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We have a tendency to believe that, owing to technological, political and cultural developments in recent years, we are the first generation to experience crime as a global problem. But crime as an international issue has a significant provenance and we can better understand our current situation by appreciating its historical context. By looking back to how the age of international crime began, and proceeded, is it possible to gain a deeper understanding not only of the problems that confront us now, but also of the international institutions set up in response.

Crime first emerged as an international issue in the final decades of the nineteenth century when white slave trading, professional criminality, anarchist outrages and alien criminality came to the attention of police, politicians, and journalists.¹ Between 1881 and 1914, the appearance of ‘world shrinking’ technologies, including steamships, undersea cables and telegraphs, combined with the activities of empires and the rise of multi-national corporations, to promote awareness of crime as an international concern. Governments across Europe sent representatives to conferences for suppression of the white slave trade, defence against anarchism and police cooperation. The British government enacted national legislation to combat white slave trafficking and alien criminality, and governments across Europe passed laws to pre-empt anarchist conspiracies. The decades before the Great War were also a period for international voluntary organisations such as the Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade, International Bureau for Suppression of Traffic in Women and the Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls and Women. These organisations pressed governments for action. When the war ended, they could boast considerable success, having placed their concerns on the international public agenda adopted by the League of Nations.
International Crime in the 20th Century: The League of Nations Era, 1919–1939 examines the role of the League of Nations in identifying crime as an issue meriting coordinated action by the nations of the world. I offer an explanation of how transnational crime became a familiar part of public understanding and of the lore of internationalism that accompanied it. In recent years, several historians have pointed to the importance of the League’s response to crime, particularly, trafficking in women. Stephanie Limoncelli has examined the politics between social purity campaigners and feminist workers within League policies, and includes a look at national efforts within France, Italy and the Netherlands. There is also some work about the League’s role in drug trafficking, although not as much as might be expected. In a 2001 essay, Virginia Berridge referred to international aspects of drug policies as ‘the forgotten dimension’. At the same time, this study does not concentrate solely on the League of Nations but examines the interwar outlook concerning globalisation of crime. Political leaders and social critics in the 1920s and 1930s noticed goings-on across borders and surmised that these generated crime problems in numerous countries at the same time. Contemplating the aftershock of the first world war established a paradigm for understanding why global events were important for national and local publics. In a sense, this book concerns one set of global anxieties and the way in which the public intellectuals of a generation brought these anxieties into everyday life.

Mathieu Deflem, who develops an explanation of international police cooperation, makes an important point when he refers to the ‘myth of international crime’. He characterises international crime as a ‘professional myth’ promoted during the 1920s by police in Europe and North America to justify centralisation of authority. Thinking of international crime as an illusion affords a useful means of interpretation, enabling us to grasp how the threat of international crime was much broader than an invention of the police. Concerns about global crime problems figured into a wider gloominess about the direction of civilisation. Leading historians invoke the metaphor of night and darkness to describe this era. Richard Overy writes of ‘the twilight years’, Piers Brandon of ‘the dark valley’, Martin Pugh how ‘we danced all night’ and Zara Steiner of ‘the light that failed’. Overy locates the source of these dark clouds to the ascendant scientific outlook. ‘Science’, he writes, ‘despite its assumed role as the voice of material reason, played a key part, though not usually deliberately, in creating the morbid culture that inhabited the Western world view in the 1920s and 1930s’. Overy emphasises the contribution of the human sciences to this outlook.
with analyses of economics, race, and psychoanalysis which introduced a vocabulary of disease, physical decline and mental instability.\textsuperscript{6}

The Hungarian chemist and social philosopher Michael Polanyi, who survived the world wars by emigrating to Germany before emigrating to England, thought a great deal about the meaning of science in society. While in Berlin, he had worked at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Physical Chemistry, directed by Fritz Haber (and would have known about Haber’s role in developing the poison gas first used in warfare at Ypres in 1915). Polanyi regarded scientific knowledge as the source of illusion in the modern world. ‘In the days when an idea could be silenced by showing that it was contrary to religion, theology, was the greatest single source of fallacies. Today, when any human thought can be discredited by branding it unscientific, the power exercised previously by theology has passed over to science; hence, science has become in its turn the greatest single source of error’.\textsuperscript{7} Polanyi believed that science produced myths as a by-product of converting moral principles into scientific claims. Through a process he called ‘moral inversion’, science intensified the moral demands made on society, even while imposing a conceptual framework that denied reality to them. Without the possibility of pursuing moral ideals as such, people translated them into a scientific vocabulary, and brought their passion to political agendas said to be informed by science.\textsuperscript{8} This process can be seen, in its more virulent form, in the myth of Jewish criminality. The idea of ‘international Jewry’ as the leaders of international crime figured into the ‘scientific’ ideal of world domination by Aryans and the need for industrial destruction of Jews as their enemy race.\textsuperscript{9}

Scientific understanding served as the point reference for the leaders of government agencies, voluntary organisations and international institutions. Interwar intellectuals worried about the effect on crime of immigration and economic crises, about the side effects of technologies, such as aeroplanes, which enabled novel means of victimisation. They worried about cinema and the effect of this new amusement on the moral development of young people. Social science became a means for response. The language of psychoanalysis became a way of understanding violent outbursts by soldiers and terrorists, economics the means of analysing markets in drugs and women. Criminologists, who claimed special scientific expertise in explaining criminal behaviour, weighed-in on the widest range of issues, from crime waves and gangsters, to anarchists and political crime.\textsuperscript{10} In 1927, the League of Nations published a worldwide study of the white slave trade, drawing on
research techniques developed in the American public health movement, the first effort to bring a social-scientific analysis to a global crime problem.

*International Crime in the 20th Century: The League of Nations Era, 1919–1939* concerns Great Britain, the United States, Germany and France. My discussion includes the role of the United States and France in international affairs, the rise of Nazism in Germany, but concentrates primarily on Britain. I examine British perceptions of international crime and the contribution of the authorities and social critics to international responses. This provides a narrative structure for a subject matter that can easily escape definition. At the same time, the focus on Britain offers two analytical advantages. First, Britain claimed the centre of world affairs. At the end of the Great War, the United States presented the world’s leading industrial power and New York superseded London as the world’s financial centre. Yet Britain still surpassed the United States in population and natural resources. Britain commanded the world’s largest empire, and with the advent of wireless and aircraft, its colonies moved closer than ever before. Britain took control of oil reserves in Iraq and Persia, and with the acquisition of Germany’s colonies in Africa, gained possession of a vast tract of real estate stretching from Cairo to the Cape. Britain led the League of Nations. President Woodrow Wilson secured the Covenant, but alienated the US Congress, and America dropped out of its leadership role just when League administration began. The British Empire was shaky, but it gave legitimacy to ‘Britain’s claim to be not merely a leading power, but the leading power of the day’.¹¹

Second, building the narrative around Britain enables a focus on global vis-à-vis local. As a matter of perspective, this strategy enables us to transverse the issue of crime from the international forum of Geneva to the national debate in London; from debates in British cities like Glasgow and Sheffield about the influence of American gangsters, to the politics of the white slave trade in Malta, a small colony within the British Empire. The international outlook of interest here can be seen not only in relations between nation states, but in how local authorities perceived planetary causes for immediate problems. In Britain, we can observe Americanisation, as a distinct form of globalisation, underway. Ian Loader and Richard Sparks point out that an historical sociology of crime policy requires a commitment ‘to taking seriously the “local” political and cultural struggles out of which “global” change is fashioned’.¹²

Although other countries—China, for example—figure into the discussion at particular points, this study neglects large portions of the
world map. It is not that these areas are unimportant or irrelevant to international affairs. Including them would have made for a more comprehensive survey, but I do not aim here for an encyclopaedic review in either a geographical or criminological sense. Rather, I focus on global events and international affairs concerning crime looking out from one nation with a pivotal role. My discussion aims for depth rather than breadth, by relying on documents and publications originating in the interwar period. It is important to get at what people in a position to know at the time, thought was happening, or would happen. Read as a study of international dimensions of crime in Britain, it contributes to work by Chris Williams, John Carter Wood, Janet Clark, Heather Shore, Stefan Slater, Georgina Sinclair and Andrew Davies who explore crime in British cities and aspects of British criminal justice in relation to national concerns between the wars. Wood and Davies bring key insights into aspects of Americanisation; Sinclair and Williams have demonstrated the importance of understanding the role of the British Empire in links to domestic policing. Other important studies of interwar crime deal with Weimar Germany and interwar France, including those of Richard Wetzell, Sace Elder, Julia Roos and Clifford Rosenberg; as well as the United States, including work by David Ruth, Claire Bond Potter and Mara Keire.

Chapter 1 concerns worldwide crime waves. During the First World War, police and prison officials, lawyers, criminologists and other academics predicted a surge in crime in the wake of demobilisation. Large numbers of young men, returning from the brutal environment of the trenches, were feared to lead a rise in violent crime. There was also concern about foreigners and a wave of alien criminality. Both Britain and the United States imposed restrictions on immigration due in large part to fears of subversive and criminal elements among immigrants. Then, in the late 1920s, new concerns appeared about a crime wave thought to be sweeping the world. This time it had to do with the army of unemployed and the dramatic increase in violence and disorder thought to result from mass redundancies. Despite the absence of evidence, from crime statistics, the logic for these correlations proved irresistible. So irresistible it continued for years after the original source of concern had subsided.

Chapter 2 explores ‘the international underworld’. In Britain, there were fears that imports from the United States not only included Ford cars, Selfridge’s department store, cocktails, jazz and super-cinemas, but also criminal activity. Gangsters appeared on cinema screens and editorialists in Glasgow and Sheffield worried about whether their cities
might have become a British Chicago. Americanisation of crime was, however, only one aspect of concern about organised criminality. Police officials, leaders of international charities, and criminologists warned of a new generation of criminals who turned emerging political, economic and social structures to their advantage. They used technology for deceitful financial transactions, to escape across national borders, and to maintain a wide-scale trade in illegal merchandise. There were, in addition, those who imagined Jewish managers at the centre of international crime. When Agatha Christie and Graham Greene created international criminals for characters in their crime stories, they made them members of the Jewish race.

Chapter 3 concerns the formation of the International Criminal Police Commission and the anti-crime ideologies of those who championed the League of Nations. The Commission began in 1923 with an international conference in Vienna and gained in membership and influence over the years. Britain, France and eventually, the United States, all joined before the Second World War. The founders pursued a partnership with the League of Nations, but neither organisation seemed able to turn their mutual admiration for each other into a shared programme. Originally, the League of Nations took on activities related to traffic in women and drugs as a trivial part of its mission. But over the years, these activities grew to become, in the minds of sincere Leaguers, the institution’s most worthwhile functions. The League could not manage to get a grip on conflict resolution and so advocates grabbed onto crime-fighting as its primary rationale. Belief in the League and its role in crime prevention engendered a logic that held, as its essential starting point the inter-connectedness of crime problems across urban and national contexts. Before the outbreak of war in 1939, the International Criminal Police Commission, as well as other organisations devoted to international criminal justice, fell to control by Nazi leaders.

The final three chapters deal with the crime problems of most concern to the League of Nations. Chapter 4 discusses the traffic in women. In the years after the Armistice, the voluntary organisations concerned with the white slave trade realised there was no trade. Travel restrictions and surveillance of residents put into place during the war had effectively ended the problem. However, the provision for monitoring earlier treaties had been built into the covenant of the League of Nations, and officials put the solution into place. In 1921, the Assembly created the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Women. Dominated by a British-American alliance, the Advisory Committee believed in a worldwide white slave trade enabled by systems of legalised brothels, and they sought to disrupt
the supply of female bodies from Europe to South America. The traffic in women reveals a larger politics of the interwar period. The Advisory Committee continued to express concern about the role of music halls as a front for white slave rackets although a closer look at one of the centres for this, the British colony of Malta, reveals no evidence of such activity. In the 1930s, the National Socialists in Germany campaigned against prostitution and targeted Jews as leading traffickers.

Chapter 5 deals with the drug trade, which occupied the League’s attention from its birth in Paris. Britain had been interested in the international control of drugs from before the Great War and welcomed intervention by the League, including the establishment of the Advisory Committee on Opium and other Dangerous Drugs. But reaching an agreement meant securing the cooperation of the Americans who insisted on nothing less than prohibition. For the British, who had financed colonial settlement on production of opium, this was not possible. Both worried about drug traffickers and pointed to China as the world chief supplier. Britain’s leading drug diplomat at Geneva, Sir Malcolm Delevingne, went so far as to suggest that short of immediate intervention, Chinese traffickers would be able to reverse nineteenth-century roles: this time around, the Chinese would make drug addicts of the British population. The Chinese, like the Americans, demurred from international cooperation, although Britain was able to establish from the 1930s a worldwide quota system based on a Central Opium Board. On the eve the Second World War, the most committed anti-drug voices within the League seemed willing to go to war with Japan over its role in spreading drugs in Manchuria.

Chapter 6 concerns reviews attempts on the part of intellectuals in the period to formulate a universal definition of terrorism. Specifically, the discussion explores the response to four instances of assassination. In Germany, the assassination of Walter Rathenau revealed political murder as a tool to undermine the Weimar democracy. In Britain, the murder of Sir Henry Wilson focused attention on Britain’s colonial relationships and treatment of political criminals. In the United States, the Wall Street bomb blast took place amidst suspicions of foreign immigrants, Bolshevik influence and trans-Atlantic anarchist networks. In France, the murders at Marseilles led to League of Nations intervention. To stave off a calamity from the assassination of the King of Yugoslavia and French foreign minister by Croat separatists, representatives worked in Geneva to formulate a convention for the suppression of terrorism. The proceedings managed to agree the meaning of ‘an act of terrorism’, but did not lead to a ratified convention before the outbreak of the Second World War.
International Crime in the 20th Century: The League of Nations Era, 1919–1939, follows on from an early study, The Invention of International Crime: A Global Issue in the Making, 1881–1914. The present volume contains some reference to this early period so that it can be read on its own. But there are a number of parallels to be gleaned from reading the two books together. These include the role of international charities in setting the international public agenda, perceptions of foreign criminality in national politics, anxieties about technological advances, the politics of empire, and the influence of criminal sciences in crime policy. The British Empire produced conceptions of a ‘global criminal class’ in the late nineteenth century, not unlike images of the ‘international underworld’ in the twentieth. Worries about crime as a signpost for the decline of civilisation ushered in the centrality of ‘trafficking’ in armaments, drugs and women as problems requiring multi-national response. Drug trafficking revived the nineteenth-century nightmare of ‘reverse colonisation’, while the interwar anti-human trafficking movement portrayed the music hall as a place of sexual danger with as much drama as those who campaigned before the war for protection of English girls from white slave traders lurking at railway termini and ports. Nazi conceptions of ‘international Jewry’ as a rationale for war and genocide in the twentieth century followed conceptions of ‘Jewish criminality’ linked to the emergence of crime as an international issue in the late nineteenth century. Overall, the period of 1881–1914 can be understood as the era of ‘emergence’ and 1919–1939 as that of ‘institutionalisation’ of crime as an international issue.
1

Worldwide Crime Wave

When experts of the 1920s and 1930s talked about crime, they used the vocabulary of crime waves. A ‘crime wave’ could refer to a surge of criminality in general, to the appearance of a novel method of breaking the law, or to the rise of a new population of criminals in society. Sometimes, reference was made to a source of statistics, but more often than not, crime wave theory had to do with expectation rather than description. Wave theorists talked most about how a series of recent criminal events signalled a trend likely to continue into the future. A wave of crime could threaten a city, nation, or as a number of police, prison authorities, journalists and academics feared, the entire planet. ‘The crime wave now afflicting the whole world’ American writer Joseph Gollomb declared, following his tour of European capitals in 1921, ‘is a logical aftermath of the war. Economic distress—poverty, insufficient food, clothing and fuel—the loosening of men’s animal passions, coupled with the general disorganization of social structure, are producing their inevitable effect’.¹

Theorising about worldwide crime waves began during the war years. As it became apparent the war would not end quickly, social observers felt compelled to assess its impact on domestic society. The idea that wartime conditions encouraged illegal activity led to the prediction that the cessation of shelling and the return of so many young men would bring about a shocking level of crime.² In the 1920s, fear of former soldiers gave way to mistrust of foreigners and threat of alien criminals seeping across national borders.³ Britain retained wartime restrictions on foreign entry, as did the United States, which effectively closed its borders. France experienced massive foreign immigration, and as a result, surpassed the United States as the largest immigrant receiving nation. Public debates in Britain and France took place
around issues of social desirability, with particular regard to criminal behaviour, and led to an extension of controls introduced during the war years.

