

PAX INTERNATIONAL

Published by
the Womens' International League for Peace
and Freedom



International Headquarters:
12 rue du Vieux-Collège, Geneva

Editor: KATHLEEN E. INNES

Subscription price: 2.50 Swiss francs, \$1 or 2/6 a year — Chèques postaux: I. 1869

This is an Anglo-Saxon number. The Editor invites contributions for July issue especially from European Sections. They must be received by July 8th, and early notice of any coming would be much appreciated.

REMINDER TO SUBSCRIBERS

Please send "Pax" subscriptions for 1939 now to Maison Internationale, 12 rue du Vieux College, Geneva—together with any due for 1938!

DEFENCE OF DEMOCRACY

"The W.I.L.P.F. appeals to its members everywhere to be awake to their task of defending by non-violent means every inch of democratic liberties of conscience, of assembly, of organisation, of press and of speech."

This is perhaps the most urgent task with which the W.I.L.P.F. is faced to-day. The use of violence, whether in the form of open warfare, or in the ruthless methods of the authoritarian States, backed by threat of guns, forces on this generation the need not only to defend democracy, but first to try to see clearly wherein lies the essence of that liberty on which a true democracy must rest.

Restrictions there must be in a civilised community, but restrictions based on the need to safeguard the personality of others.

The needs of a people enjoying vigorous spiritual, mental and social life within a healthy State demand these rights, to meet freely, and to organise freely; to see plays, to print books and papers and to read them, freely; to discuss freely, and to speak their minds. These rights are absent in the Totalitarian State, and in many States that call themselves democracies they are sharply menaced. Moreover the growth of ideological propaganda subsidised from other countries has put into the hands of those who would stifle criticism a powerful weapon for the suppression of free opinion.

Each country could make its own list of the points at which it feels its liberties infringed or threatened. In England the introduction of conscription has roused and divided the country sharply. It is a startling departure from tradition, in a country where, except for a short period during the Great War, enlistment for all fighting services has been on a voluntary basis for many generations. The demand of the State that young citizens should train for killing when the whole weight of education, religion, and law, has been thrown in the scales to teach them respect for human life, has raised a storm of protest. Although the measure is urged in the name of democracy, ("if there is dirty work to do, all should share") there is a very strong body of opinion that regards concession to this claim of the State as a deplorable step towards Totalitarian policy. Even though there are very substantial safeguards for the conscientious objector who can make good his case before a tribunal it is a concession

to the basic claim of the State to subordinate the individual to the State, instead of building the State on the well-being and needs of the individual personalities.

And therein it touches the very foundations on which democracy rests. No man can take away that inner freedom. The State may mete out prison, or even death, but over that inner being it has no claims. The nation that is composed of citizens, secure in the knowledge of this inner law of liberty, self-disciplined enough to claim a freedom which is not licence, nor based upon the degradation of any fellow creature, is on the way to create the true democracy.

In the up-surge of democratic movements in our day there have been advances along these lines. What an utter defeat it would be if democracy, driven mad by threat of violence, surrendered this basis of the free spirit and took to itself the very weapons of violence and compulsion which it is its purpose to supplant!

It is easy to accept the manifestations of violence as final and triumphant in the chaos of to-day, and easy to overlook the forces which lie behind, forces less easy to assess. Yet in China, in Spain, in Czecho-Slovakia, when the guns and the Gestapo have done their utmost, there lives something which these cannot destroy, and it lives in the spirits of people who in themselves are free, and in whom lie the seed from which a new liberty will spring. In India a vast nation is finding freedom; a completely unarmed people is building a new democracy by the disciplined practice of non-violence, and the deliberate and successful use of spiritual as opposed to material force.

Let us defend our democratic liberties by all means, recognising that that defence lies not in the blind and brutal answer of bomb for bomb, but in the unconquerable freedom of the human spirit.

B. DUNCAN HARRIS.

POINTS FROM THE REPORT OF THE WORK AT HEADQUARTERS

It is encouraging to learn that while recent events have made it impossible for some of our international members—for the present—to continue in membership, new members have joined, so that our numbers have not varied much. But we need a great many more international members!

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE UNITED STATES SECTION, WASHINGTON, D.C. MAY 4, 5, 6

Women gathered from the length and breadth of the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific, met together in the one place that could bring them closest to each other and closest to the world membership of which they are a part. For Washington, a city existing only to be the capital of a great federation of states, emphasises as no other city can the broadly American character of the problems that confront us. And Washington, where in those days of the conference, the Prince and Princess of Denmark were received, and the President of Nicaragua was escorted past our hotel on his way to the White House, Washington, where the flags of all nations fly over the embassies, brings close the ties with the four corners of the earth, in all of which are members of the Women's International League.

