subject.....

ON THE RECORD

By DOROTHY THOMPSON

Mr. Eden's Speech

New York, June 1.—If the English-speaking people lose this war, it will be because their leaders have failed to understand the revolutionary nature of the struggle. It will be because they failed to discern and direct the main currents of the times; it will be because their leaders insist on thinking that we live in 1918 instead of 1941, and that with minor modifications the world of 1918 can again be restored.

Mr. Eden's speech recognizes that revolutionary currents exist, but gives no evidence that he really understands them. Echoing the President's words, "We do not accept the Nazi shape of things to come," he projected things to come that are distinguished chiefly by their shapelessness.

This is peculiarly disheartening at this moment of history, for Hitler's projected world is anything but shapeless; it is a form of prodigious power, filled with terror.

But it is the current against that anarchy and shapelessness, that has falsely claimed to be freedom, that constitutes Hitler's greatest asset, for it leads people to be willing to accept almost any shape, and almost any form, if only it promises to end chaos.

Mr. Eden seems completely to have forgotten that the peoples of Europe—as contrasted with their governments—and especially the people of England, took up the sword, not against Germany, but against Nazism. In doing so they went to war against the concept of domination imposed by force and terror. But they did not go to war for the preservation of that divided Europe, in which nations are played off against nations and powers against powers for the benefit of the wire-puller.

That idea was dead in the minds of the people after the last war, and failure of their leaders to realize it led directly to this war.

Hence, the avowed intention against Germany after the war—the revival of the old doctrine of Germany's original sin—is utterly without resonance.

All Europe and all western civilization must find a system of mutual protection against these recurrent civil wars that occur in the heart of our world, from whatever source.

If the suspicion arises, however, that the shape of things to come is to include another attempt to forge guarantees against the industrial strength and work capacity of the German nation, and to attempt to keep her weak on all points because she is a formidable competitor, then no "moral" order can be claimed.

The problem of Europe is not so primitive as that. The problem is how to integrate the nations in such a manner that the strength and virtue of each becomes the strength and virtue of all, and, in particular, so that Germany's formidable energies are put into the service of the whole of western civilization, instead of being a menace to it. The attempt to cut off Samson's hair again will have the same effect that it did before—it will lead him to pull down the pillars of the Temple.

The true issue, comprehended by the last man in the street in Europe but never adequately faced by democratic governments, is between co-operation and domination, between federation and monopoly. It is the twentieth century's struggle for a new realization of the great European and American concepts of freedom and equality—these, together with order.

No half-way solution will work. It must be radical.

Mr. Eden's suggestion of "a peaceful brotherhood of nations with due liberty to each to develop its own balanced economic life and its characteristic culture" is too vague, and is the concept of a "transitional period." Nations cannot each develop a balanced economic life on their own. Hitler knows that. The problem is the development of an integrated economic life, a more perfect and equal union, which will promote the general welfare and secure liberty and justice for all.

The attempt of the post-war states of Europe each to develop a balanced economic life led to prosperity for some and misery for others, Balkanized Europe and played directly into the hands of Hitler.

Similarly the attempt to call the Arab tribes to revolt on the side of Britain will fail. In the Arabian world Great Britain has pursued a completely unclear policy. Her worst mistakes have been her consistent appeasement of Arab terrorists, particularly in respect to the

Jewish homeland in Palestine. Britain should either have supported the Jewish homeland, and armed it, and made it perfectly clear that she intended what she said, or she should never have started it. The very people who are now conspiring with the Germans and Italians against her in Iraq, and elsewhere in Arabia, are terrorist chieftains whom she herself encouraged.

She has refused to arm the Jewish settlers, although they would have raised an army of every Palestinian youth to fight for Britain.

These Palestinian Jews are men who left professions, remade their own bodies, broke stones on roads, irrigated deserts, paid and paid heavily for every scrap of land, and have soil made with their own hands to defend. The British attitude has been that they would be with her anyhow and therefore it was necessary to placate the Arabs, none of whom incidentally has lost anything from the Palestinian experiment. But not a word is said about Palestine, and again the issue is confused, for it was the brutal persecution of the Jews that first awoke the conscience of the world against Hitler.

In Britain's situation today, it is very difficult, probably impossible, to lay down anything like a blueprint for peace, but certain principles ought to be kept clear. Unless they are, the European revolution will be lost. And if it is lost, the war is lost.
(Released by the Bell Syndicate, Inc.)