And then there was the economic crisis of early 1930s and explanations of how rising numbers of unemployed would turn to crime to satisfy unmet needs. In Britain, the Home Office pointed to a statistical correlation between unemployment figures and crime rates. Newspaper headlines foretold of restless crowds on the verge of theft, destruction and riot. Public officials warned of an army of desperate men, likely to steal and liable to resort to violence. Just as talk of one crime wave ended, another global event renewed concern, and led to fresh speculation about the start of another. In the build-up to each new surge, few bothered to find out whether fears of earlier waves had really materialised.

Aftershock of war

The Great War delivered brutality and destruction to nearly every continent on earth, and for the generation that lived through it, it was easy to imagine every change to occur in society as a legacy of the conflict. In Germany, militarists used the word Weltkrieg (world war) to refer to their desire to take the war beyond Europe as they found the means to do so. Engagements took place from the Black Sea to the Falkland islands, from Tsingtao on China’s Shantung peninsula to the Gallipoli peninsula. When the mortars stopped, four great empires had disappeared—that of Austria-Hungary, Germany, Russia, and the Ottoman Turks. Millions had been killed or maimed; countless others displaced. The global means of transportation, communication and trade had been seriously disrupted. Shortages of coal, food and building materials compounded the difficulties of daily life. Many of the world’s financial and commercial structures had vanished. Fortunes accumulated from agriculture and land ownership gave way to new financial empires built on electric circuits and the internal-combustion engine. Where old elites remained, they had to contend with new ideas and movements. Workers and women sought a permanent place in economic and civic life; political and social grievances created revolutionary projects in many parts of Europe.

Speculation about the effect of the war on domestic crime had started shortly after the outbreak of hostilities. The magistrate at Westminster Police Court, Cecil Chapman, advised the public to prepare for an increase of delinquency, not only in Britain, but all belligerent nations.
He could think of a dozen reasons for crime to increase: absence of fathers; absence of elder brothers; mothers working away from home; abbreviated school terms worsened by school closings; scarcity of masters, scout leaders and other men devoted to the work of clubs; rise in wages by every member of the family more than 14 years of age; artificial darkness of the streets; decrease in police protection; and a surfeit of temptations, such as the sight of vans laden with parcels. Chapman worried about a general lowering of moral standards among the civilian population. Based on his enquiries, he reported that a general rise in pilfering had started in 1916. Managers at railway companies, wharves, retail shops and stores calculated increases of 100, 200 and even 300 per cent. ‘The idea that “everybody else seems to be making a lot out of the War, so I don’t see why I shouldn’t have my bit” is widely prevalent’. Chapman, who unlike most of his colleagues on the bench, declared his support for giving women the right to vote, expressed particular concern about degradation of feminine virtue. Women and girls had become victims of the ‘pilfering mania’ in the same way as men—ladies confessed to pocketing what they could while passing shelves in crowded stores. Others were caught up in the vortex of sexual misconduct. Charges for soliciting and insulting behaviour had increased during the war years and the real level of prostitution was higher than what appeared in court.

In May 1919, the commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, Sir Neville Macready, offered a rather alarming forecast: the world war would inflate the amount of criminal activity and alter the typical criminal. ‘Freedom in battle from the restraint of ordinary law’ he said, ‘lowered man’s respect for fear of that institution, with the result that an increase in crime invariably followed war’. He attributed a ‘big rise in the number of robberies’ to a change in the post-war frame of mind; ‘the robber of to-day’ had grown callous after four years of killing and was indifferent to taking life. Before the war, a burglar who encountered a householder would most likely retreat, but after the war, this same burglar would resort to violence, even murder. Macready warned of assaults on women, and specifically, an increase in the number of murdered women. Before the war, a man might issue his wife a ‘clip behind the ear’ and everything would be alright the next day. But ‘after four years of life-taking’ he would hit her in the head with an iron bar or anything that might be available, and ‘there would be no next day for her’. Margaret Wynn Nevinson also feared for women. She had campaigned with the Pankhursts for women’s rights and became the first woman to adjudicate at criminal petty sessions when she sat on the Hampstead Bench in
London. The country had been promised peace, but ‘everywhere there is terrible unrest, crimes of violence, murder and suicide, dishonesty and immorality, a general loss of honour and self-control’. All of these things represented the natural outcome of war; soldiers had practised in the art of killing, human life counted for little in the trenches. ‘Crimes of violence are greatly increased, women generally the victims; one is murdered as a wife, as a mistress, as a sweet-heart; or even a “No thank you” to a would-be suitor’.10

The chair of the prison commissioners, Evelyn Ruggles-Brise, seconded Macready’s dreary outlook. He pointed to a study of the motivations for crime among veterans imprisoned for criminal offences. The research examined the cases of 6,461 men committed to prison who had served with the armed forces; 3,411 were first offenders and 1,398 classed as habitual offenders. ‘It has been observed that a large proportion of these ex-soldiers were young men, some earning good wages at the time of their committal, and that they were not prompted to commit crime because of want, but through sheer lawlessness’. This ‘may not have been due to criminal instincts, but generated by the conditions of active service in different parts of the world, where the normal restraints of conduct had been banished by the stress of war’. He also pointed to an increase in thefts and pilfering, that was ‘incidental to the war’. This category of prisoner had stolen from railway companies, munitions factories, docks, warehouses and the like where the lack of supervision, and the increase of congestion, together with the high cost of living, ‘made the temptation to steal...almost overwhelming’.11

A chorus of experts from other countries joined in. In Lessons of the World-War (1918), Augustin Hamon, at the New University of Brussels, claimed the great conflict had reversed the customary moral value of actions. A man surrounded by wastage and slaughter developed the ‘idea of resorting to violence in order to obtain the realization of his desires and requirements’. Soldiers under repeated assault from explosives displayed a shocking selfishness about their person and possessions. In wartime conditions, ‘the human being reverts to primitive animality’.12 Jean-André Roux of the University of Dijon, writing for the Revue politique et parlementaire, warned of the danger accompanying demobilisation. Economic factors related to industrial and commercial reorganisation would have an unsettling effect. Peasants who lost their interest in the land would drift to the cities, resulting in villages without labourers, where ‘acts of violence, disorder, and pillage will occur’. Personal morality had deteriorated during the years of war with the break-up of homes and fear of death, resulting in a ‘moral vertigo’.
Morality would not be restored to its pre-war condition. ‘The men will come back from these years of war with a new outlook,’ and he feared, ‘the habit they have formed of violent solutions and of acts of force’.13

In the United States, national experts discussed the reality of, and reasons for, an unprecedented outbreak of criminality. ‘The world at large is definitely under the impression that there is an enormous increase in crime in the United States and that this is of recent origin’ noted Ellen Potter, Secretary of Welfare in Pennsylvania. She felt this impression was drawn from newspapers, magazines, and ‘intricate machines’ that had been set up for gathering the news, ‘the great news agencies, the telegraph, telephone, radio, movie, etc.’ She presented statistics for her state to show that in proportion to the growth in population, crime had decreased from 1875 to 1926. There was, however, an increase in ‘spectacular crimes’ against persons and crime committed by much younger persons (youth crime). When combined with modern journalistic technique, and news gathered more competently throughout the whole world by great news agencies, ordinary Americans were overwhelmed by ‘a sense of deluge by a crime wave’.14 Hugo Pam, president of the Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology in Chicago, agreed. In his annual address for 1919, he noted statistics from England and France had revealed a decrease in crime during the war, but the spectre of an increase could be seen on the horizon. ‘The newspapers are filled with accounts of crimes of such daring and boldness as to make the average citizen stand aghast at the manner in which the security of life and rights of property are ruthlessly disregarded and imperiled’.15

The New York Times assembled a panel to investigate the ‘worldwide crime wave’ that had reached American cities. Williams J. Burns, founder of Burns International Detective Agency, said there was no doubt the nation was experiencing a crime wave, and although there was more than one reason for it, the after-effect of war was the most important. During the war, ordinary respect for the sanctity of human life broke down and men became accustomed to taking human life. Bernard Glueck, head of the psychiatric unit at Sing Sing prison, agreed. Although the statistics revealed the total amount of crime to have decreased, crimes of violence had become more frequent. ‘The war caused a change. Because of the experience of war there is a tendency to transvaluate the seriousness of crime’.16 In an address to the International Association of Chiefs of Police convened at Detroit in 1920, August Vollmer predicted crime would increase during each of the next few years until about 1927. Vollmer, professor of criminology at the University of California in Berkeley, said: ‘We must allow ten years for the injuries done
by the war to those intimately related to it to spend their force’. It was important to understand how countless men and women suffered fatigue and dread beyond their endurance. Most people had inhibitions. But owing to wartime experiences, certain nerve cells became diseased, and under such pressure, inhibitory powers disintegrated.17

In Germany, the behaviour of many returning soldiers appeared to confirm fears of a post-war crime wave. Armed bands of ‘deserters and criminals’ swarmed across city and country.18 Members of the British Red Cross Commission, who visited Hamburg in January 1919, brought back news of troubled conditions. On the surface, order was being maintained by 8,000 armed troops. But from the newspapers, they could see the prevalence of violent crime. The police, except when supported by military troops, had practically no authority. The existence of ‘large masses of unemployed persons in Hamburg is a grave problem,’ the Red Cross visitors concluded, ‘and constitutes a standing menace to the security of life and property’. Not only did the unemployed represent a ready audience for agitators of all sorts, ‘violent crime (house-breaking, robbery and murder) is prevalent’.19 Berliners, too, learned of crime from newspapers: political assassinations, robbery-murders and ‘family tragedies’. The press warned about the tactics of predatory criminals who burst out of dark places to attack upstanding citizens. On the occasion of a murder trial involving a robbery-murder in Tiergarten, one headline read: VAMPIRES. SHADOW PICTURES FROM BERLIN LIFE. The imagery of vampire-criminals had particular resonance in a city darkened by the loss of street lighting during the war.20

One the reasons experts expected men who had survived the trenches to engage in criminal violence on their return home was a psychiatric condition referred to as ‘shell-shock’. Freud’s idea that such disabilities were the hysterical manifestation of unconscious mental states began to take root, even in Britain, where journalists elaborated psychoanalytic theories about the role of the unconscious in wartime neurosis. Newspaper articles about shell-shock, which started to appear in 1915, had become commonplace by 1916.21 Ernest Jones, Freud’s leading English interpreter, pointed out how well war itself accorded with psychoanalytic views of the human mind as containing beneath the surface a body of imperfectly controlled and explosive forces. War not only allowed, but encouraged and ordered, men to engage in behaviour of a kind abhorrent to the civilised mind. All sorts of previously forbidden and buried impulses, cruel and sadistic, murderous and so on, were stirred to greater activity, and old psychic conflicts, which had been dealt with by repression previously, required the person to deal with them afresh
under different circumstances. ‘In bayonet practice,’ Jones explained, ‘the man is taught how best to inflict horrible injuries, and he is encouraged to indulge in activities of this order, from the very thought of which he has all of his life been trying to escape’.  

Philip Gibbs, a war correspondent, observed that all was not right with the spirit of the men who returned home. After the demobilisation, peace pageants, celebration and flag-waving, men who had been patient became impatient, men accustomed to discipline broke into disobedience bordering on riot. ‘They were subject to queer moods, queer tempers, fits of profound depression alternating with a restless desire for pleasure’. For months after the Armistice, newspapers contained stories of dreadful crimes committed by soldiers or ex-soldiers: riots, street rows and solitary acts of ‘homicidal mania and secret lust’. Many murders of young women, outrages upon little girls; and violent robberies took place since demobilisation that appalled decent people. The cause, he suggested, was easy to understand. It was an after-effect of the discipline and training of modern warfare. But, Gibbs clarified, the majority of men in khaki were clean-living and clean-hearted fellows who struggled to return unscathed in soul from the horrors they witnessed. ‘It would be foul libel on many of them to besmirch their honour by a general accusation of lowered morality, and brutal tendencies...’. Gibbs surmised, along with leading psychiatrists, the war had accelerated tendencies in those that had been immoral to begin with. The war had intensified the instincts of those few ‘vice-rotted, criminal, degenerate and brutal fellows’ that haunted every battalion.

The War Office Committee of Enquiry conducted hearings into shell-shock. Beginning in 1920, the committee heard from some 59 witnesses, including staff officers, medical officers, neurologists and psychologists about the nature of shell-shock, general treatment, specific military measures for prevention and treatment, and cowardice in battle. The witnesses presented diverse views; many using terms associated with psychoanalysis (repression, transference) but avoiding reference to Freud. Squadron Leader W. Tyrell, of the Royal Air Force Medical Service, explained how shell-shock was related to criminal behaviour. He defined shell-shock as depletion of nervous energy necessary for maintaining will power and self control. The observant officer could detect signs of approaching breakdown. The wild, fighting type would become moody and quiet. The sullen type became excitable and talkative. The careful man became suddenly reckless, and the previously well-behaved man became the perpetrator of petty crimes.
Even before the end of 1919, however, it was becoming clear to Macready, Ruggles-Brise, and others, that crime statistics would not yield evidence of a wave effect. It seemed unimaginable that the wide-scale wave of violence that was the war would not bring a post-war crime wave in its wake, but there was nothing remarkable in the figures. In December, Macready told the public not to worry about a great increase in crime. The connection between wartime experience and violent crime had been an illusion of the press. The prominence given to some crimes, because of their sensational aspects, had given the public a false idea of their frequency. In his annual report for 1919 (completed in 1920), Macready reviewed statistics that disproved his earlier prediction. ‘Crimes of violence continue to be remarkably low’ he said, especially considering the conditions many men have been living under during the past five years and the frequency of ‘shell-shock’ among veterans. There were only 26 cases of murder in London for 1919 compared with 25 in 1913, and the numbers of manslaughter, attempted murders, and wounding had actually been less in 1919 than in 1913. ‘It is, perhaps, too early to form an opinion, but the figures appear to be a remarkable indication of the moral stability of the nation as a whole’. Certain categories of crimes against property showed considerable increase (although numbers of burglary and housebreaking remained unchanged from 1913). He attributed this increase to ‘temporary causes’, including the demobilisation of men who before the war had been engaged in crime and reverted to their former activities on release. Experiences in the trenches had nothing to do with it. The ‘permanent cause’ was likely the carelessness of property-owners who left their premises containing valuable property unattended at night believing in the security provided by insurance.