In the three days of the Annual Meeting, the delegates had this atmosphere in which to consider the pressing problems which must be met in the spirit of peace and freedom. On the first day, it was Europe which came closest to us,—brought to our friendly luncheon tables in the Hotel Washington by the report of Clarence Pickett, of the American Friends' Service to Refugees. Taking for granted, as well he might, that the sympathy of his audience was with the effort to give every possible opportunity to those forced to turn their backs on opportunities now tragically closed to them, he gave the facts which make it of advantage and glory to America to receive these exiles. The intellectual and business inheritance, the possibility of assimilation, all favoured a welcome which should widen as far as practicable the doors of entry. Not only in this first meeting but throughout the conference the thought of these European exiles was with us,—when we heard the fine report of our International Chairman, Emily Greene Balch, when we heard the report of Margaret Jones, our chairman of refugees, when we listened with tears and wonder to the dramatic rendering by Cornelia Stabler at the closing dinner, of the story of the Austrian mother faced with loss of her home and husband and the blackest future for her children,—and when we passed in business sessions the following resolutions:—

1. The U.S. Section of the W.I.L.P.F. wishes to record its admiration of the work of the British Section in placing in England forty-two members of our Czecho-Slovakian Branch and sends to the British Section its warm appreciation of their accomplishments.

2. Whereas the Wagner Rogers Joint Resolution for aid to German Refugee Children offers hope for 20,000 children by allowing them to enter the United States outside the annual quota and whereas careful safeguards for the care of these 20,000 children are being worked out by child welfare committees in the country, be it resolved that the W.I.L.P.F. welcomes this humanitarian plan and urges the speedy passage of the bill.

* * * *

South America came close to us through the report of Eloise Brainard, just returned from a seven months' trip, where, through contact with men and women working for peace and through attendance at the Lima Conference she felt "the responsibility of maintaining peace in this hemisphere and for developing international relations founded on justice, friendship, and co-operation, so that

we may not become another Europe." Her specific suggestions were:—

First; become familiar with the inter-American Peace System and its applications. You will be surprised to see how many of its provisions are in line with the recommendations made by the immortal first Congress of the Women's International League in 1915. Promote the study of this peace system in clubs to which you belong, securing material from the Pan-American Union.

Second; ask our Government to use the Pan-American principle of co-operation in removing the most fruitful source of conflict,—unsettled boundaries.

A resolution on this subject was passed for submission to the President. Its last paragraph ran as follows:—"Be it resolved: That the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom respectfully urge the President of the United States of America to take such steps as he deems best for the purpose of initiating a movement among the nations of this hemisphere to hasten the settlement of all pending boundary questions so that by some date to be determined, such as the first of January, 1941, all inter-American frontiers may be definitely fixed, and this source of danger to the peace of the Americas forever removed."

A resolution was also passed to conform with action of women in Argentina, to send a cablegram urging on General Franco the cessation of these—(military and political)—executions and the granting of general amnesty to military and political prisoners.

* * * *

With this sense of community with other nations constantly re-enforced by our surroundings and our business, it was impossible for the conference to consider America's foreign policy in any spirit which could have been called "isolationist." That foreign policy was considered at several sessions. What America's part should be in the increasingly tense world situation was the focus of all our thinking. Two outstanding men addressed the conference in an evening session on this subject, Clark Eichelberger and Norman Thomas. Our own leaders holding to different courses put before us the paths to world settlement that appealed to their reason and their hope. Our members, who had been given an unusual opportunity to study this subject in detail and report their convictions in a nation-wide poll, had sent in their vote on America's neutrality policy. Out of these weeks of serious consideration culminating in intense and interesting sessions, the American Section evolved its statement of belief and expressed it in a resolution to the President, Secretary of State, Senate and House Committees on Foreign Affairs:

Whereas the W.I.L.P.F. is unalterably opposed to United States participation in and support of foreign war, declared or undeclared, for any purpose, and

Whereas we are determined to work for all legislation which tends to insure our non-participation,

Be it therefore resolved that the W.I.L.P.F. reaffirms its intention to support

1. The Mandatory type of Neutrality legislation with additional provisions to strengthen it in basic war materials.
2. The war referendum.
3. Legislation against conscription.
4. A peace-time embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions.
5. The Bone War Tax Bill.

Although in reaching this decision those prevailed who felt that the United States should refrain from force, direct or indirect, in the settlement of world conflict, it was not a victory for "isolation" in any sense. It was again and again reiterated that an America protecting peace and democracy would in the end serve the world best. And that her weight might be thrown into all co-operative effort to settle world conflict, it was further resolved, "that the W.I.L.P.F. urgently requests the President to take, without delay, the necessary steps to prepare a plan for the calling of a World Constitutional Convention which shall draw up a constitution for the all-inclusive, democratic, non-military Federation of Nations essential to the life of civilised man."

