

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: 1. 1869

THE POSITION OF THE JEWS

(Since this Report was presented the persecution of the Jews in Germany has been tragically intensified. As a prominent English Jew, writing in *The Times*, pointed out, however: "The difference between the treatment of the Jews during the last three or four days and their treatment during the last three or four years is quantitative. Qualitatively, these things have been going on continuously.")

From the Report presented to the Executive Committee, September, 1938

During recent months the position of the Jews in Europe has grown rapidly worse. The Hungarian "Youth Laws," which introduced a *Numerus clausus* in most callings had as a consequence the ending of the means of livelihood of thousands, and much increased desire for emigration.

In Roumania, the new law, revising the laws relating to citizenship, brought with it fearfully disturbing consequences for the Jews. Those in Roumania lost the right to earn their living, and those abroad were declared stateless, so that other means of livelihood and right of domicile were endangered. Enormous economic pressure was exercised on the Roumanian Jews so that they went through misery equal to that of those in Poland.

In Poland, the Jews' position is unvaryingly bad. The Polish Jews, since they cannot leave the country legally, try to do so illegally. The European countries will not admit them willingly. They fill the prisons, or are passed on from one country to another. The Polish Consular authorities refuse to the authorities of the countries in which they are imprisoned, the issue of Polish passports, with which, according to international custom, they could be deported to their land of origin, so they linger for months in temporary quarters, because no one can give them identity papers.

The centre of Jewish persecutions remains Germany, but even the suffering of Jews in Germany cannot be compared with the persecution in Austria. The method of spreading an "anxiety psychosis" amongst opponents, as it is practised with such success by Germany towards all democratic lands, can be used unhindered, against the unprotected minority of Jews.

Everything that the Press of the world has reported about the Jews, who are not sure of their freedom and life, either in their houses or in the streets, or in any public place, gives only a feeble picture of what is actually happening. There is hardly a Jewish family that has not some member either in a concentration camp, or who has committed suicide.

It happens not seldom, that the relatives of a "prisoner" receive the laconic news that his remains are to be fetched from a certain spot. It is significant of the general attitude that an illustration can appear in the "Sturmer," in which are depicted coffins of Jewish suicides with the inscription: "Recommended for imitation."

Since the State has adopted a programme for the annihilation of the Jews, and goes forward relentlessly with the confiscation of Jewish possessions, the desire seems to grow among the general population to share the booty with the State, showing a greed that is unprecedented.

It is clear, that for the Jews, gold has lost its value, when it is a question of saving their lives, or those of their families and friends. A trade therefore goes on for large sums, even with Gestapo-functionaries, high Nazi officials and others, in such "angels of safety" as true and false passports, true and false travel permits, and also in illegal "safe-conducts" over frontiers. The "Lufthansa" sells aeroplane seats to the Jews knowing they will be arrested on arrival at their destination—Zurich, Paris, Prague, London. Sometimes it happens that the Company sells the tickets, and then declares itself unable to take the passengers, and refuses to take back the unused tickets.

There is, in truth, nowhere a right of asylum for the Jews. One may compare the history of the other post-war immigrants with theirs. In the great movements of emigration of Greeks, Turks, Bulgars—the emigrants went to their homelands. Others, such as the Russians, found asylum which replaced their homes. Humanitarian Societies of all kinds were ready to lessen their sufferings. For the Jews till now there has been only one positive aid, i.e., their own solidarity and mutual helpfulness.

Palestine remains for them the Land of Promise. It has been drawn into domestic strife because of the play of international interests.

Everywhere the Jews are treated as unwanted. Except for America, which, sure of its public opinion, raised its quota, no land up to now has given permission for any immigration, unless it was clearly dictated by egoism. Only men with capital, or men who through their knowledge and calling would bring some advantage to the land to which they migrated, have been admitted. The European countries are hermetically sealed to Jewish immigration. Right of asylum is given to political emigrants, but Jewish emigration is regarded as non-political. The world conscience, which must bear so much to-day, is deadened.

There is only one faint hope, for the solution of the Jewish question: the courageous voice of truth, which takes the initiative in defending the spiritual against the secular; right against wrong; freedom against slavery; democracy against dictatorships; and is ready to take up the fight against the whole range of nefarious propaganda.

To the Jews themselves the task remains, to manifest the strength which this inhuman age demands of them, in order not to be wrecked spiritually and morally.

THE EUROPEAN SCENE—WHAT NEXT?