Ruggles-Brise reached a similar conclusion in the report of the prison commissioners for 1920. Although it was ‘idealistic and rash to predict figures of crime in the future’, or to generalise from the war period, Britain should be encouraged by ‘the fact that, in a period of re-action from the terrible strain to which the nation has been subject, there should not have been a greater disposition to illegal acts than the figures for the year illustrate’. Only 1,200 prisoners were received in 1919–1920 for offences against police regulations compared to 12,000 in 1913–1914; only 1,193 male convicts received penal servitude as against 2,700 in 1914. ‘There is every reason to hope that the supply of the Convict population is falling—the great bulk being recidivists—and this bulk gradually diminishing, and being men who are passing into the later age categories, and gradually disappearing from criminal sta-
The pre-war generation, Ruggles-Brise suggested, had been more criminal than the post-war generation. Nor did a surge occur in Germany or the United States. In *Krieg und Kriminalität in Deutschland* (War and Crime in Germany), Moritz Liepmann reviewed a series of studies of links between the brutalisation effect and homicides. Liepmann, professor of criminal law at Hamburg, concluded there was not enough evidence to demonstrate a connection. Any simple causal link between deprivation and criminal acquisitiveness did not hold up to scrutiny given the complex effect of economic conditions on human conduct. He also pointed to an alternative explanation for wholesale violence: the war had produced new technologies of murder. One of the more worrisome legacies of the conflict was the clandestine smuggling of firearms by returning soldiers. In 1920, the government reported illegal possession of nearly two million rifles, 8,500 machine guns and 400 mortars. The absence of a national system for collating crime statistics ruled out making with confidence generalisations about the United States as a whole, but experts concluded there was no crime wave either. George Kirchwey, dean of the law school at Columbia University, accepted wave theory to some extent, but insisted the effect would not be as prevalent in America as in those countries where social and economic conditions were more upset. In these countries, ‘you have real “crime waves” affecting almost the entire population’, but ‘this country has been little affected by the war, compared to Europe; and it cannot be said that there is a general demoralization, or that our system of law and order has broken down’. Macready’s American counterpart, Richard Enright, commissioner of the New York City Police Department, took a more firm view: there was no crime wave. He produced figures for homicide, assault, burglary and larceny revealing slight decreases from 1917 to 1918 and 1919. It was a serious offence, he suggested, even to talk of a crime wave where none existed. Speculation about excessive criminality injured the business interests of the city.

For some, the statistics did not matter. It was simply too difficult to accept that Britain could have escaped the greatest of all wars without permanent moral disability. There was, despite the figures of arrests and prisoners, a steady record of crimes in the press. *The Times* reported three outrages in a single month in 1920: murder of man by a burglar, two thefts at post offices, and a robbery in which the thieves made their escape by motor car. ‘The probability of a “wave” of crime after the war’ had been ‘foreseen and foretold by students of social problems’, and the reasons for this included release from the Army. A large
number of professional criminals who had been in the military during the war had returned home, unable to find work, and with disregard for the sacredness of human life. A man on trial for fraud, a double suicide in a cottage, a suicide-murder, drug-taking, the murder of a beautiful young woman: ‘There is unquestionably a crime wave’ the Manchester Guardian decided in 1922, ‘which, if it does not congest the gaols, is nevertheless the mark of a postwar neurosis that...[has] effects not only on social conduct but also on appreciation of the beauties and sanities of life’. The belief in a post-war crime wave was among the war’s survivors.

Migrants and foreigners

The war ended practises, and institutionalised others, that had a way of shaping how people thought about crime. At a 1923 session of the League of Nations concerning the traffic in women, the American representative, Grace Abbott, acknowledged that restrictions on intercontinental travel had made it difficult for white-slavers to operate. The system of international regulation based on passport inspection was unlikely to succeed, however, because as she pointed out, passport requirements were only a temporary measure and bound to be abolished. Yet contrary to what Abbott (and her colleagues) expected, passport regulations continued as did restrictions on immigration. Between 1914 and 1918, governments learned how easy it was to regulate not only foreigners, but citizens, and ‘temporary’ measures adopted during a time of war became a fixture of peace. The passport, a document of uncertain value and inconsistent practice before the war, became the standard requirement for international travel.

In Britain, restrictions on foreigners had commenced with the outbreak of war. Originally, the Aliens Restriction Order (1914) required that alien enemies register with the police and prohibited them from residing in particular areas. Beginning with Belgian refugees in December 1914, this requirement was extended to alien friends, and by June 1918, all aliens over 18 years of age, male and female, wherever resident, had to register with police. The Alien Restriction (Amendment) Act of 1919 allowed the power exercised by the Order in Council in time of war or national emergency to be exercised ‘not only in those circumstances, but at any time’. Essentially, the act placed a foreigner in Britain completely outside the protection of law, and within the power of the Secretary of State; and under the supervision of police; a foreigner had not the rights of a British subject nor even the legal position of the friendly alien recognised before 1914. Although the measure was intended to remain
in force for one year, Parliament extended it year by year. An attempt in 1927 to make the section permanent failed, but it continued an annual lease of life under the Expiring Laws Continuance Acts. ‘One may regret the days’, a Home Office official commented in 1932, ‘when restrictions did not exist and the traveller was not troubled with passports or controls; but since the times demand control it is our business to make it effective’. As he explained, ‘our business’ referred to protecting the home labour market from foreign workers and to keeping out the destitute, diseased and criminal alien.39

The image of the alien criminal featured prominently in the rationale for passage of the Alien Restriction (Amendment) Act. The parliamentary debate leading up to passage in November 1919 began and ended with declarations about the criminality of aliens. Sir Ernest Wild admitted he was new to the House of Commons, but urged passage of the act with reference to a subject with which he was ‘qualified to deal’. As recorder for the Central Criminal Court in London, he declared that crimes by aliens generated much of the work with which magistrates had to deal. ‘Vice!’ he exclaimed, ‘why they [aliens] are at the bottom of one-half, at least, of the vice in this Metropolis and of this country’. Aliens perpetrated the ‘unnatural vice’ of the white slave traffic leading to exploitation of English girls and the ‘gambling hells’ leading young men to destruction. Aliens brought ‘such horrible practises as doping and unnatural offences—this is the atmosphere that has been introduced into this country by these people’.40 Colonel Charles Burn, MP for Torquay, added that no German had ever come to Britain for the good of the British. ‘We know the enemy alien we have here, and when we know that men and women of enemy origin are the instigators of crime, and have proved themselves again and again to be some of our greatest criminals, now is the time to get rid of them’. When men were brought up in criminal court for white slave traffic they were nearly always Germans.41

To provide statistical support for such claims, anti-alien agitators resuscitated the arguments leading to passage of the Aliens Act in 1905. Noting it was difficult to gauge the dimensions of the current threat, Wild offered statistics given before the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration in 1902. He talked about a rise between 1889 and 1903 in crimes against the person, forgery, and matters of decency and disorderly houses. When one member, James Kiley, the Liberal representative for Whitechapel, said that police records for the East End of London indicated that only something more like 2 per cent of total convictions were due to aliens, he was met by statistics from the past. Herbert
Nield, Conservative for Ealing constituency, said that with reference to the statistics quoted by Mr Kiley, all he could say was that he had seen statistics for 1914 which contradicted that theory. ‘I think I can safely say that the criminal statistics with regard to aliens have enormously increased’. If any members would take the time to read the returns published by the Royal Commission in 1903 they would see the members of the commission were unanimously of the opinion that the alien population ‘was a great danger, not only to our own population, but to the State’.42

The theme of alien criminality percolated throughout the 1920s. Colonel Arthur Lane’s The Alien Menace appeared in three editions. Lane, who supported the ‘Militant Christian Patriots’ and other anti-Semitic causes, described the influx of aliens as a national disaster that threatened to break-up the British Empire. Drawing on anecdotes gleaned from newspapers, he ranted about foreigners as a leading source of unemployment, a threat to public health, and a drain on public morals. He complained about Germans taking positions of head-waiter away from English waiters, Russians who could not be deported without agreeing to return to the Soviet authority, and Jews involved in frauds and subversive politics. His book reprinted articles from newspapers about aliens avoiding deportation, Jewish links with Bolshevism, dole frauds, fraudulent bankruptcies, illegal landings and stowaways, use of bogus passports, white slave traffic, drug traffic, forgery, stealing and blackmail. He offered quotations from Ernest Wild and others concerned with immigrants in Britain. Captain Stanley Shaw, founder of the British Brothers League, claimed that aliens represented the ‘cleverest crooks’. For Shaw, ‘most of the serious crime in this country is committed by aliens, instigated by aliens, or controlled by aliens. The home-bred crooks amount to very little’.43 The Alien Menace received an enthusiastic endorsement from the Primrose League, an auxiliary of the Conservative Party. Founded in 1883 for the ‘maintenance of Religion, the Estates of the Realm, and the unity of the British Empire’, it became during the 1920s a leading political voice for anti-alienism and anti-communism. The Primrose League praised Lane’s arguments linking aliens to criminality and unemployment in Britain.44

In 1924, The Times ran a series on ‘Alien London’ including one story devoted to ‘Criminal Types’. According to the articles, violent crime seldom occurred in London’s Jewish quarter, and had decreased generally, but the more recently-arrived Jews had given the community a bad name for ‘untruthfulness and commercial dishonesty’. Chinamen, when taken to crime, generally engaged in cocaine smuggling or clandestine opium
dens. There were some quarrels among the Chinese, usually over gambling, but seldom complex organised crime. There was also a Negro colony near Tottenham Road which gave the police trouble; many had come from the British West Indies. The most dangerous alien criminal was not, in any case, a slum resident, but a bird of passage who could afford first-class travel to London, and from a room at a grand hotel, orchestrate a bold robbery or cocaine transfer, then disappear before the police could intervene. The Times went on to say the authorities were having some success. The Home Office, with the assistance of the Jewish Association for Protection of Girls and Women, had smashed one particularly bad class of criminal, ‘the foreign white slave trafficker’, while the ‘alien political criminal’ had done nothing of the sort of acts committed by really desperate types responsible for the Siege of Sidney Street before the war. Many had departed for the attractions of Bolshevist Russia, and as for the alien of really bad political antecedents—‘a close watch is kept’.45

The British government refused to remove restrictions on entrance of aliens. In the House of Commons, Labour party politician John Scurr, raised the question, stating the regulations operated against poor Jews in his Mile End constituency in London’s East End. Jewish immigrants had demonstrated they were good citizens, and if it became necessary in times of special unemployment to impose restrictions, these decisions should be taken not by the Home Office, but by the Ministry of Labour. Samuel Finburgh, speaking as a member of the Jewish community, explained the hardships imposed by the regulations on long term residents. They were regarded as aliens, compelled to notify the police before they moved house from one street to the next, and when they sought naturalisation, the Home Office placed every conceivable object in their way. Sir William Joynson-Hicks, the Home Secretary, denied Finburgh’s claims. ‘I challenge the honourable members of community to give one single instance in which there has been any anti-Jewish bias shown by the Home Office’, he said in reply, and added: ‘The leaders of the Jewish community know that perfectly well’. As to Scurr’s general remarks, Joynson-Hicks declared that if there were no restrictions, the nation would be flooded by immigrants from oppressed and downtrodden countries around the world. He pointed to cases of undesirable aliens deported under magistrates’ orders for offences related to cocaine and the white slave trade. During the ten months ending 31 October 1925, there had been 219 deportation orders against aliens, almost all of whom had been convicted of a crime.46
In France, the war years had led to immigration of workers for munitions factories and economic activities reduced by departure of French for soldiers. Factory workers were recruited from French colonies, leading to a population after the war of Algerians, Tunisians, and Moors, as well as Chinese. French observers worried these immigrants adhered to their traditions and lacked ‘solid virtues’ needed for citizenship. Novelist Georges Simenon reflected French attitudes toward these workers in the pages of his Maigret series. Inspector Maigret heads the Police Judiciare (the equivalent of Scotland Yard), and the characters surrounding him make repeated slurs about Jews and immigrants. In Pietr le letton (1933), a judge asks his clerk: ‘What the devil are all these foreigners doing here?’ In 1932, a Russian émigré assassinated French President Paul Doumer. Two weeks later, the Council of Ministers issued new regulations that announced increased scrutiny over the foreign-born population. Radio Normandie, a commercial radio station that had recently started broadcasting, offered xenophobic commentary on the case. The announcer said the self-proclaimed ‘land of liberty’ brought such troubles on itself by indiscriminately welcoming foreigners, and this had resulted in an ‘international underworld’ living on French soil. L’ami du Peuple made the criminality of foreigners a particular issue in a series of editorials in 1933. The paper supplied figures showing that immigrants made up 53 per cent of criminals in Marseilles in 1927 and accounted for 75 per cent of crimes in the Alpes-Maritimes for the same year.

Unlike the United Kingdom, statistics in France could be made to show a link. The authors of an article on ‘The Problem of Aliens in France’ reported that when taking into account the proportion of foreigners compared to French subjects, the number of foreign offenders was four or five times greater. Despite a press campaign calling attention to the undesirability of foreigners, the number of deportations remained too small. In 1920, the police managed to expel only some 6,483, 5,718 for crimes and misdemeanours. Aliens also took the lead in ‘sins against the public eye’. Certain acts, while not violations of criminal statutes, amounted to dangers to the nation. ‘Here again the aliens take the lead. Too many of them lack morality, or belong to that class of social agitators or disturbers of the peace whose typical picture had been so powerfully drawn by Zola in Germainal’. The article urged the government to enact a new policy concerning immigration.