At the closing dinner the spirit which must animate all these actions in order to make them an instrument of our purpose was admirably expressed by all of our speakers. Most eloquent of all perhaps was the shy, quiet Quaker woman, who protested that the written rather than the spoken word was her medium, but whose word went straight out and found its place deep within our hearts. Nora Walsh, author of "The House of Exile" and "Reaching for the Stars," reminded us simply "that peace begins in your own hearts and homes. Only such a one who finds it there is fit to preach peace abroad."

ADELAIDE NICHOLS BAKER.

* * * *

Officers, United States Section for 1939-40:

Mrs. Hannah Clothier Hull, Honorary President.
Dr. Gertrude C. Bussey, President.
Mrs. Carlton L. Hommel, First Vice-President.
Mrs. Dorothy Medders Robinson, Second Vice-President.
Mrs. Caroline O'Day, Third Vice-President.
Miss Margaret Jones, Secretary.
Dr. Helen Taft Manning, Treasurer.
Mrs. Frederick J. Taussig, Treasurer of International Funds.

SOME POINTS OF AUSTRALIAN POLICY

The dominant principle of Australian foreign policy is to follow wherever Great Britain leads. This dates from the time, not yet far past, when Australia, politically, consisted of six small separate British colonies, and the habit of dependence continues, despite the great changes of the last forty years. I know of only two outstanding exceptions: one, the "White Australia" policy, and the other, the refusal by the Australian people of conscription during the Great War.

In the first of these, Great Britain was not concerned. It was from the outset wholly an Australian policy, and a singularly unanimous one. It has had the unbroken support of all political parties. It sprang from experience following the influx of Chinese to the Australian gold-fields, the arrival of a fair number of Hindus and Afghans about the same time, and the employment of Kanakas from the Pacific Islands on the Queensland sugar plantations. (Later, these last were all sent home again). European settlers, finding themselves for the first time in personal contact with races other than their own, saw certain problems looming ahead. They had determined to maintain a high standard of working and living conditions, which the admission of coloured labour threatened to destroy. The incidence of the American Civil War gave

them poignant warning of a danger to be avoided. Hence the White Australia policy. The question of its ethics is a complex one which cannot be dealt with in a short article, but from the point of view of international relations the policy has not produced any friction. The present fear of a possible Japanese invasion is not rooted in "incidents" arising out of the White Australia policy, such incidents being non-existent. At its inception, the Japanese were still living in complete national isolation, and their subsequent outward movement has not been accompanied by any pressure for entrance into Australia. In 1915, as one of the allied nations, they convoyed Australian troop-ships to Europe and asked no *quid pro quo*. But every country, seemingly, must have a "potential enemy," and the rapid militarisation of Japan has made it serviceable in that capacity to advocates of increased armaments and of conscription. Against this trend, tours to Japan have become popular, trade between the two countries has developed and brought with it increase of friendly interest; internationalists are turning from the disappointments of Geneva to the hopes of the Pan-Pacific movement; open-minded Australians, enlightened by personal meeting with cultured Orientals, are realising their previous mistake in assuming that all Asiatics were of the ignorant coolie class, and have begun to question whether the total exclusion policy, which they had accepted as an axiom of national life, is after all quite sound. Such a frame of mind had no welcome ready for the proposal that private persons should do what the League of Nations had refused to do, and take on themselves to restrain Japanese militarism by boycotting imports from Japan. Common thought ran somewhat on these lines: both the Chinese and the Japanese have respected our edict and have left us to ourselves, the least we can do in return is not to meddle with them; they are fairly evenly matched, the Japanese having military strength and organisation, the Chinese the strength of numbers and territory; each understands the other better than we can hope to understand either, their future *modus vivendi* is a thing that they themselves must establish; pin-prick partisanship from us can only irritate, and make a bad matter worse by prejudicing the chances of future co-operation and goodwill. Certain groups, however, have favoured the boycott, some from purely disinterested motives, some from race-hatred and political animosity. Pacifists like the W.I.L.P.F. found it impossible to align themselves with the movement, feeling that it contradicted the more liberal attitude which they had for years been striving for. Sympathy with Chinese suffering was shown by public contributions to relief funds, but the consensus of opinion on the boycott is shown by the fact that trade between Australia and Japan has flowed on with practically no disturbance.

This, of course, impinges on the whole question of "collective security" by force of economic sanctions. That policy has never had more than an academic following in this country. A recently published article on "The Australian Outlook," by Sir Henry Gullett, Minister for External Affairs, excellently expresses in these words the point of view of the Australian Labour Party:

"They look with mistrust upon overseas ventures which are only indirectly defensive. They are highly suspicious of the causes of war. They sincerely believe that where there is empire there is ambition, unscrupulous and

WATFORD
GREAT
PAID
21 JUN

imperialistic, with a strong disposition to the engineering of warfare. With equal sincerity they believe that dominating financial interests engaged in armament and munition making, in production or fabrication of base metals, and the manufacture of war-time supplies of equipment and foodstuffs, are ever callously seeking to promote international conflict on a grand scale. Those beliefs explain the hostility of Australian Labour to unreserved Imperial co-operation in foreign policy."

