

499

8  
Tues June 11 1935

# Letters to the Editor

## REIGN OF LAW IN EUROPE

### GERMAN POLICY

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

Sir,—Now that two weeks have elapsed since Herr Hitler delivered his anxiously awaited speech, it is perhaps possible to form some considered opinion as to the significance of his pronouncements.

We welcome his speech because it creates the opportunity of starting afresh. Herr Hitler repudiates war as an instrument of policy: he demands a peaceful procedure for the revision of treaties, and he is prepared to join in setting up a system of "collective cooperation."

In 1919 the Allies refused to tolerate Germany when they excluded her from the League. Such an attitude may have been natural, but it was fatal to the success of the new institution, which was intended to bring peace to Europe. Had an impartial tribunal been in existence to draft the constitution of the League and to propose to both parties the terms of a peace settlement, how different the results might have been. Probably such a tribunal would have made, in the words of the Chancellor, a clear separation between the Treaty of Versailles, built on the distinction between victors and vanquished, and the League of Nations, which must be built on equal valuation and equality of rights of all its members.

It is not too late even now to remedy this error. A new conference could be called which German representatives would attend, not to sign a dictated peace, but to assist as equals in framing a new charter of European liberty, equality, and security, and in instituting a League of Justice and Peace.

The test of sincerity and good faith will be the determination to institute the reign of law. Science during the last 25 years has paved the way for this development by accelerating the means of communication and placing at the disposal of a federal authority super-weapons for the maintenance of order and the exercise of the police function. Will the nations of Europe rise to the occasion? Will they hand over their air weapons to a neutral body—the League—which is charged with the twofold responsibility of revising and upholding the public law? By doing so the cooperating States members will not only have placed an insuperable obstacle in the path of the aggressor, but they will also have given pledges and hostages for their own good behaviour.

All attempts to mitigate or localize war by regional pacts, alliances, or ententes will fail just as they failed in 1914. Nothing short of a firmly established reign of law will suffice to banish the spectre of war from Europe.

Whoever raises the torch of war in Europe can only wish for chaos (says the Chancellor). We for our part live in the firm conviction that not the decline of the Occident but its resurrection will be fulfilled in our time. That Germany may make an imperishable contribution to this great work is our proud hope and our unshakable belief.

If all the leaders of the European nations are prepared to face the problem in this spirit, if they are willing to make "imperishable contributions," then we can contemplate the future with equanimity and with the assurance that at last Europe has set out on the road to recovery, security, and peace.

I am yours faithfully,  
DAVIES.

Thorney House, Smith Square, Westminster, S.W.1, June 6.

and Italy; nor would we be helping either of them.

I know a great many Italians, and even more Germans, who are suffering acutely from concentration camps, imprisonment, poverty, injustice, and persecution. They look to the British people to help them, not because we are happy and prosperous, nor because we wish other nations to copy ourselves, but because we do not think it wise to train the youth of any nation to think that war is the ideal way of settling international disputes. There is such a thing as moral indignation which is of more importance than material preparation; and if we are afraid from reasons of diplomacy of expressing the God that is within us we will go down to history as moral cowards.

British statesmen may be too absorbed in their own affairs to care much what happens to other people, but I think this is both religiously and morally wrong. We should not be afraid of fighting for Freedom, Justice, and Mercy—either at home or abroad.

Yours,  
June 10. MARGOT OXFORD.

### REUNION WITH THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

TO THE EDITOR

F  
C  
c  
t  
s  
t  
a  
S  
t  
o  
a  
o  
st  
n  
w  
c:  
a  
th  
n  
th  
vi  
ha  
Ba  
of  
we  
£8  
th  
th  
fig  
it  
im  
co  
sh  
th  
]  
val  
va  
po  
of  
su  
we  
an  
m  
fr  
co  
pu  
ha  
co  
va  
pa  
or  
rel  
ye  
£1A

### TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

Sir,—I cannot agree with Sir John Marriott's recommendation in *The Times* of to-day about recent German development. He says:—

The English people, happy in the circumstances of our own political evolution, are constitutionally incapable of understanding why other peoples should be so unlike ourselves.

We should be of little international service to our neighbours—of which Sir John Marriott takes it as our duty—if we watched without some sign of moral indignation what is going on at the present time, and has been going on for a long time among our neighbours—Germany

To  
Sir,  
article  
for loc  
made  
None  
attent  
of vi  
fact  
Th  
Act,  
vagar  
ties  
ge