In Paris the Préfecture de Police established an immigration service, linked to its political branch, the Renseignements généraux. It became the model for police forces elsewhere. Before anyone else, the Paris police
sent agents throughout the city on an annual basis to verify declarations of residence, to stop people on the streets to examine identity papers, and to carry out background checks on whole communities of foreign workers and colonial subjects. The police questioned anyone who looked out of place, or kept what they regarded as unsuitable company, routinely confiscating people’s work and residency papers to keep them in line. The police denied residency permits, initiating expulsions that numbered in the thousands. Foreigners found to be in ‘an irregular situation’ on account of their papers were expelled from France. By the 1930s, police authorities came from around the world to learn Parisian police sweep methods and witness the massive card file listing every immigrant by nationality, profession and residence.\textsuperscript{51}

Some British commentators welcomed the import of such a system in Britain. ‘Crime in Paris has been on the increase since the war’, a British journalist, Harry Greenwall, complained in 1921, ‘and statistics prove that 1920 was one of the worst years for crime Paris has ever experienced’. Greenwall assigned the surge in crime to the influx of foreigners, and praised the methods of the Préfecture de Police for dealing with them. Foreigners had to register when they had remained in France for more than a fortnight. While some did not comply, many did. When a French person, including those of French nationality, came into contact with the police, an entry was made in their dossier kept at the Préfecture de Police. There was a special brigade \textit{police des meublées}. These detectives looked into hotels and lodging houses of Paris; they enquired into the antecedents of foreigners, and obtained personal details to compare with records. They examined registration books to screen for suspects, and scrutinised the occupation of suspects. From the summer of 1920 until June 1921, the police carried out nightly raids. The authorities selected a different quarter each night, and netted thousands of suspects in roundups, in which every hotel and lodging house was searched.\textsuperscript{52}

In Germany, the press complained about the \textit{Ostjuden} problem. As a correspondent for a British newspaper explained, \textit{Ostjuden} referred to Jews who migrated into Berlin from Poland and Galicia. It was claimed, with some exaggeration, there were more than 30,000 in Berlin alone, said to be responsible for a housing problem and a big portion of the city’s crimes. The chief of the criminal police told a British newspaper correspondent that talk of an ominous increase in crime was not sensationalism. The problem had less to do with the advent of new crimes than with familiar crimes committed in greater numbers. Crime was worse in Germany than in France and England, the victorious
countries, owing to greater poverty, shortages of necessities and demoralisation. ‘Yes there is a huge influx of shady characters from the east, and they have helped swell the criminal population of Berlin’ the chief of criminal police said when asked about the migrants, ‘You would be surprised by the number of Poles and Galicians amongst the thieves we catch’. Nothing was done about the problem, the chief continued to say, because of an inactive Socialist government. ‘But something will have to be done’.53 During the 1920s and 1930s, German newspapers carried stories of serial murderers. In Hanover, a homosexual man was executed in 1925 for 30 murders; the ‘Bluebeard of the Silesian railway’ killed 14 women; in Düsseldorf, a serial killer went on trial in 1931. The language used to describe these crimes fed off, and played into, discussion of ‘aliens’ living inside German borders, whether marked by ethnic difference, marked defects, or physical disease.54

The immigration policy pursued by the United States had the biggest effect worldwide. As in Britain and France, anti-immigrant agitation reflected concerns tied to race, nationalism and foreign criminality. The demand for restriction began during the war with the literacy test requirement in 1917. Fuelled by nationalism, this legislation initiated an era of restriction and selection. In the years immediately after the war, Congress felt the need for passing some sort of restrictivist measure without making a study of the problem. Consequently, a temporary law was passed in May 1921 and extended for three years. In 1924, the Congress put into effect the quota system which allowed limited numbers of entrants from nations based on the proportion of foreign population in 1910. It also stipulated that no more than 20 per cent of the quota could be admitted in any given month; in effect, a monthly quota as well as a yearly quota. The preoccupation with race and racial affiliations, a feature which made it unlike previous immigration policy, became the basis for the quota system. The legislation also established provision for ‘immigration visas’ which replaced the passport visa. This meant the counting was carried out by American officials abroad rather than at ports of entry.55

Allegations of criminality fortified anti-immigrant sentiment. In 1926, the Congress received the answer to Chicago’s crime problems in the form of a bill proposed by the two senators from Illinois. The people of Chicago found themselves overwhelmed in their efforts to curb lawlessness by ‘a colony of unnaturalized persons’ who extorted money from citizens by ‘terrorizing, kidnappings and assassinations’. Not only did they bring criminal habits from foreign lands to the United States, they lowered the moral threshold of Americans. Many of these aliens
had become wealthy as rum-runners and boot-leggers, operating in collusion with corrupt public officials, who sold liquor under police protection. Edwin Grant, president of the California State Law Enforcement League, presented a number of cases involving foreign nationals to justify exclusion of immigrants. He complained about the deportation of white-slave trafficker, Skopolitis, to Greece at the expense of the US government. The point of his complaint was not the expense of deportation, but why the man had been allowed to gain entry in the first place. ‘For countless years thousands of Skopolitises have been pouring onto American soil...;’ Grant thundered, ‘no sooner do they sail past the Statue of Liberty than they mistake liberty for license—and embark on their lives of crime’. Foreigners were responsible for the crime wave in cities, all the ‘big movements of lawlessness’ and ‘movements that aim at anarchy’. Grant worried about the smuggling of aliens over the Canadian and Mexican borders, but felt this could be handled with effective enforcement. He also worried about sailors arriving by ship from foreign ports who were able to go ashore without restriction and urged the legislation to close this loophole.

The lack of a national system for aggregation of crime figures did not prevent commentators from taking strong views. In 1925, Minnesota businessman Mark O. Prentiss organised the first National Crime Commission. He persuaded several prominent judges and lawyers to join a panel of business leaders to carry out an investigation into the alarming increase of crime. Prentiss believed the courts and prisons failed to punish lawbreakers effectively and urged establishment of a national criminal record information bureau to catch repeaters. From ‘authoritative sources’ he claimed to have learned ‘that the great majority of our crimes of violence are committed by foreign born persons or the sons of foreign-born’. He urged the Bureau of Immigration to fingerprint all immigrants on entry and advised judges, on sentencing, to order deportation of alien criminals. Prentiss alleged that more than 60 per cent of the crimes violence in the United States had been committed by foreign-born or sons of the foreign-born. He was challenged on this point by Emanuel Celler, Democrat of Brooklyn, who referred to the statement as a ‘deliberate falsehood’. Census data confirmed, Celler insisted, that ‘the more foreigners we have the less homicides we have’. He rejected proposals that week impose procedures to register, measure and fingerprint new arrivals.

A second national crime commission, the National Committee on Law Observance, chaired by George Wickersham, affirmed Celler’s argument. The report determined ‘that in proportion to their respective
numbers the foreign born commit considerably fewer crimes than the native born’. For crimes of violence, rates of foreign born compared favourably with that of native born, and for property crimes, rates by native born exceeded that of foreign born. Further, a 1932 study of crime in California refuted the alarmist views of Grant and Prentiss. Stanford University social science professor Walter G. Beach reviewed offences in the state from 1900 to 1927 and found that serious offences by Chinese and Japanese immigrants was quite low. On the whole, Oriental criminality could be reduced to participation in minor offences, suggestive of their lack of acquaintance with the ways and culture of America.

The danger of unemployment

The economic crisis of 1929–33 revived fears of a crime wave. The Great Slump, as it was known in Britain, and Great Depression, in the United States, was the turning point between the wars, the moment at which commentators no longer looked back to the First World War to understand social, economic and political conditions. It was also worldwide. Yorkshire writer J.B. Priestly, travelling abroad when the Great Slump began, realised that even on the islands of the South Seas, the slump had found him. ‘We may be under fifty different national flags, but we are compelled to serve now under only one economic flag’. From the collapse of the post-war economic boom in 1921 until the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939, Britain experienced unemployment on an unprecedented scale. The worst period occurred from 1931 until 1935, when the number of unemployed never fell below two million, and soared to three million in the winter of 1932–3.

Newspaper columnists and government authorities could foresee a reserve army of idle and angry men turning to criminal behaviour. In 1932, the National Unemployed Workers Movement organised a ‘hunger march’. Some 1,500 men walked to London, some from as far away as Scotland, to protest the government’s employment policy. By October, it was predicted that a gathering in Hyde Park would attract 10,000 protestors. The police fielded a massive operation, and the press predicted widespread violence and disorder. In April of that year, the Home Secretary, Herbert Samuels, alerted the House of Commons to the prospect of an increase in crime. He felt he should make a general statement, he said, because the ‘public mind’ was disturbed by the increase in particular classes of criminal activity. He reviewed statistics for indictable offences to show an increase from three years ago. He
mentioned burglaries and breakings-in, smash-and-grab raids and very brutal and shocking cases which had attracted so much public attention. Samuels then reviewed three factors responsible for this increase. He cited the consequences of the war, and impact of the motor car on social life, but pointed to the economic depression as the factor of greatest importance. ‘I attribute very largely the present increase of crime to the fact that we are living in a time of extreme economic depression’.65

Most of the increase in crime statistics consisted of stealing by young offenders in depressed districts, Samuels said. This pattern was not unique to Britain: ‘The same feature is visible in other countries subject to this depression—and what country is not? Indeed, the sociologists may wonder that, considering the gravity of the depression and the width of its experiment, the increase of crime has not been more both in this country and others’. Samuels explained he had arrived at this conclusion from reading the Political Quarterly where he spotted an informative line graph. The graph plotted the curve of the crime statistics in conjunction with the curve of unemployment, and there was a remarkable correspondence between the two.66 The article, written by a researcher at the London School of Economics, S.K. Ruck, reviewed statistics of unemployment and real wages in England and Wales from 1893 to 1929. Ruck observed that the correspondence between the two curves was so close it was hard to resist the conclusion that it reflected cause and effect. But, he admitted, the correlation might be due to a larger portion of the population engaging in crime, or an increase in crimes committed by the same number of criminals. Further, there was no definite evidence on whether there had been an increase in the percentage of ‘first offenders’ such as might be expected if the lack of work motivated individuals to break the law. Never-the-less, he concluded that, from all indications, crime was increasingly quite rapidly, and he recommended the formation of a Royal Commission on Crime and its Treatment to perform some ‘hard thinking’ on the subject.67

Leaders of the Howard League for Penal Reform found the argument convincing. Crime had increased from 1929 to 1931, as the figures for indictable offences revealed, and it was well this increase be taken seriously. The editors of the Howard Journal felt a ‘certain bitter amusement’ in reading the ‘myriad ingenious explanations’ for the crime wave when the answer was obvious. There was no need to search for the cause of crime beyond ‘the spectre of poverty and unemployment’ and the ‘creeping paralysis of trade and industry’ that had ensued since the war. ‘As the Home Secretary told the House of Commons recently,
the graph of crime has, year after year, moved up and down in a course almost exactly parallel to the unemployment graph’. The Howard League invited the secretary to give an address in December 1932. Samuels made Ruck’s graph the basis of his talk on ‘The Crime Wave and How the Cope With It’. He restated his conclusion that as unemployment had increased, so crime had increased in all countries affected by the economic depression.

If Ruck agreed with Samuels’s interpretations, others did not. A.M. Carr-Saunders, professor of social science at Liverpool University, observed that those who argued for the unemployment effect on crime anchored their position on statistics for indictable offences. He pointed to statistics for non-indictable offences from 1900 to 1931 which revealed a downward trend. In fact, there had been a marked decrease in recent years when the population increased and unemployment figures had doubled. It was important to note that coincident with increase in unemployment there had been an increase in orderly behaviour. ‘It seems that this fact, if known to, is at least not appreciated by those who talk of the increase of crime and attribute it to unemployment’. Other sceptics felt that unemployment represented an excuse for the government’s failure to take effective anti-crime measures. The Saturday Review found the crime statistics for 1929 rather unpleasant reading, nor rendered more agreeable by ‘the facile excuse of the Home Office that the great increase in crime is due to the trade depression. It used to be the war, it is now unemployment, and when trade revives no doubt it will be something equally satisfying to the official mind’.

Unemployment and crime remained a point of debate in Britain throughout the 1930s. Ruck carried out a study to determine whether unemployment had led to an increase in first-offenders. He compared those registered for serious offences in the Metropolitan Police district for 1927 with those for 1932, and found that although there had been an increase in the number of first-offenders, from 5,758 to 6,507, as a proportion of offenders, this represented a decrease, from 41 per cent to 37 per cent. This ‘contrary result’ had not been anticipated. Ruck interpreted the result to mean that while the industrial depression had increased the number of offenders, criminals who had already committed crimes likely increase their offending, so that the proportion of first-time offenders declined slightly. The increased use of the automobile by a certain type of criminal may have had some effect, although the ‘motor-bandit’ of newspaper reports represented a small portion of criminals. He went on to distinguish between ‘static’ and ‘dynamic’ poverty. Static poverty, in the sense of a low customary standard of
living, had little effect on crime rates. But dynamic poverty, arising from unemployment and enforced idleness, had significant influence. ‘The concurrent increases of unemployment and crime in recent years are consistent with the view that it is within the vicissitudes of employment, rather than of poverty, that the movement of crime is related’.72

The Howard League had no second-thoughts. In 1935, the editors of the Howard Journal underlined crime figures as showing increases in offenders for 1929 to 1932, and a decrease in 1933, as evidence of the effect of the industrial depression. In the year when unemployment figures began to decline, there was a turn for the better in crime statistics as well. ‘We have written, perhaps ad nauseam, in the Howard Journal of the preponderating influence of social conditions—poverty, unemployment, overcrowding—on the incidence of crime. The latest Criminal Statistics fortify and justify our belief in its overwhelming importance’.73 Crime novelist Dorothy L. Sayers shared this view, after a fashion. When asked about modern methods of crime and the influence of the motor car, she said the real difficulty was that there were so many unemployed, and that so many of these had been brought up never to have had employment. It was so much easier to pursue a career in highway robbery rather do a job of honest work. She thought this would always be the case after big wars.74

Demonstrating the correlation between unemployment and crime was not as neat as Ruck’s line graph. Hermann Mannheim, at the London School of Economics, who made his own study in the 1930s, could not sustain the causal chain. He compared the situation across specific regions of the country, and when he looked at the two industrial cities of Sheffield and Leeds, unearthed contradictory results. There was hardly any increase in indictable offences in Sheffield in 1926 and 1931, during a period when unemployment had nearly doubled, and nothing like a surge in unemployment to explain the ‘crime wave’ of 1928. Leeds experienced a decline in crime during the first year of the great depression. ‘On the whole,’ Mannheim concluded, ‘it must be admitted that the rise in crime figures from 1931 to 1932 seems negligible when compared with the simultaneous deterioration of the economic position of the unemployed’. He went on to suggest that when figures for crime and unemployment peaked at the same time, it could be reasonably assumed that unemployment had been the cause and crime the effect. But where crime figures remained low, despite high unemployment, other factors must be responsible for counter-balancing its evil effects.75

The Home Office also turned up statistical evidence inconsistent with the message of Ruck’s graph. In 1933, an enquiry by the Public Accounts
Committee examined the proposition that unemployment and industrial depression were responsible for a large proportion of crime, and therefore, an increase in the prison population. If this were true, variations in the average daily prison population would vary with unemployment figures. Yet in fact, notwithstanding an increase of unemployment from one million in 1921 to 2.75 million in 1930, the prison population had increased very little. The report suggested that if there was a connection to be found in statistics concerning unemployment and crime, it would be in the annual volumes of crime statistics, not in annual prison figures.76

The economic depression was more severe in the United States, but the effect on crime proved as equivocal. One criminologist, Clayton Ettinger, presented unemployment as a significant economic contribution to criminal behaviour. He reported figures from the Bureau of Census to show the portion of prisoners employed at the time of their offence. At more than 30 per cent for crimes of robbery, drugs, larceny and forgery, the percentage of unemployed was ‘exceedingly high’ although he conceded that although unemployment claimed more of those in prison than the general population, in many cases this may have been voluntary. Crimes against property was the logical result of economic depression, including that of 1929–31, when wages fell, standards of living collapsed and workers joined the army of unemployed. Unemployment led to demoralisation, and this developed into a hostility toward more fortunate, and a tendency to commit economic crimes. But ‘just how far an economic depression influences the commission of crime it is difficult to determine’.77 Vernon Jones, of the Psychological Laboratory at Clark University, concluded there was a link between unemployment and crime based on changes in arrest figures for cities in Massachusetts from 1920 to 1931. The rises and falls in the curves for unemployment and crime corresponded for nine of 11 years. The relationship was true for theft, but not for other crime problems, such as juvenile delinquency.78

Other crime specialists failed to reach the same conclusions. George Vold at the University of Minnesota pointed out that the figures of prisoners received from courts (1926–1933) and offences known to police (1931–1934) refuted the idea of a crime wave related to economic depression. The fact that the trend in these two indexes seemed to be downward was ‘amazing’ given that at the end of 1934 there were some 12 million unemployed and nearly 20 million persons on relief. He could find no increase in crime commensurate with the depression, nor any sudden increase in crime as a result of widespread
loss of economic standing. ‘The American people appear to have changed relatively little in respect to the kinds of behaviour usually called crime, despite the widespread demoralization and disorganization of individual lives and of community activity so intimately associated with the depression’. Ray Simpson, psychologist at the Institute for Juvenile Research in Chicago, questioned the tendency to place the blame for many social ills on factors such as the war, prohibition and the depression. He examined admissions figures to eight institutions in Illinois from 1919 to 1932 and found a consistent increase beginning in about 1923. ‘The most striking fact to be stressed is that the so-called “crime wave” started back in 1923 or 1924!’ During the first three years of depression (1930–1932), the rate increased only slightly by comparison. Not only did the evidence suggest the depression had ‘very little influence’ on the crime rate, the figures suggested ‘the depression has tended to stop the so-called crime wave rather than to initiate it’. In 1937, the Social Science Research Council commissioned Thorsten Sellin to review the research on economic conditions and crime, with reference to methodological issues. He generated a list of questions (that remained to be answered) in an effort to stimulate further research.