Those beliefs also explain the reluctance of a still wider public to be bound by pacts for common defence. From afar, we have looked on the peoples of Europe as the élite of mankind, but if they, the common inheritors of the world's best wisdom, culture, philosophy and religion, have reached an impasse whence there is no way out but war, what can a community like ours do but try to save itself from the terrible repercussions?

At the moment we await the effects of the adoption of conscription in Great Britain. An attempt will almost certainly be made to impose a similar measure here. It certainly will be seen whether the spirit of independence and freedom will again prevail to nullify this encroachment upon civil liberty in Australia, as it did in the historic conscription referendums of 1916 and 1917.

ELEANOR M. MOORE.

Hon. Secretary, Australian Section.

OUR NEW ZEALAND SECTION

Extracts from a Letter

First, in connection with the refusal of the waterside workers in New South Wales to load scrap iron for Japan, the dispute went on for about four months. The men refused on the ground that the scrap iron would be used in the manufacture of armaments, bombs, etc., which might in the near future be used against Australia or some friendly nation. The vessel was taken to Newcastle, N.S.W., but the waterside workers there also refused to load it, and it was brought back to Port Kembla, the original port. The dispute ended when the Government threatened to license the men, which of course meant that those who persisted in refusing would not receive a license and would therefore be barred from getting work on the wharves. The scrap iron was then placed on board and everything was ready for sailing when some members of the crew refused to work the ship on the same grounds. Two or three were prosecuted and imprisoned for short terms for refusing duty, others engaged in their place, and the vessel at last got away.

In this connection, too, you should know that New Zealand had also been shipping scrap iron to Japan. Shortly after the Labour Government took office, however, in 1935, when Japan became aggressive, our Premier, Mr. Savage, issued a decree that no scrap iron would be exported from New Zealand to any country whatever. This effectually put a stop at once to any grievance that might have arisen in Japanese minds. Of course, the iron is accumulating, but if our Government starts ironworks it can be used here.

Re a report on the political situation in N.Z. and the reaction of the Government and people to the critical problems in Europe, Asia and America, the Government here is in rather an awkward position. The Labour Party

here has always stood for peace and against every kind of Jingoism. As a matter of fact four men who are now Cabinet Ministers went to goal in 1916 and '17 for their opposition to conscription. When, therefore, Labour won the Parliamentary elections of 1935 and 1938 the members of all the Peace societies felt they had got a big step in advance. Nevertheless, as long as New Zealand is part of the British Empire she must keep in step with the Mother Country and the other Dominions; consequently, with all the world roaring out for Defence measures our Government last year felt obliged to spend a large sum of money on the Air Force. Mr. Savage also suggested that a Conference be held on the question of defence, armaments, etc., and something of the sort has now been decided upon—Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand to be represented, in order, I presume, to work out a common ground for action. In the meantime the Government has assured us that come what may there will be no conscription here. . . .

With respect to Peace Societies all the big international associations have branches here, and they are of all grades of pacifism from the absolute pacifists like the Society of Friends, the Peace Pledge Union and the No More War Union to some who think that aggressors should be met by a combination of the nations who stand for peace—collective security under the League of Nations or some such association. What is really needed here and in every other part of the world is for all these little societies to sink their differences (they are very slight after all), amalgamate and concentrate on arousing such a storm of public opinion against war that no Government will dare to stand against it by entering upon another slaughter of the people.

LETTERS FROM WELL-WISHERS

1. "I feel that the W.I.L. have upheld an absolutely right policy through all these difficult times. Now, more than ever, there is need for such an organisation.

I wish I could help you financially, as I cannot do so in any direct way. I can only try to uphold your ideas in my very limited Trade Union sphere.

I enclose a donation of £1 to your Funds as a small token of my gratitude that the W.I.L. still lives and works."

2. The following letter has come from an International Member in U.S.A.—one of those who, in May, 1915, came across the ocean with Jane Addams in the midst of war, to join European women in founding the Women's International Headquarters in Geneva:—

"It is a pleasure and a privilege to receive a letter as an International Member. I assure you that if the International Congress is held in the U.S., I will do my little "possible" towards its support.

"The Emergency Meeting did splendid work. I am much pleased with the cable to President Roosevelt.

"I entirely endorse the Emergency Meeting's statement of the present world situation. I agree with their proposals for collective consultation and planning, and consider the suggested bases for a world conference admirable. It is a full and clear continuation of the work begun at the Hague in 1915. (When I read your letter my mind rushed back to a phrase I got out of Wallenstein in my school-days: "Daran erkenn ich meine Pappenheimer!")"