

Mr. McBride condemns the present fighting generation as unfit to take their place as leaders of our post-war world striving for a united peace. He would have these leaders "selected"—yes, selected from the front line, and sent to an "International Youth College," where they will apply themselves diligently to "research into the immense and complex problems of peace, and towards evolving plans for peace."

Might I ask who shall select? And who shall determine the standards of the research? The answer is obvious. These "leaders" will be selected by their own Governments, and therefore they will not necessarily represent the people. And what man can lead the people unless he represents them? No-one but a dictator!

Likewise, the information and knowledge accessible to the "college" will be standardized by the Governments, which will consist of Baldwin-opinionated gentry of the decaying generation—the same generation that blundered into this war; and will, given the chance, stubbornly do so again.

These selectees. In Mr. McBride's words, ". . . it will happen that young men of the quality required are already holding high rank and occupying key positions . . ." Will a man of present high rank in the field, used to military laws, used to dictating orders and punishments alike, make a desirable leader? The writer then goes on to claim that his "college" will have an "individuality of constitution." Might I remind him that the 3rd Reich also has an "individuality of constitution"?

To sum up Mr. McBride's proposals: it appears that he desires to combine a League of Nations with a troop of armed Boy Scouts, and instruct them to carry the convictions and practices of the Chamberlain generation into posterity.

With regard to the present fighting generation, Mr. McBride claims that their leaders will be war-weary; and that with victory will come exhaustion

of the resources of our generation. I do not think so. The process of the training of a leader is accelerated by the trials of war. Again, the reflections of any fighting man, in any period in which he is free to reflect, are devoted to peace, what it is, how it can be attained, and, more important still, how it can be maintained. A man cannot be converted into a leader, no more can a leader be schooled to another's idea of leadership.

Winston Churchill is a leader. He first made headlines in the Boer War. He erred and strayed in the years following, but his instinctive leadership and courage led his feet back upon the right path. In erring, he learnt, until finally, in the climax of his greatness, he stands as one of the most inspiring and beloved leaders that the world has known. Joan of Arc was a leader. Was she trained in a school, was she soaked in a formula of peace gathered by ancient and stubborn governors of her preceding generation?

And so to peace. What is this obscure definition for which blood has flowed so freely and so long? Perhaps it is not so far removed from war as we would think. Perhaps war and peace are not words of opposite meaning. In war, we fight for our homes, our wives, and our children. Whether these things are present, or only dreams of the future, is of little account. And in peace we fight for those self-same things—under vastly different conditions, certainly, but they are still the greater things in life; they are the husk of the man. This generation's warriors comprehend that peace to a far greater extent than any political degenerate ever could.

Our leaders will assert themselves when the time comes. That time cannot be before they themselves have removed this present and greater threat to peace. If we can ensure that they will not be trampled upon by an older and fast-waning type of politician, then the duty that is theirs, the duty for which they have been unconsciously making themselves ready, will become far easier for them to discharge.