The course of events in Central Europe has diverted attention from what is happening in Spain. But the close connection between the two must not be forgotten. The question presses: What is to be the sequel to the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia? In what direction will the ambitions of the Nazi and Fascist powers now be turned? This is a question of vital concern to the democratic countries, whose number in Europe is rapidly diminishing. There are some indications that the next move may be made in the direction of Spain. Hitler has received a measure of appeasement by his success in annexing without a blow a large part of what was previously Czechoslovakia. It may be that he may take a little time to consolidate his gains here and that his demand for colonies may be postponed for a few months.

The Question of Spain

It would seem, therefore, that in carrying out the policy of appeasing dictators the next to receive satisfaction must be Mussolini, and this brings us to the Anglo-Italian Agreement and "settlement" in Spain. Mussolini has over and over again declared that his aim in Spain is the victory of Franco, and since his prestige has been considerably dimmed by the German successes in Austria and in Eastern Europe, he can scarcely afford to allow his laurels to be withered in Spain. With the Anglo-Italian Agreement goes the recognition by Great Britain of his conquest of Abyssinia—recognition which brings with it both moral and material gains.

The Anglo-Italian Agreement, which was the cause of Mr. Eden's resignation last February, for some months remained unratified because its terms were not fulfilled by Italy. The principal condition of the ratification of the Anglo-Italian Agreement was that there should be a "settlement in Spain." At the time, Mr. Chamberlain was pressed more than once in the House of Commons, to say what he meant by a settlement, but he was always careful to avoid a definition and therefore kept his hands free to accept as a settlement what he deemed to be opportune at a given moment.

Government Spain Disbands the Volunteers

Let us remind ourselves of the present situation as to intervention or non-intervention in Spain. Last September, the Spanish Government announced that they were intending to dispense with all foreign volunteers, and in order that the departure of the whole number might be certified by an international body, they asked the League of Nations to send an International Commission to supervise the evacuation. This International Commission was appointed, its members went to Spain, and the disbandment of the volunteers, said to number 10,000, has taken place.

The next question that arises is the position of the foreign troops, Germans and Italians, on the side of Franco. It would be impossible to regard any "settlement" in Spain as having been reached while intervention in that country on a large scale is being carried on by Germany and Italy. Now that all the foreign volunteers on the Government side are being sent away, there would seem an overwhelming case for the sending away of all the foreign troops on the other side. The British plan for the withdrawal of volunteers which was accepted by the Non-Intervention Committee provided, to begin with, for the withdrawal not of an equal, but of a *proportionate*, number from each side. The case, therefore, has not been met by the withdrawal of 10,000 Italian troops from Franco's side, since this represents only a fraction of the total, whereas all the foreign volunteers have been withdrawn from Government Spain.

A Plan for Starving Government Spain

Mussolini, having withdrawn 10,000 men who have been in Spain for eighteen months, claimed this represented a settlement in Spain sufficient to bring the Anglo-Italian Agreement into operation. Sufficient, he may urge, to justify the granting to Franco of belligerent rights, which was to be one of the results of the carrying out of the British plan. Franco and his allies, Germany and Italy, attach great importance to his obtaining belligerent rights mainly because it would give him the right to declare a blockade and thus prevent food ships from reaching Government Spain; in other words, having failed to defeat Government forces in battle, he would endeavour to starve the country into submission by preventing goods from reaching it by sea. Presumably we shall see a renewed submarine campaign, which can be carried on under the guise of a lawful operation of blockade, which is the right of a belligerent.

The Importance of Spain to Great Britain

Are these matters of concern to Great Britain? Does it matter to us what the fate of Spain is to be? Is it not rather of the first importance to have come to terms with Italy? These are the questions which have been raised in connection with the ratification of the Anglo-Italian Agreement and with the granting of belligerent rights to Franco. For many reasons a friendly Spain has always been a matter of considerable interest to Great Britain: Spain commands the eastern shore of the Mediterranean; the defence of France which we have frequently declared to be essential to our own security would be made very much more difficult if France had a potential enemy on her southern frontier, and if the value of the British Navy in the Mediterranean were impaired by the use of Spain for

hostile naval and aerial bases. The surrender of Czechoslovakia, the main bulwark against German aggression in the East has not lessened the importance of a friendly Spain for Britain and France; on the contrary, Spain is even more obviously the key to French and British security and to European peace. It is thus of the utmost importance that British policy should be directed to insistence upon real non-intervention in Spain; this should mean that all foreign troops are removed from both sides, and that Franco should not be given the opportunity of starving out Government Spain with the assistance of his allies. The first interest of Great Britain is a peaceful and a friendly Spain; the best hope of peace is that the two parties should be able to come to an agreement without the aid of powerful allies from outside who have interests of their own to serve.