The clearest signposts could be found in Germany, which had become, according to Morris Ploscowe, a ‘vast sociological laboratory’ for the effect of economic conditions on criminal behaviour. Ploscowe, a New York attorney specialising in European legal systems, said the value of money dwindled and even the highest paid felt the pinch of want. ‘General necessity and privation brought with it a record increase of property crimes’. The most striking about this is was that it included a large portion of the population that had not until then come into conflict with the law. The number of women and children involved in crime had increased tremendously. Ploscowe went on to suggest that the mechanism of unemployment as a criminogenic factor operated differently on professional and habitual criminals. While it had little effect on professional and habitual criminals, it was felt most keenly on first offenders, and the danger was that if employment conditions did not improve, it would push first offenders to become professional.

But even then, the link between unemployment and crime was politicised. The National Socialists exaggerated the extent of unemployment, and its social impact, in order to inflate their importance in solving Germany’s problems. In his address to the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, which met at Berlin in 1935, Joseph Goebbels reviewed ‘the constructive work of the National Socialist state’. When the government had come to power, there were three cardinal problems of
internal unity, unemployment and restoration of national sovereignty. The National Socialist state had defeated the ‘paralysing problem of unemployment’—nearly seven million unemployed—with expansion of factories and offices that created jobs for five million workers.84

Conclusions

Detective fiction soared in popularity during the 1920s and 1930s. It has been suggested that it represented a psychological response to the losses of the Great War. Families denied knowledge of missing relatives could obtain within the pages of the story precise information about who had been killed and for what purpose.85 There may be another explanation. Perhaps readers found in crime fiction some escape from the talk of certain increase in real crime. Social, political and economic upheavals of the interwar period led to speculation about surges of criminal activity across many nations at the same time. Police, prison officials and other experts expected a rise in crime in proportion to the destruction of war. The statistics did not cooperate, but this did not end speculation.

Could it really be that the first global war, the horrors of mass slaughter, had no significant effect on crime rates afterward? Social commentators, editorialists and others continued to monitor crime patterns, looking for the first signs the wave was about to break. Within a few years, there were other reasons to suspect a worldwide crime wave might happen after all. Government authorities, in the House of Commons and Home Office, thought they could see a crime wave in the influx of immigrants, while professionals in the Home Office and the Howard League turned their attention toward the criminality of the unemployed. Once again, the evidence was scarce. The MPs arguing for the threat of foreign criminality could not find statistical support to begin with, while the officials insisting on the criminogenic effect of worklessness had to rely on a line subject to considerable doubt. A number of academics concluded the evidence, even for the impact of the economic crisis, was far from clear.

The worldwide crime wave of the interwar period became the biggest crime problem that never was. Thinking about the aftershock of a world war initiated a chain of thought about the effects on crime of other global social events and prepared interwar intellectuals for accepting the necessity of international responses.
When J.B. Priestly visited the Nottingham Goose Fair in 1931, he did not spot any geese. But, Priestly did notice Al Capone’s armoured car on display. For Priestly, theatre critic and author, reference to this notorious gangster confirmed one more way in which Britain was becoming more like America. During his tour of England that year, he found a medieval Britain of cathedrals and market towns, a Victorian Britain of railway termini, and a post-war Britain that had been born in America. ‘This is the England of arterial by-pass roads, of filling stations and factories that look like exhibition buildings, of giant cinemas and dance halls and cafés, bungalows with tiny garages, cocktail bars, Woolworths, motor-coaches, wireless, hiking, factory girls looking like actresses....’1

The British public had an appetite for American crime stories and news-writers found ample ways to indulge them. It might have been nothing more than an idle pleasure, except that many public intellectuals believed there was a depressing message in the tales of gangsters, machine guns and over-powered automobiles. The United States overwhelmed Britain with industrial methods and management philosophies, leisure activities and entertainment industries, and a generation of social critics wondered about the effect.2 British susceptibility to all-things-American meant the inescapable possibility, even probability, that the gangsters who controlled American cities could extend their reach to the likes of Glasgow and Sheffield. There were also signs in France and Germany that crime had become Americanised.3 And as worrisome as this was, the experts could see even deeper troubles. Capone’s car did not merely signify the expansion of Chicago’s underworld across the Atlantic, but an underworld that stretched across every city in the world.
Journalists, criminologists, leaders of international charities, advocates for the League of Nations, novelists and politicians referred to an ‘international underworld’. There was an underworld specific to particular cities, but also of underworld figures operating in cities linked together to form trans-continental networks. Sometimes, references to this underworld included explanations of relationships and specific activities. There were references to technology, evidenced by ‘motor bandits’, a phrase that placed the daring, fearsome criminal of the eighteenth century in the driver’s seat of a powerful, twentieth-century machine. But more often than not, references to cross-border crime presumed the existence of syndicates, entrepreneurs and organised criminal activities, with the implicit understanding that because these activities relied on secret relationships, outsiders could never be clear about exactly how things work. There were also references to a conspiracy of master-criminals who operated behind the scenes. In Britain and America, as well as Germany, accusing fingers pointed to ‘international Jewry’ as the source of cross-border criminality.

Crime-border criminality

Advances in technology transformed everyday life in the 1920s and 1930s. Automobiles, ships and aeroplanes normalised travel over great distances, and wireless receivers, gramophones and telephones became part of the furniture in middle-class homes. Affordable Morris, Austin and Ford cars enabled lazy afternoons in the countryside and motorcoaches rivalled railway carriages for business travel between cities. Autogiros hovered in skies overhead and massive ocean liners skated across oceans and seas. The LZ 127 Graf Zeppelin completed an around-the-world flight in 1929, and ten years later, the Royal Mail commenced regular transatlantic airmail service.

Cinematographs became the biggest and fastest-growing form of popular entertainment of the interwar period. By 1926 there were 3,000 picture houses in Britain, and by 1938, some 4,800. This amounted to a seating capacity of 3.25 million, or roughly one seat for every ten people in the population. On average, half of the population over 14 years of age went to the cinema once per week. American-styled picture houses mushroomed across London. The ‘super-cinema’ included a café with a dance floor on the first floor, where people could have their tea or supper before or after the picture shows. The ‘talkies’, which made their first appearance in 1928, enjoyed immediate success. By 1932, every cinema in London had the talkie apparatus. The interwar generation also had the
first look at television. In 1927, the American Telegraph and Telephone Company arranged a demonstration. Viewers in New York watched the secretary of commerce, Herbert Hoover, leaf through papers in his Washington DC desk some 200 miles away. The technology featured a grid of neon tube and thousands of electrodes expressed the glowing patches of the picture. Herbert Ives, who led the research behind the public demonstration, predicted that a television communication service would appear, followed in a few years, by a broadcast service. He predicted a world in which people would buy television receivers just as they bought wireless valves. By the outbreak of war in 1939, much of this prophecy had become true. Regular television programmes aired in Holland, France, Germany and Russia. Britain’s broadcasting tower at Alexandra Palace provided daily transmission for British viewers, and in America, the Columbia Broadcasting Company and Radio Corporation of America operated television studios.

From the 1920s, film images tended to depict science and technology in negative ways. In the late nineteenth century and until the Great War, films and popular novels included engineers as heroes who brought a human face to industry; individuals who carried civilisation forward, enlarging opportunities and human comforts for all. But from the distribution of Fritz Lang’s Metropolis (1926), a stream of American, British and European films reflected negative social attitudes toward technology. The most common theme proposed that technical knowledge may be progressive and good, but was vulnerable to corruption in its application. A less common theme revealed certain kinds of technology to be intrinsically corrosive of human well-being, and suggested they spelt disaster regardless of attempts to utilise them for society’s benefit. Metropolis portrays a city of the future in which the leading industrialist seeks to crush the workers. Maria, who works for social justice, antagonises the industrialist who uses her image for a robot to lead the workers astray. Another German film, Ein Unsichtbarer geht durch die Stadt (An Invisible Man Goes Through the City) by Harry Piel, opens with a scene of depression-era Berlin of the 1920s. The main character, Harry, acquires a new technological device—a kind of electric headgear—that makes him invisible and he uses it to become rich. When a friend steals the device and misuses it for criminal purposes, Harry helps track down the thief using other technological tools: car, motorbike and aeroplane.

Experts warned about an emerging generation of border-crossing criminals empowered by advances in transportation and communication. ‘The international criminal is invariably one who has spent much time
in the study and commission of crime’ declared A.K. Mayhall, president of the Chief Constables Association of England and Wales; ‘he does not hesitate to jump the continents and commit crime of a serious nature at every opportunity’. Forgers, confidence men and jewel thieves were often international in their activities. ‘Methods of crime are for ever changing—perhaps more rapidly than formerly—and each country has its own problems, but on the international side there are obviously many problems we share in common’.11 French writer Frederic Boutet agreed. ‘The telephone, wireless telegraphy, aviation, the electric forces used in industry, new forms of explosives and the newest implements of every description are now turned to account by the expert practitioners of crime, gentlemen who float a theft almost like a public company, and who plan out a burglary with all the thoroughness and mechanical skill required for constructing an artesian well in the Sahara’.12 On his tour of European police departments in 1926, American PhD student Sheldon Glueck marvelled at the use of motion pictures in Germany to advise the public of ‘the methods used by criminals’ and the ‘dangers of modern metropolitan life’. Cinematographs in Berlin, Munich and Dresden regularly screened anti-crime films, made by police forces in cooperation with motion picture companies. The film *Gefährten der Großstadtstrasse* (Dangers of the Streets of the Large City) indicated methods of protection against burglars, murders and white slavers.13

The aeroplane raised some alarming possibilities. As soon as the age of aviation began, experts realised the potential for abuse by criminal minds. In 1914, the *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology* included an article about the difficulties presented by ‘the criminal in the air’. The article envisioned the legal complications with a hypothetical case of an American who wished to murder an Italian he had met in France. The American invites the Italian to join him on a voyage of his air-ship, and when above Swiss territory, pushes his victim overboard. The Italian, who falls over Berne, lands in the garden of the Russian minister’s residence, in soil acknowledged to be Russian owing to its diplomatic status. The American continues his aerial voyage, eventually landing in Germany. Because the Italian had expired in midair (the push itself would not have killed him), in space claimed by no sovereign authority, the first complication would be to prove that a crime had actually been committed. Legal authorities would need to decide how far a man would drop into the air before being legally dead, even if it was decided that jurisdiction applied in the country where the body landed.14 In fact, an incident along these lines occurred in 1933. In March of that year, an aero-
plane, *The City of Liverpool*, crashed at Dixmude, Belgium. One of the passengers, a Manchester dentist named Albert Voss, had apparently fallen out before the crash. His body was not burned in a manner consistent with that of the other crash victims and observers speculated about the circumstances of his death. Rumours circulated in the press about drug smuggling on the continent, and Norman Kendal, head of the Metropolitan Police, wanted a post mortem by a competent pathologist. The inquest had been complicated by the legal thicket of international airspace. The acting coroner in Surrey told the Home Office there would be no point to conducting an inquest as the evidence would need to be imported from a foreign country, and even if it could be produced, there would be no legal power to compel attendance of witnesses.¹⁵

Drug traffickers and white slave traders could make use of aeroplanes to expand their evil ventures across the world map. The chief of the Rotterdam Police, Adriaan Sirks, explained how Chinese traffickers made the most of technology to distribute opium throughout British India, Burma, the Malay States, Hong Kong and the Netherlands Indies. ‘The case to which I refer, the gang made use of the most up-to-date methods, even employing an aeroplane’.¹⁶ Henry T.F. Rhodes, who generated a small library of popular books on crime, reiterated Sirks’s point: ‘Every form of transport from the camel to the aeroplane is used by the drug barons….’ He explained how an aeroplane would sweep low to land in a lonely stretch of country. It was a rendezvous with distributors; the packet was deposited at the agreed place, and the ‘plane takes off, and is quickly out of sight’. Aeroplanes proved very useful to the drug barons because they eliminated frontiers and the problems of Customs examinations.¹⁷ In an address to a London audience in 1934, Rachel Crowdy of the League of Nations Traffic in Women Committee, commented on the complications of modern transportation for preventing the white slave trade. It was important for anti-traffic workers to grasp how the methods by which girls were taken from one country to another had changed. No longer was surveillance at ports and railway termini sufficient, but would need to encompass aerodromes and motorways. ‘There is the air problem and still more, the increased road and motor traffic. How much supervision is given to road traffic?’¹⁸

To counter the threat, police forces across Europe and America commissioned corps of police aviators. In 1919, the re-organisation of German police included the formation of a network of aeroplanes to prevent smuggling and criminality in general. A landing place for
police aeroplanes had been built along the Swiss border, with plans for similar facilities at Hamburg, Hanover, Breslau and other towns. These efforts had been occasioned by the successful pursuit by aerial surveillance of smugglers who had attempted to make off for Switzerland with 20 million marks. In Britain, the Liverpool and District Aero Club offered an aviation course to constables, including lectures and demonstrations at the airport. The New York City Police Department deployed an aerial unit in 1918 as part of its reserve unit. Colonel Jefferson de Mont Thompson led a squad of 89 police aviators, many of whom had seen service in the war. Others thought of even more interesting uses. Dr Marie Stopes, who authored Britain’s first manual of sexual health, despatched in 1925 a letter to the editor of Aeroplane containing the proposition that war could be averted forever by using aeroplanes to scatter birth control propaganda throughout the world.

