

THE second annual Oklahoma Institute of International Relations was held on the University campus June 12 to 23. The cumulative attendance was in excess of forty thousand, which represented an increase of fifty per cent over the initial sessions of last year.

The 1939 program was organized around the subject "The Foreign Policies of the Great Powers." Experts were chosen to address the large outdoor evening assemblies and to lead the round table discussions in the morning sessions.

The first speaker was R. K. Markham, *Christian Science Monitor* correspondent for southeastern Europe, and who has spent more than a quarter of a century in that mercurial section.

Summing up the conditions in that section, Mr. Markham warned the people of the United States that when Hitler marches down the Danube, he will march, not as a conqueror, but as a deliverer. Populations in Balkanized Europe are badly governed and greatly in need of the organizing genius of a foreign people.

In every country of southeastern Europe there is a strong minority that would welcome Hitler as a savior, and this is especially true in Hungary, Roumania, and Jugo-Slavia.

Dr. Willhelm Sollmann, former Reichstag and cabinet member in Germany, interpreted the Nazi foreign policy in clear, concise terms. Hitler is no artificial person—he represents the longings and aspirations of the average German. This was the thesis of this former German editor. He further contended that the threat of Hitler had probably saved democracy as a governmental discipline.

The high point of the conference was reached in the visit of ex-President Eduard Benes, of Czecho-Slovakia. Fifteen thousand people visited the campus to see and hear this important world figure. They heard him, in amazing sincerity, plead with them to have faith in the ultimate triumph of democracy, because that system, and that alone, comes nearest to fulfilling the higher aspirations of the individual citizen.

One of the most enthusiastically received of all the speakers, Dr. T. Z. Koo, of Shanghai, China, spoke of the Sino-Japanese crisis with remarkable detachment. The great question in the Orient is whether or not the Japanese will be able to retain control of the Chinese transportation lines, he said.

Dr. Koo predicted that Japan would lose the war, and quickly, if the United States would cease shipping war supplies to the aggressor. He placed his reliance upon the new spirit of China and upon the success that the Chinese are having with guerrilla warfare.

The futility of the Japanese offensive was likened by Koo to a man's punching a feather cushion, A blow upon the cush-

ion merely brings a bulge at another place.

Dr. Bertram Maxwell, of Washburn College, discussed the enigmatic Russian foreign policy. Of world importance at the moment, because of Britain's attempt to drive Russia into an anti-Hitler defensive alliance, Russian foreign policy was described as one of essential pacifism.

Of all the great powers, said Mr. Maxwell, only the United States and Russia can afford to pursue such a policy, for they have few non-continental possessions and are, therefore, in a good position to defend their national interests.

Dr. Linus Glanville, of Southern Methodist University, emphasized the essential shifting character of Italian foreign policy. Bottled up in the Mediterranean, and lacking completely the minerals that produce power in the modern world, the Italian statecraft must be one of bargaining. When the crisis comes, said Glanville, Mussolini will sell Italian support to the



Ex-President Benes of Ex-Czechoslovakia, who drew more persons to the Fieldhouse than any athletic event ever did

Institute on World Politics

by

Cortez A. M. Ewing

highest bidder. Only by such a policy can he compensate for the rude prank which nature played upon Italy by not providing enough coal and iron for Italian needs.

French foreign policy was discussed by Dr. Walter Sharpe, of the University of Wisconsin. Recoiling from the position of preponderance which she held after 1920, France has lost much, but she must not be underestimated. With the strongest army in Europe, and with internal unity for the first time since the war, France is still the key power in military affairs. The loss of Czechoslovakia was a severe diplomatic blow, but the indigenous

French power will assert itself in the event of hostilities.

The multifarious phases of British foreign policy were discussed by Drs. R. J. Dangerfield and O. E. Benson, of the University of Oklahoma government faculty. The former pointed out the loss of British prestige that followed Munich, and observed that "perfidious Albion" was again engaged upon her traditional role of building a balance of power on the continent. Hence the frantic attempt to draw Russia into the bloc against Germany.

Dr. Benson surveyed the colonial field and emphasized the effect which the loss in prestige would have in regard to the loyalty of British colonials. Immediately, however, Britain stood to lose more in the Orient than in any other world sector.

Discussions on American foreign policy were led by Dr. H. C. Nixon, visiting professor at the University. Having been a member of the American contingent at Versailles, Mr. Nixon pointed out the fundamental changes in attitude since the war.

Our policy in the international scene, said Mr. Nixon, may feature either collective security or isolation—but in either event we shall have to pay the price. In the former, we shall have to participate actively in world affairs and throw our diplomatic might on the side of our ostensible national interest. If we choose isolation, we shall have to be prepared to defend ourselves without assistance. Thus we shall have to build armaments against not only single powers, but against combinations of foreign powers.

We cannot have our cake and eat it too. We must choose between the two policies.