A BRITISH CONTRIBUTOR.

SWEDEN'S NEUTRALITY POLICY AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

(This article is of interest as throwing light on the attitude of all the smaller Powers.—ED.)

"Why does Sweden want to leave the League?" is a question you often meet abroad.

Last February, on behalf of the Swedish Government, Mr. Unden made a declaration at Geneva with regard to sanctions. At the end of the debate in the Committee of 28, he made the statement that "The Swedish Government will consider themselves entitled to adopt a line of conduct in conformity with the declarations made by the Swedish delegation in the Committee." The point at issue was whether any useful purpose could be served by upholding a formal obligation of sanctions when actual facts had proved the present impossibility of their universal and compulsory application. It was better and safer to recognise the situation as it was, thereby preventing a fallacious belief in the capacity of the League to act as a coercive body at present.

The Foreign Ministers of the northern countries, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland, met in Copenhagen, July 23rd—24th this year. The other so-called Oslo States—Holland, Belgium and Luxemburg—took part. This Conference was nothing new. Conferences and discussions between representatives of the small northern countries have frequently taken place in Geneva during the sittings of the Assembly of the League of Nations. In the communiqué issued you find the following statements: "The Ministers are strongly impressed by the dangers created by the present armaments race, and are unanimous in wishing to utilise every opportunity which may present itself to resume the efforts to arrive at an international agreement for the purpose of terminating the armaments race. They have, in especial, resolved to support any initiative to bring about an agreement on the subject of the problems connected with bombardments from the air. In the conviction that their states should continue to participate in the work of the League of Nations, they note that their Governments are resolved to continue the line of action which they have defined in declaring that they regard the sanctions system, under the present conditions and according to the practice followed during the last years, as not having any obligatory character. They are, furthermore, of opinion that this non-obligatory character does not apply to a particular group of States, but to all members of the League."

At the League Assembly in September, Mr. Sandler, Foreign Minister of Sweden, insisted upon a declaration from the League of Nations about the non-obligatory character of Article 16. He did not advocate any reform of the pact, but a *temporary* stating of the "actual practice, which cannot be denied."

In insisting upon this, however, he indicated that, in certain situations, Sweden may continue to use sanctions. Sweden does not want to put herself in the same favourable position as Switzerland. In an interview, Mr. Sandler in reply, regretted that the collective security system did not function at this moment, when there is a threat of war, or, at least, of another "dictated peace," "a new Versailles on the ruins of Versailles."

How can it be that a government of a country up till now faithful to the League principles, considers it a duty to the majority of her people to insist upon a declaration about the non-binding character of sanctions? Although rebellious against this attitude and, consequently, far from defending it, I think the time has come to try to make it understood. The small nations have always tried to *force* the Great Powers to apply sanctions according to the statutes of the League of Nations. Up to now Sweden has kept her obligations to the League in fullest confidence in this new instrument for peace. Mr. Sandler himself has always been against bilateral alliances, saying that they only weaken the League pact which is the only pact necessary. The small and weak democratic states are disgusted with the Great Powers using the League of Nations as an instrument for their own, egoistic, imperialistic policy.

Therefore Sweden's policy has come to be: Peace for the northern countries in alliance with nobody, and against none.

If the fate of Spain has been able to shake only the Swedish workers, the shameful betrayal of Czechoslovakia has shaken our whole nation to the depths of her soul, used as we are to peace, freedom and independence.

"No more war" now means to us as to the other small countries: "No war as long as there is a small State to sacrifice." And the northern countries understand that none of them will be worth an aero-ticket to Berlin.

GRETA ENGQVIST.

THE WORLD'S RAW MATERIALS

At a Conference on "The World's Natural Resources and Standards of Living", arranged by "The International Industrial Relations Institute," from August 30th to September 1st, inclusive, 1937, at The Hague, an interesting paper was given on "The Raw Materials of the World and their Distribution" by Herman Kranold, Associate Professor of Economics, Talladega College, Talladega, Alabama, U.S.A. The material was based on a then forthcoming book by Professor Kranold on "The International Distribution of Raw Materials" (Messrs. George Routledge & Sons Ltd., London). We reprint a summary of his paper, as we think it will stimulate many to a study of a book of special interest in connection with the problem of colonies.

"Many nations have long claimed to suffer from a cruel lack of raw materials necessary to their security and a decent standard of living; they particularly assert their

need of territorial rearrangements, among which, acquisition of colonial possessions holds first place. This is a strange experience at a time when a large part of those raw materials which might be produced with the world's present facilities cannot be sold at a price covering their cost, and when the steady, though slow and hesitating retirement of the existing empires from colonial domination is an ascertained fact. This double paradox certainly requires some clearing up, and part of such an inquiry is undertaken in this paper.