No transportation technology in the interwar period generated greater concern about crime, however, than the motor car. The Home Office Blue-book for 1928 mentioned access to the automobile as one of the reasons for an increase in crime. An editorial in *The Times* applauded this assessment. Aside from the decline in morals and lack of education, changes in the way of life brought about by transportation and communication had helped the criminal. The availability of motor cars, along with the electrification of railway lines, had spread the population over a larger area. Homes in the new suburban areas became easy prey for thieves who could, using transportation, escape back to the anonymity of the city. The police found it difficult to cope with travelling criminals. ‘Not for the first time crime has been made easier and immunity from detection greater by a product of civilisation’.

In the United States, at an initial meeting of Prentiss’s National Crime Commission in 1925, business leaders spoke of losses due to the ‘brazen activities of the modern criminal, with his ready pistol and his purring automobile ready for the “get away”’. At the National Conference of Catholic Charities, Frederick L. Moran of Albany, New York, pointed to the ‘cheap automobile’ as introducing a new ‘species of migratory group’. Families travelled from town to town, sometimes with caravan trailer in tow, and this motorised ‘sort of gypsyhood among low standard families’ represented another evil of the auto. The California Crime Commission concluded in 1929 the time had passed when crime could be solved by local authorities, by city, township and county authorities. Before the advent of rapid travel by automobiles on paved highways, as well as trains and aeroplanes, local peace officers could cope with the situation. But things had changed. A burglar could
commit an offence in Los Angeles one day and appear in San Francisco the next. There was a need for greater involvement by the state government.26 ‘The motor vehicle has ushered in a new era of crime and police problems’ declared Arch Mandel of the Dayton Research Association, ‘and apparently, a new type of offender’. Whereas criminals had not ventured into central cities except at night, it was not uncommon for holdups to occur in these areas at midday. ‘State lines have been eliminated by the automobile. Detection of criminals is becoming more and more a nation-wide task’.27

The motor car threatened to accelerate the commercialisation of sexual conduct. Frederick Sempkins, on behalf of the British Social Hygiene Council, believed prostitution to have increased owing to weakening of family life and social bonds for moral stability. ‘The war had no doubt something to do with this, but the internal combustion engine — which removed the salutary brake of local gossip—probably had more’.28 Dr Johannes Ninck, of the Swiss National Committee of the International Bureau for the Suppression of Traffic in Women, identified the motor car as a real problem for the international anti-traffic effort. Since the Great War, Switzerland had registered a marked decrease in white slave traffic. The closing of the frontier, the introduction of passport control and identification papers, and increased railway fares, had all contributed to the difficulties experienced by traffickers in women and children. But ‘the motor car has become a dangerous weapon in the hands of traffickers. The kidnapping of unsuspecting girls by motor car is often attempted and even accomplished’.29 The annual report of American Social Hygiene Association for 1929 referred to the new threat of roadhouses. Young people had easy access to remote locations for drunkenness, indecent dancing and illicit sexual liaisons. The ‘combination of automobiles, good roads, inns, roadhouses and tourist camps has created many new sex problems the solution of which will tax the ingenuity and resourcefulness of all the social agencies’.30

British observers felt compelled to understand the lessons of the car for American society. P.W. Wilson, a British MP who had emigrated to America, explained the situation confronting Europe. In the United States, the automobile afforded fugitives a real chance to escape justice. A bandit in San Francisco could travel by automobile from coast to coast, a distance of some 3,000 miles, without being asked to produce a passport or other means of identification. In Europe, policing international borders precluded this sort of flight. The rate of automobile ownership across Europe was far less than in the United States, and the range allowed by travel limited to 100 or 200 miles. But, the coming of
the automobile to Europe would Americanise the threat. The authors of a British university textbook for 1934 looked to America for a glimpse at what the car, and other aspects of American culture, would do to Britain. Aspects of the ‘old order’ could still be found England, but would hardly survive another decade; the ‘motor-coach, wireless, cinema and education are rapidly destroying them’. The ‘general process of civilization’ evident in Britain, was on display in America. ‘The wireless, the car, and the movies have become three insidious drugs.’

Americanisation competed with biologistic notions of how advances in civilisation portended new forms of criminality. Flamboyant defence attorney Clarence Darrow explained that civilisation created ‘new crimes and new ways to commit crime’. Stealing and selling automobiles had become a growing business. ‘Probably it will continue to make them until the flying machine is perfected, and then to some extent at least the airplane will take its place....’ The invention of the railway had taken people from the open air and sunlight of the country and small village, and placed them in the city, an atmosphere not really fitted for life. Civilisation had imposed new ‘strain and stress upon man’s nervous system’ and this had brought about ‘abnormalities and excesses that are either crimes or lead to crimes’. Max Schlapp and Edward Smith developed this theme their *The New Criminology* (1928). They dismissed Lombroso’s doctrine of atavistic reversion, but insisted the Italian criminal anthropologist had shown how the root causes of crime could be found through biological, anthropological and medical science. Modern life was responsible, they said, for the rise in madness, idiocy and criminality. Steam transportation, power machinery, motor cars, the telegraph and telephones, wireless, motion pictures, and flying machines ‘have become dreadful weapons turned against the nervous constitution of the western races’.

In addition to transportation, experts rushed to figure out the social impact of new communications medium: broadcast radio. The United States accepted commercial radio early on, with sponsored programmes from the 1920s. By 1923, there were some 460 stations broadcasting at the same wavelength. This uncontrolled growth led to congestion of signals, as stations competed with each other to fill the airwaves with every form of entertainment, to try and blot other rival’s programmes. From the time of the Radio Act (1927), national networks teamed up with sponsors to reach a national radio audience. Britain allowed major manufacturers to form the British Broadcasting Company in 1922, but decided wanted to avoid the chaos crackling over American radio waves. The British Broadcasting Corporation was chartered as a public corpor-
ation, run by an independent board of directors and financed by a licence fee.

American observers bristled at the thought of government censorship, but admitted some radio programming might have an adverse social impact. In 1934, Phillips Lord Inc produced a popular series, *Gangbusters*, which focused on the gangsters at the lawmen’s expense. Lord gleaned his story lines from police files, detective novels and investigative reports. His productions, featuring wailing sirens, feminine shrieks, slamming doors and police calls, won a wide audience. The *Gangbusters* remained a sponsored programme for more than 20 years, but had its critics. In a letter to New York City mayor Fiorello LaGuardia, a citizen complained that *Gangbusters* taught youngsters how to break locks, pick pockets, hide corpses and evade the police. Magazine editors insisted the show presented a do-it-yourself manual rather than a sermon that crime does not pay. A probation officer told *Time* magazine in 1939 that among juveniles apprehended, ‘forty-six young busters admittedly took their cues straight from *Gang Busters*.36 Others detected the potential for crime prevention. The *Gangbusters* series actually began as an FBI production. J. Edgar Hoover commissioned the original production, *G-Men*, to counter public admiration for urban mobsters and Midwestern bandits. But Hoover eschewed sensational aspects and the programme only aired for a single 13-episode season.37

The BBC also sought to use the power of radio for crime prevention. Charles Seipmann, who arranged ‘Talks’ at the BBC, wanted to pursue crime as a theme. In the late 1920s, reports of ‘motor bandits’ began to appear in British newspapers. An *Evening News* article, entitled ‘1907 cannot catch 1927’, described how a ‘smash-and-grab’ raid had taken place before a crowd of shoppers in Kensington. The thieves made away in a motor car while a police constable gave chase on ‘Quicksilver’, a horse. While the country had nothing like the motor bandits of the USA, it was difficult to see how the police would respond without so much as a motorcycle.38 In 1932, Lord Trenchard began preparing a report for how to deal with the problem of ‘motor bandits’. These included organised raids on post offices, jeweller’s shops, bank messengers and railway stations. Home Secretaries and police officers had offered suggestions, and Lord Trenchard, commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, was said to be hard at work on schemes to prevent the problem. Here Seipmann saw his chance.

In November 1932, Seipmann invited Trenchard for a meeting to discuss a radio interview. Seipmann wanted a police official with ‘sufficient public weight’ to give the first talk in a ‘series directing
public attention to the facts of the position relating to crime’. He asked Trenchard to furnish staff to answer questions at a microphone put by examiners. Trenchard said that he would think it over but wanted more information about the questions. He understood he would be asked: How many smash-and-grab raids take place in a month? Is it usually the same type of man? What is the average age? Do men who receive more lenient punishments commit these crimes again, more than those who receive severe sentences? What is the total amount of robbery in London? Is the trend going up or down? Siepmann replied that ‘working out the detail of the series’ was ‘mighty hard’ and that he was ‘not very far along with it’. He assured Trenchard that whatever the questions would be, they would be submitted in advance of the talk. He had several examiners in mind, including Edward Cadogan, of the visitation committee at a Borstal in Rochester, Margery Fry, the first woman in England to become a magistrate and Gervais Rentoul, Select Committee on Capital Punishment. The matter was referred to Sir John Reith at the Home Office, who would not approve it, and Siepmann postponed the series.39

The gangster class

American gangsterism had become such a cliché in Britain by the 1930s that George Orwell mourned the decline of English murder. The ‘perfect English murder’, he explained, involved a professional man in a semi-detached house, a leader of the Conservative party or temperance association. He would have gone astray by holding a secret passion for a secretary or the wife of a professional associate, and have resorted to murder after a long period wrestling with his conscience. Murder, it was decided, would have been less shameful than having been exposed for adultery. Once having decided on murder, he planned the terrible event with clever, bureaucratic precision, and been exposed only by neglecting a trivial detail. The Englishness of the crime ensured a stable society where the all-prevailing hypocrisy at least guaranteed that a crime as serious as murder was explained with reference to strong emotions. Yet the most notorious case in recent years, Orwell lamented, involved an eighteen-year-old English waitress and an American army deserter. ‘The background was not domesticity, but the anonymous life of the dance-halls and false values of the American film’. She described herself as a strip-tease artist and ‘gun-moll’; he claimed to be a ‘big-time Chicago gangster’. Together they murdered a taxi driver for money to spend at the dog races. Orwell hoped the ‘whole meaningless story, with its
atmosphere of dance-halls, movie-palaces, cheap perfume, false names and stolen cars' would not survive the war period.\textsuperscript{40}

While critiques of American influence over British society can be found in the late nineteenth century, British debates about Americanisation took their contemporary form in the decades after the Great War. The term itself, ‘Americanisation,’ seldom appeared in print before 1919. In Britain between the wars, it became a code for invoking an increasing number of changes that unsettled and altered the British cultural landscape.\textsuperscript{41} The Americanisation of crime patterns in Britain was less about identifying the direct cause of fluctuations in crime statistics than about broad influences, or as the \textit{Daily Mirror} put it, ‘certain vague influences that reach us from the underworld of America’. British newspapers maintained a regular and persistent monitor of American criminal justice and what they concluded was disturbing. American criminal justice, which had long ago departed from English models, had lost its way and allowed crime to spiral out of control. It was time for Scotland Yard to take more effective measures against a mentality that divided the nation into honest citizens and gangsters. ‘Once we allow the criminal to think that crime is a facile and profitable way of living and we are confronted with the problem that has become one of the terrors of the United States’.\textsuperscript{42}

The attention paid to Chicago’s reputation for lawlessness led to fears that British cities would fall victim to gangsterism. In the 1930s, Glasgow took the name of ‘the Scottish Chicago’ in local press reports about gang violence. Newspaper stories included claims about individuals with links to America’s underworld. The \textit{Glasgow Weekly Record} told the story in 1929 about Al Capone’s Scottish bodyguard. The more alarming version of such links had to do with accounts of Chicago gangsters migrating from the United States to Britain. The \textit{Weekly Herald} in 1932 attributed an outbreak of smash-and-grab raids in the city to the influence of gunmen from Chicago and New York. On the whole, stories like these warned that Glasgow was turning into Chicago or that the city was already in the grip of Chicago-style gangsters.\textsuperscript{43} Alexander McArthur produced a novel of Glasgow’s gang wars of the 1920s. \textit{No Mean City} narrates the rise and fall of Johnnie Stark, ‘the razor king’, who coordinated pubs raids for whisky and fights with rival gangs. MacArthur, a Glasgow resident, explained that the Glasgow gangster was not a criminal, but a hooligan and a fighter, who battled for excitement and adventure rather than profit. But even MacArthur could not resist the comparison with Chicago. The novel included an appendix of newspaper references to gang activity to show how the story presented a composite of the truth. The Glasgow gangsters and their ‘molls’
frequented dance halls where they slashed faces and thumped heads. ‘The gangsters have come to Britain. Glasgow, the second city the Empire... frankly acknowledges their reign of terror’.44

Glasgow became the British city most closely associated with the gang menace, but the vocabulary of Americanisation and gangsterism began in Sheffield. In the 1920s, gangs organised an open-air gambling racket in the Park district of the city. The battle for control produced murders, stabbings, and assaults between rival gangs and on police constables who attempted to intervene. Newspaper editors feared that magistrates had become intimidated by the power of the gangs and allowed assailants to escape with minor fines. The dynamic began to change in 1926 with the installation of Percy Sillitoe as chief constable. Sillitoe, who would become known as ‘the man who broke the Sheffield gangs’, engaged in a high-profile campaign. He repeatedly reminded the newspapers of his determination to break-up gangs and never missed an opportunity to promote his campaign in court.45

Sillitoe’s efforts received a warm reception from journalists, but there was also a reluctance to accept the notoriety that came with it. The author of a letter to the Sheffield Telegraph approved of the sharp sentences passed on those gangsters responsible for razor attacks on police. But at the time worried that the attention given to cases of outrage gave the impression that Sheffield was a city in peril. ‘Sheffield, in spite of its gangs, is not a dangerous place to live in, yet one would think reading some of the comments on gang cases that it was as lawless as Chicago’. The letter went on to suggest that, quite possibly the evil in Chicago was also exaggerated (‘sometimes they do exaggerate a bit in the U.S.A.’).46 An editorial in the Sheffield Mail pursued a similar theme. ‘Sheffield is not Chicago. Human life and limb are not exposed to American crime risks or a percentage of those risks. Way back in Michigan [Illinois?] our Sheffield gang affrays would seem small affairs to the gunmen and machine-gun bandits’.47 The newspaper affirmed the city’s support for Sillitoe’s success in getting magistrates to take a tougher line on the hooligan. Sillitoe left Sheffield in 1931 to become chief constable of Glasgow, and more than anything else, it was his reputation from Sheffield that earned him his new post. He said that he found Glasgow ‘overrun by gangsters terrorizing other citizens and waging war between themselves in the streets’. In 1933, Sillitoe travelled to Chicago. He gave a speech at the International Association of Chiefs of Police in which he highlighted the differences between American and British crime patterns. Although the fact that he chose Chicago in which to give such a speech might have suggested the parallel was not altogether irrelevant.
The idea of the American gangster with reference to crime in Britain was in large part a device for social commentary. Yet the reference was also understood as social phenomenon. Gangsterism resulted from economic, social and cultural forces at work: full-flower in the United States, green chutes in the United Kingdom. In 1932, the Home Office sent Herbert du Parcq to enquire into the causes of the riot at Dartmoor prison. In January, unrest amongst prisoners left more than 20 prison officers incapacitated or with serious injuries. The governor had maintained order until the arrival of police who forced the rioters back under lock-and-key with a baton charge. Du Parcq did not think there was any substance to the prisoners’ grievances, nor did he fault the administration in general or actions taken by individuals in the days leading up to the riot. Rather, he attributed to the whole affair to the influx of ‘the dangerous modern type of criminal’ to the prison population. ‘In the last few years’, du Parcq told the Home Secretary, ‘a type of prisoner has made his appearance at Dartmoor who may be described conveniently as being of the “motor bandit” or “gangster” class’. He did not say these men had been imported from the United States or that they had been influenced by American gangsters as such. But he was, in invoking the language of gangsters, prepared to understand British crime through the conceptual lens of American crime.48