"The endeavour is to find out if it is possible, with real meaning, to measure the strength of the more important countries with a series of comprehensive figures, one figure only for each country. The following system of marks (in the Schoolmaster's sense) has been used in this paper :

- (1) For each raw material treated in the survey, 10 marks were distributed among the 80 countries of the world, in proportion to the size of their production.
- (2) Those marks which fell to any one of the fifteen countries selected for analysis were credited to it.
- (3) Colonies were included with their wealth in the wealth of the mother country.
- (4) Countries were selected in accordance with size. Raw materials were chosen for their basic usefulness, both in peace and war; and for their importance either in total or for particular nations in international exchange. They were weighted in accordance with the proportion they constitute in total world exports of all commodities.
- (5) Each nation's need for raw materials was considered to be in proportion to its population, including its colonial areas.
- (6) The final figure for determining the strength of each country with respect to raw materials is the ratio of its share in 'weighted marks' for wealth in these materials, to its rank in population in comparison with the other countries considered.

The following conclusions were reached :

"(1) The real composition of the group of the 'have-not' nations is quite different from the oft-repeated statement of to-day : Germany is not a member of this group, nor is Italy, but France is.

"(2) Colonies in the world to-day are not sources but rather leaks in regard to wealth in raw materials.

"Thus, whatever we believe concerning our chances for buying the peace of the world by bribing the territorial ambitions of some countries by reshuffling the distribution of colonies, we certainly cannot expect to see the material situation of these countries substantially improved by colonial redistribution, unless we make the thoroughgoing assumption that parts of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa or India may be used for such trading in land and its inhabitant chattels.

"The popular argument of over-population also assumes a different appearance in the light of these figures. India is certainly already over-populated. As to the others : Two countries, Germany and Italy, try to increase their population by all possible governmental means and two, Japan and Russia, show rapid increase even without such governmental endeavours. In the

cases of Japan and Italy, colonial conquest extending over more than forty years has done nothing to mitigate the evil. Can we assume that their future experience will be different, and fundamentally different at that?

"Thus one inference may safely be drawn from these figures : They explode the myth of the division of the great nations into a majority of 'haves' and a minority, consisting of Germany, Italy and Japan, of 'have-nots'. The truth is quite different from that extremely popular slogan. We find that, beginning with the richest, the great nations fall into the following four groups :

"(1) We may call the United States, the Union of South Africa, Australia, and Canada the *plutocrats* among the nations. Three of these have colonies, though not important ones, and none of their colonies contribute in any remarkable way to the wealth of the mother country; rather, they dilute it statistically and in fact. If, then, wealth in raw materials be power, the colonies of these three are leakages, not sources of power.

"(2) The second-best group comprises Italy, Germany, Great Britain and Russia, as the *upper middle class* in the society of nations, among them two of the so-called 'have-nots', namely Germany and Italy. Russia is rising fast; but Great Britain would gradually approach the median position of Italy should Britain's retreat from Empire continue as it has already been going on for more than half a century. Even Italy, with her large population, and with her poverty in minerals, is not so badly off after all, though her colonies do not contribute an atom toward her position with regard to raw materials, but are so far a distinct source of weakness. How far the conquest of Ethiopia will change that situation is, of course, an open question, though what we know does not justify any sanguine hope. Russia has developed during the last ten years by such leaps and bounds that, despite her probably rapidly growing population, it is quite possible that she may turn her back, within the next ten years, on so mediocre a class as the second-best group and rise to the rank of the wealthy aristocracy among the great powers.

"(3) The third group I should like to call the *lower middle class* among the nations. It comprises, if we follow the results of our inquiry, Holland, despite her great and rich and well-developed colonies, Brazil, Japan, and, worse off than the Eastern Insular Empire, France. In the latter case the colonies contribute 61 per cent. to the population denominator, but very little to the raw materials.

"(4) The poorest group, the *proletarians* among the nations, consists of Poland, India and China.

"If the British Empire were treated as a unit in these figures, what would be the result in its rank in possession of raw materials as wealth for its population? Adding the weighted crude marks in wealth and the populations for Australia, Canada, India, and South Africa to those of the mother country (disregarding the small dominions), we get a total population of 511 millions, or 29 per cent. of all the populations considered here and 29 per cent. of the weighted crude marks. This gives us a quotient of 1. In other words, if we include these four dominions, Great Britain comes down to the rank of Italy.