Specialists in policing and criminology had identified gangsters as a special category of criminal. German policing specialist Robert Heindl published a multi-volume study of the Berufsverbrecher (the professional criminal). The German word implies not only the sense of membership in a profession, but also characterises the activities as ‘work’, that is, skills, competencies, and above all, specialisation. Heindl guessed some 8,500 Berufsverbrecher represented the core of the criminal class of the Weimar Republic. Although some questioned his conceptualisation as an ‘ideal type’, he influenced a generation of police concerned with the growth of crime in big cities. Berlin, with its growing concentration of commercial and manufacturing activities, provided increased opportunities to steal and trade in stolen goods.49

Henry T.F. Rhodes explained that while the word ‘gangster’ was overworked, there was in fact a ‘gangster ideology’ worldwide. Gangsterdom had not developed in England to the same extent as in the United States, and naturally, had nothing to do with Prohibition. But regretfully, instances of bribery, corruption, insurance rackets and match fixing, revealed that gangsters in England could match the brawn and brains of counterparts in America. Organised crime followed that of modern business and those with financial genius crossed into the
criminal sphere. Drug traffic, white slavery, bribery and corruption repre-
represented ‘capitalism gone crooked and mad’. ‘Criminality of this type
is a new phenomenon because it arises directly out of the specific charac-
teristics which belong to our social and economic order. It persists and
grows as our economic system becomes more complex and unmanageable,
and will continue to do so until that system is fundamentally changed’.50

Others took the view that Americanisation of crime had more to do
with the influence of Hollywood on the British mind. Before passage of
the Quota Act (1927), well over 90 per cent of the films screened in
Britain were American productions, and while the number of British
films increased during the 1930s as a result of act, ‘Hollywood’ remained
a synonym for the entire film industry. Crime represented a staple
feature of American entertainment. A typical programme from 1935
included: (1) newsreel, (2) Mickey Mouse in Pluto, (3) Possessed with
Clark Gable and (4) The Little Giant with Edward G. Robinson.51 The
most successful genre of the period, the gangster movie, featured a
criminal character with an attractive personality and the thrill of com-
plicity in watching this character’s violent death. In 1930, the Chicago
Crime Commission released a list of the city’s 28 most dangerous ‘public
enemies’. Newswriters adopted the term, christening Al Capone as ‘Public
Enemy Number One’. The following year, Warner Brothers released
The Public Enemy starring James Cagney. His portrayal established the
image of the gangster for decades: night life, fine clothes and expensive
cars. A small-time crook and ethnic minority (Irish) from a tough neigh-
bourhood, Cagney presented a character so determined to crawl out of
poverty that only an army of G-men with machine guns could stop
him. In response to the allegations of critics who charged that Cagney’s
characters glorified violence, his studio cast him in roles of police officer
or criminals who collapsed on their way to the electric chair.52

American observers tended to take the view that British people were
wrong to worry about Hollywood influence, because in reality, the
United States was nothing like what appeared on the screen. In a 1939
speech, the American ambassador to Britain, Joseph Kennedy, explained
that given the flood of American films, British people could be forgiven
for thinking that nothing happened on the other side of the Atlantic
except for ‘gangster shootings, rapes and kidnappings’.53 William Snow,
who presided over the American Social Hygiene Association, agreed with
a British colleague about the dubious moral message in many Holly-
wood films. ‘I am not at all shocked at what you say about American
films. Very many people in this country feel as strongly as you do....’
He went on to explain that censorship had been tried in 48 states
‘without very great success’ and censorship at the federal level was opposed by many people on various grounds. Unfortunately, films that had been seen by relatively few people, owing to a storm of protest in each community where they were shown, were then shipped to other countries. By design, the worst films went abroad. ‘Films which not only show America at its worst, but an America which does not really exist….’

For other British social critics, the problem was not the influence of America as pictured on the film, but the influence of the film itself. Too many American movies featured physical violence, encouraged the ‘romance of lawlessness’, portrayed ‘luxury in its most vulgar and ostentatious forms’ and the encouraged the ‘less edifying aspects of sex’. While such themes were common to crude melodrama the world over, they had been developed to an unparalleled level by the ‘peculiar genius’ of American cinematographers. While visiting picture houses in New York City, one Londoner reported having learned three ingenious methods of committing a felony. Films represented ‘powerful aids to crime’ by demonstrating how to cut a telephone line, steal an automobile and handle a loaded revolver. If all this was not bad enough, there was a more subtle criminal psychology underlying many of the plots. The hero and heroine always began poor, depicted in humble circumstances made especially ugly. By the end of the picture, they became rich, and they did so without any virtue except for good looks and luck.

The British Board of Film Censors worried about scenes demonstrating the methods of crime that might lend themselves to imitation, and about lowering the moral tone of youth behaviour generally. The BBFC expressed its view in 43 rules, most of which concerned moral issues along the lines of prostitution, pre-marital sex, and sexual perversion. The rules also included specific prohibition on films showing the modus operandi of criminals, gruesome murders, executions, white slave traffic, drug addiction and drug smuggling. The board insisted stories could not be solely about crime and the criminal life, without any counter-balancing of romance and adventure. As the board explained in rejecting one screenplay about gangsters surrounding a Chinese restaurant in the imaginary Tiger Bay slum of London: ‘The whole story is an exact replica of the worst type of American gangster film with the scene laid out in London amidst low and sordid surroundings. The minor characters are drunken sailors and prostitutes of every race and colour. The dialogue savours strongly of American phrases and is frequently coarse’. The most screened author of the 1930s, Edgar Wallace, who supplied the
basis for 39 British and American films, frequently ran into difficulty with his depiction of criminality. In rejecting a Wallace novel *When the Gangs Came to London* (1932), the board explained why it had ‘a good deal of trouble with “gangster films” in recent years’. Only because they were American did the board allow them to pass because ‘in this country we do not allow our police to be shown on the screen as incompetent or accepting bribes from criminals’. Wholesale machine-gun murders might be appropriate for depiction on the streets of Chicago, but not London. The board could not accept a plot in which the Metropolitan Police had to rely on a junior American police officer, nor a picture in which an MP was shot dead on the floor of the House of Commons.57

The chief constable of Wallasey was in no doubt about the influence of Hollywood films on Britain’s youth. He issued in 1933 a report with the details of a rise in youth involved in house-breaking and shop-breaking. Most of the youthful offenders responsible for the thefts were not ‘the criminal type’, but young people from good families tempted into crime by idleness. He did, never-the-less, urge consideration of an ominous sign. ‘I cannot refrain from commenting adversely on the pernicious and growing habit of youth in using Americans…’ the chief constable said, ‘to appear, in their own vernacular, “tough guys”’. On one of my officers going to search him a young housebreaker said to him “Lay off, cop”. “Oh yeah!” is a frequent answer to charges, and we are promised “shoots up in the burg”, and threatened with being “bumped off” by these would be racketeers, who are mere boys and who have never been away from their home towns’.58 The London underworld as well appeared vulnerable to Hollywood influence. A local news reporter investigating Islington’s most notorious café in 1933 found girls playing the ‘hard-boiled’ Kate role, next to men dressed in Chicago-style overcoats and hats.59 French journalists were also prepared to believe in the suggestive power of cinema. Newspapers in Paris pointed to the cinema as the inspiration for a series of burglaries in the district of Passy, in which thieves had entered flats by climbing water spouts and scaling high walls.60

Cyril Burt, school psychologist for the London County Council, thought it was easy to blame the cinema for misbehaviour in young people. Films had the power to induce criminal behaviour, but not in the ways most commentators worried about. The cinema, he said, had been ‘freely censured and abused for stimulating the young adventurer to mischief, folly and even crime’. Among the critics were teachers, magistrates and chief constables. In his research, he found 7 per cent of delinquent boys visiting the cinema 2–3 times per week, and in a few
cases, had ranked it as the ‘principle cause of crime’. But he also pointed out that young people were quick to offer the cinema to deflect blame from their own moral laxity. The power of the moving pictures could be stated in three ways, the first two of which were over-rated as causes of delinquency. First, there were the suggestability of ‘crook films’. He found no evidence of crime as a result of the faculty of imitativeness; only the most ‘dull children’ found inspiration in these themes. Second, the moral censors claimed the attraction of the cinema led young persons to steal to obtain money for admittance. This too could only be said to affect a few. Three, there were ‘general and more elusive influences’; and here, Burt suggested, was the main source of harm. The themes depicted in cinemas promoted unceasing excitement and extreme emotionalism as normal adult characteristics. Within the story, the villain formed a lasting mental picture, a memory more permanent than an abstract moral rule. ‘Far better is it’ Burt concluded, ‘that notions and images of vice should never be placed before the eyes at all’.61

‘The international Jew’

Not everyone who referred to an international underworld imagined a conspiracy behind it. But for a certain number of public intellectuals, the problem of international crime was not about technological advance or American gangsterism but ‘international Jewry’. They saw the criminal underworld as a hierarchy of criminals around the world, led by the unrivalled masters of organised criminality.

The myth of Jewish criminality figured into National Socialist ideology. Overtly anti-Semitic tracts such as Der Jude als Verbrecher (The Jew as Criminal), published in Berlin in 1937, declared swindling to be the ‘typical Jewish crime’. Jews were said to engage in swindles involving precious gemstones, worthless goods, and frauds involving securities, stocks, cheques and insurance. There were no greater masters of einspongs geschäfte, the confidence game, than Jews. The authors described an international version in which the victim is induced to providing cash to cover the purchase of saws from a German supplier to be resold to a buyer waiting in London. When the sale falls through, the cash has gone astray and the goods turn out to be worthless. ‘Do we still need to attest that there are no greater masters of einspongs geschäfte than the Jews?’ In their chapter on white slavery, they purport to explain how the Jewish ability to operate as imposters enables them to carry on the traffic in young women under disguise as Russians. Jewish traffickers worked out of a hotel in the Alexanderplatz, not far from the Jewish
Quarter, where in conjunction with a cook who doubled as a procuress, they secured women for the brothels of Buenos Aires. They worked in conjunction with recruiters, employers and other middlemen, but remained directors behind the scenes. Although there was still much the authorities needed to learn and white slavery, ‘Only one thing can we maintain with certainty—that the great majority of white slavers are Jews. This fact cannot be contested’.62

Claims about Jewish superiority in international crime were not limited to Nazi rhetoric. In reminiscences about his career as a detective inspector with Scotland Yard, Percy J. Smith defined ‘international crooks’ as the ‘cleverest, craftiest and most resourceful of all criminals operating’. He devoted most of one chapter to his experience with a Jewish tobacconist who had been ‘trimmed’ by a Jewish confidence trickster. The tobacconist, who had saved a great deal of money, lost it to a Russian Jew posing as a sailor, who had lured his victim with a tale about his willingness to part with a leather bag full of diamonds for a small amount of cash. Jewish criminal had taken advantage of Jewish victim, or as Smith summarised: ‘Greed had once again met greed, and the cleverer had won the round’.63 A French detective, René Cassellari, claimed that Jews were responsible for the white slave trade in France. During his 20 years with the Sûrété Général, he had learned the methods of these criminals. Paris had always been a ‘happy hunting ground’ for the ‘loathsome creatures’ who scoured the streets to find beautiful women to entice to a life of shame in some country like Argentina. ‘Cunning was not the word. The white slavers, most of them International Jews, required no telling that the boat-trains out of Paris were being closely watched by men of the Sûrété…’. The trade operated out of houses on the edge of Paris, always on the main railways lines to Havre, Boulogne, Cherbourg and other port cities with routes to South America. No fast trains stopped at such places, which is just what the white slavers wanted. They took the slowest trains of which no one took the slightest notice. Castellari boasted to having broken up a gang operating from Sart rouville, near Paris, who had turned the inside of a modest house into a hotel and kept a stock of passports for their victims.64

When Graham Greene wanted to create international criminals for his ‘entertainments’, he made them Jewish characters. In A Gun For Sale, Sir Marcus presents a Jewish criminal who can pass for a member of a respectable English family. He lives in hotels, Claridge’s in London and the Carlton in Cannes, or with influential friends, such as Soppelsa’s yacht off Rhodes. He amassed a fortune in the illegal arms trade through
neutral countries in Europe, from gold mines in the Rand and petroleum operations in East Africa, maintained with favours to political figures and pay-offs to intermediates. He does not hesitate to hire professional killers to remove those in his way, and dies in the end, blinded by his arrogance and self-importance. In *Brighton Rock*, the Boy receives instructions to call on Mr Colleoni ‘a small Jew with a new round belly’ in the lavish surroundings of the Cosmopolitan Hotel. Colleoni warns the Boy to stay away from the betting rackets surrounding the races even though he makes it clear this is only a small part of his illegal empire. ‘His old Semitic face showed few emotions but a mild amusement, a mild friendliness; but suddenly sitting there in the rich Victorian room, with the gold lighter in his pocket and the cigar-case on his lap, he looked as a man might look who owned the whole world, the whole visible world that is, the cash registers and policemen and prostitutes, Parliament and the laws which say “this is Right and this is Wrong”’.65

Supposedly, Jewish criminals had the capacity to pass between the ‘upperworld’ and ‘underworld’, to instigate secret intrigues in high places and to profit from ordinary criminal activities well-known to police. Agatha Christie regularly included Jewish characters in her stories of the 1920s and 1930s; some of these are labelled as Jews, others can be identified from Jewish names. Like Greene, she evokes stereotypes of Jewish characteristics; her Jewish characters are foreign, rather clever, and engaged in professions related to finance, banking, art, antiques and diamonds. In *The Mystery of the Blue Train*, the great detective Hercule Poirot exposes M. Papopolous, an antique dealer who ‘deals with the highest in Europe and with the lowest riff-raff of the underworld’. Papopolous has a small shop in Paris but the police suspect him of being ‘something more…a receiver of stolen goods, especially jewels’. He is thought to be Greek, but Poirot knows better. He reminds Papopolous of a scandal some years earlier. ‘Seventeen years is a long time’, Poirot says, ‘but your race does not forget’. ‘A Greek?’ Papopolous replies, to which the detective explains that it was not his Greek identity to which he was referring. ‘You are right, Mr Poirot’ he said quietly. ‘I am a Jew. And as you say, our race does not forget’.66

Nesta Webster, who combined a writing career with political activism, popularised Jewish conspiracy theories. After several novels, she turned to ‘nonfiction’, beginning with an account the French Revolution, followed by studies of revolutionary movements and secret societies in world history. She charged that Jews set into motion the ‘five great powers at work in the world’, of freemasonry, theosophy, pan-Germanism, international finance and Bolshevism, and had a pivotal role in ‘minor
subversive movements’: psychoanalysis, degenerate art, cinema and drug trafficking.\textsuperscript{67} In \textit{Secret Societies and Subversive Movements} (1924), she claimed to have a letter from a New York physician confirming a connection between ‘radicalism and narcoticism’. Members of the federal narcotics squad, charged with enforcing the Harrison Narcotics Act, explained that narcotics traffic had furnished radicals with large profits. During the summer of 1920, seven New York physicians had been arrested for illegitimate use of narcotic prescriptions, and when raided, every office contained large quantities of radical literature. The letter went on to say that an investigation by a national magazine confirmed that the narcotics distributors ‘were almost invariably of the Jewish race, and that the pedlars were exclusively Jewish and Italian’. She went on to insinuate a Jewish susceptibility to mental illness and anarchism. Quoting a report from an American psychiatrist, she wrote that anarchists have been ‘developed largely from the criminal classes’ and that ‘anarchy,\textit{ per se}, is a psychopathic manifestation’. A student of anarchism, therefore, would not only be obliged to cover the field of criminology, but its more significant and important background, psychopathology.\textsuperscript{68}

In Britain, George Sydenham Clark, the first Viscount Sydenham of Combe, advanced imperialist and anti-socialist causes in addition to tales of Jewish conspiracies. He was a professional military officer, who had served on the War Office staff and as governor of Bombay, who produced a series of essays on military science and imperial defence. In the 1920s, he joined the Liberty League (as did Rudyard Kipling and H. Rider Haggard) to combat Bolshevism in the United Kingdom, and together with George Harvey, the American ambassador to Britain, promoted anti-League of Nations sentiment in the United States.\textsuperscript{69} Sydenham praised Webster for detailing what he referred to as ‘the Jewish world problem’, that of a coordinated Jewish effort to undermine the British Empire. A small number of Jews across western countries grasped control of political affairs and key industries; it was the same, he said, with cinema and the drug traffic.\textsuperscript{70}

Sydenham promoted the first English edition of \textit{The Protocols of the Elders of Zion}. Ostensibly the minutes of the first Zionist congress at Basle in 1897, the book purported to detail a plot by Jews for gaining control over Gentiles throughout the world. The first evidence exposing the \textit{Protocols} as a forgery appeared in August 1921 in a \textit{Times} series entitled ‘The Truth About the Protocols’. The Tsarist secret police cooked up the material in order to provoke pogroms against Jews and to deflect anger from their monarch. An English translation, published by Eyre and
Spottiswoode, entitled *The Jewish Peril*, appeared in 1920 and sold out of its original print run of 30,000. The Britons, a society dedicated to distributing anti-Semitism, brought out two new editions before the end of the year. Basil Thomson, head of Special Branch at the Metropolitan Police, suspected a forgery. Europe, in the 1920s, was full of Russians who tried to pass for secret agents and they produced loads of unreliable documents. But he felt the story was more or less true anyway: ‘No doubt the famous Protocols faithfully reflect the kind of talk that has been current among fanatically Nationalist Jews among themselves for more than a century’. Thomson welcomed anti-Semitism as a hedge against Bolshevist influence, a position he shared with Sydenham.71 In November 1921, Sydenham published an article defending *The Protocols* as revealing the truth of Jewish activity behind-the-scenes. ‘Forgers are unable to secure the accuracy of their forecasts, and most of the prophesies in the Protocols stand fulfilled before our eyes’.72

In America, the proponents of Jewish conspiracy theory included Charles Coughlin, a Catholic priest and radio presenter. In *Money: Questions and Answers* (1936), Coughlin declared the world’s real rulers to be the controllers of finance, and offered a quote from Meyer Amschel Rothschild as proof of this strategy. Through international manipulation of gold, a small group of ‘money creators’ living in various countries, ensured that wars would continue. International bankers ruled the world by manipulating the money structure of various nations, and in this way, they ‘dominate and control both the economic and social life of any nation’. In an appendix, he offered a look at secret correspondence in which an ‘American international banker’ in New York invited the ‘Rothschilds, International Bankers’ in London to take advantage of weak legal structure of the United States that allowed national banks complete control of national finance.73

Coughlin assisted at several parishes in Detroit before being sent in 1926 to a congregation in Royal Oak, Michigan, where he started a weekly radio broadcast over a local station. The CBS network carried his broadcast but took him off the air in 1931 given his refusal to tone down his criticism of President Herbert Hoover. Coughlin responded by organising his own network programme carried by some 30 stations which reached an audience estimated at 30 million. Coughlin initially supported President Roosevelt but became disillusioned. He accused Roosevelt of leaning toward ‘international socialism’ and praised Hitler and Mussolini for their fight against Communism. In 1934, he formed the National Union of Social Justice, which at the time represented a significant political rival to the Democrat Party. He published *Social
Justice Weekly, with a circulation of a million, as well as a number of books. After his failure to deny Roosevelt’s re-election, he temporarily withdrew from the air waves. But he returned with even more extreme views. In 1941, Coughlin said that Stalin’s and Hitler’s bid to create world domination were ‘not half as dangerous’ as the ‘Roosevelt-Churchill combination’. When the United States entered the war, the National Association of Broadcasters withdrew Coughlin from radio and the US Post Office banned his weekly paper.74

But no one had a more decisive role in linking the myth of international crime and Jewish conspiracy theory than Boris Brasol. Brasol—lawyer, spy, criminologist, and anti-Semite—arrived in New York City during the Great War. Formerly a prosecuting attorney in St Petersburg, he lectured on Russian literature at Columbia University and joined the Criminological Survey Commission at the university’s law school in 1925. He churned out criminology articles and books, including a popular text, The Elements of Crime, in which he reviewed the aetiology of criminal behaviour alongside a description of criminal law.75 Brasol welcomed efforts underway in Vienna to found a permanent international police bureau to deal with the activities of international forgers, counterfeiters and murderers. ‘The need for such an organ is obvious, since, as stated, professional criminality itself is no longer a local affair, confined to territorial limits of this or that particular state’. In Crime, Criminology and Criminological Institutes (1938), Brasol underlined the significance of professional criminality in the development of criminology in Europe and America. There was a marked tendency among professional criminals to improve the technique of perpetrating offences. ‘It may seem a paradox, and yet it is true, that no line of human “endeavor” is progressing as rapidly as criminality. The modern criminal is fully equipped with all the latest devices of technique, and, accordingly, criminal activities have assumed a highly efficient, and, at times, strictly scientific character’.76

Brasol’s anti-Semitism overlapped his criminology. In The World at the Cross Roads, he offered fantastic accounts of international Jewish conspiracies from the Russian Revolution to the League of Nations, and in Socialism and Civilisation, developed the connection between Bolshevism, criminality and Jewishness. In Russia, the forcible overthrow of the provisional government ‘was carried out entirely by the irresponsible mob of sailors, idle workmen, deserters from the front, German agents and Jewish internationalists’. In the United States, Jews carried out destructive work, including the posting of more than a hundred letter-bombs to various officials. Bomb outrages were carried
out by ‘conscious enemies of civilization, fanatical dreamers, and criminal ex-convicts, guided and organized by the treacherous internationalists’. Most of the Bolshevist propaganda in the United States, he insisted, was distributed by ‘different aliens, among whom are many Finns, Jews, and Hungarians’. But Brasol did not stop here. He had also been an agent in the Okhrana and anti-Semitic propagandist, and shortly after his arrival in the United States, organised a network of former Tsarist officers within the Russian émigré population. One of his first projects was to produce an English translation of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion. Brasol arranged for the daughter of a former Tsarist general to make a translation, and to circulate her work, he contacted the Ford Motor Company. Brasol’s efforts led to a series in Henry Ford’s newspaper, the Dearborn Independent, and later, a book by Ford entitled, The International Jew.

The ‘international Jew’, Ford wrote, referred to the ‘Jew who exercises international control’. It was unfortunate that those who sought to grasp world-control came from the Jewish race, because this reflected badly on ordinary Jews. But there was no other racial or national type that produced such grappers and wielders of world-domination. ‘It is not merely that there are a few Jews among international financial controllers; it is that these world controllers are exclusively Jews’. The international Jew was not only rich, but in possession of a ‘commercial and masterful genius’, that when combined with ‘racial loyalty’, produced a power unavailable to any other group. The International Jew included two chapters on Jewish criminality, one purporting to explain the origins of the ‘Jewish liquor trust’ and the other on the ‘Jewish bootlegging evil’. The illicit liquor trade, both before and after prohibition, had always been Jewish. It was not that every bootlegger one might encounter was a Jew, but rather, that it was unlikely any Jewish bootlegger would even be encountered. Jewish control of the illegal liquor trade did not occur openly, but at the level of wholesale supply and underground distribution. Further, Jews used their control of cinema, jazz music and the theatre to promote and maintain ‘the idea of drink’ in everyday life. The ‘drip of whiskey’ was constant in all of the ‘Jew-written, Jew-produced, and Jew-controlled’ productions on the stage.

Conclusions

References to crime in the 1920s and 1930s alluded to the spectre of an international underworld. Although no one could be sure, from various reports it appeared that criminal networks extended from city to city,
across the Atlantic, throughout Europe, throughout the world. Police officials, leaders of international charities and other experts warned of a new generation of criminals who made of the most of advances in communication and transportation. Forgers, swindlers and thieves travelled with ease in automobiles. Drug traffickers and white slave traders ferried their merchandise across borders with aeroplanes.

For some, the threat of underworld crime was only an illusion of film. Hollywood sent so many films across the Atlantic, featuring machine guns and big cars, it appeared Chicago gangsters might leap off cinema screens into the streets of British cities. American commentators suggested Americanisation of crime was not really underway in Britain because America was not really full of gangsters, guns and cars. Others saw deeper global conspiracies. References to Jewishness, internationalism and criminality appeared in books by police authorities and social critics, as well as popular crime novels. Hitler found a copy of Ford’s work, which had been published in German in 1922, at the National Socialist Institute in Munich. Hitler admired Ford’s industrial genius and anti-Bolshevist stance, and relied on Ford’s writings for his own work, Mein Kampf. The International Jew remained at arm’s length in Hitler’s private office.
In Murder on the Orient Express (1934) Agatha Christie’s detective Hercule Poirot solves the case of a murdered American industrialist. When questioning the Hungarian countess, Poirot announces himself as an ‘international detective’. The countess responds by asking about the basis of this internationalism: ‘You belong to the League of Nations?’ to which Poirot declares, ‘I belong to the world, Madame’. Both the question and the answer provide significant clues about the League of Nations and its role in crime prevention between the wars.

The League of Nations was born in Paris in 1919. President Woodrow Wilson insisted on chairing the League commission because the League of Nations represented the centrepiece of his peace settlement. The commission drew up the blueprint for the new political machinery, and although neither the British nor the French believed it would work, both agreed to it. The Constitution contained 23 articles, only two of which dealt with issues of crime. But as early as 1921, when the League’s failure as a political institution became apparent, the issue of crime acquired importance. Advocates championed the League’s activities in suppressing dangerous drugs and trafficking in women as justification for its continued existence. What began as an institution for pre-empting the clash of empires became a multi-national institution for crime prevention. In the process, League enthusiasts offered a series of arguments that formed the lore of international crime.

The International Criminal Police Commission (later to become known as INTERPOL) began in 1923. At international conferences, diplomats took the view that informal police cooperation furnished the best response to dealing with cross-border crimes. But the police responsible for the Commission wanted formal incorporation into the League of Nations and the credibility that came with the backing of international
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treaties. The leadership of the Commission tried to establish a relationship, until 1936, when the German delegation at the conference in Belgrade voted against cooperation. Hitler had taken Germany out of the League and they deferred to the wishes of their leader. Nazification of the International Criminal Police Commission and other organisations, such as the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission and the International Bureau for the Suppression of Traffic in Women, made fiction out of the promise of international justice.

International police

In December 1919, Marius van Houten circulated a letter to police executives in various countries containing his proposals for an international policing organisation. Van Houten, a district commander in Eindhoven, had achieved the rank of captain in the Royal Military Police during the war. An international police organisation was needed, he suggested, owing to the emergence of a ‘new class of criminal—the international criminal’. It was undeniable that crime had increased in the aftermath of the war. Many people had become depraved, the result of having to live like savages during the years of conflict. Children carried on without proper supervision and many of their parents, who formerly possessed respect for the law, had been forced to follow devious paths. Many former soldiers had resigned themselves to acts of murder, brutality and theft. The clash of nations had given the criminal element the opportunity of learning foreign languages and of becoming familiar with cultures in other countries. The international criminal also received a boost from advances in transportation and communication. The railway, telegraph, telephone, automobile, aeroplane and wireless had revolutionised the nature and methods of crime.

The organisation van Houten had in mind would remove the difficulties of inter-police cooperation. It would tackle the crimes included in existing extradition agreements as well as emerging international crimes. As a matter of bureaucratic structure, the organisation could follow along the lines identified in the international treaties agreed in 1904 and 1910 concerning the white slave traffic. Each country would establish a national bureau, charged with communicating with a similar bureau in every other country, and forwarding this correspondence to an international bureau that would serve as world headquarters. The international bureau would be attached to the League of Nations. It would submit to the Council proposals for prevention and detection of international crime, offer advice concerning international regulations
relevant to police, collect the descriptions, photographs and files of international criminals; circulate information about crimes via a police journal, and conduct further investigations when needed.\textsuperscript{4}

The idea found a positive reception in Britain where there had been some interest in international police cooperation. In 1898, the government sent Howard Vincent, the first to head the Criminal Investigation Division at Scotland Yard, to the International Defence Against Anarchism Conference in Rome. Vincent took the lead at the conference in pulling together the police authorities in attendance for a ‘closed door’ session to discuss cooperative measures. The police emphasised the need for improving inter-departmental communication and agreed to combine their knowledge of suspects. The diplomats gathered at Rome did not agree a formal treaty, however, and few nations followed through with domestic legislation to carry out resolutions passed at the conference. The British government did not participate in the International Police Congress convened in Monaco in 1914. This congress was attended by French legal authorities, as well as representatives from Italy and Russia. There was some discussion that diplomatic formalities hindering international police cooperation should be abandoned in favour of direct, informal police communication, but the outbreak of war ended any movement toward building a practical framework.\textsuperscript{5}

Basil Thomson, assistant commissioner of the Metropolitan Police and head of Special Branch CID, welcomed van Houten’s letter. During the war years, he had developed a speciality in dealing with internal security and counter-espionage. The Secret Service Bureau had collected information about German spies and it fell to the head of the CID to arrest and interrogate suspects. Following the Armistice, the Home Office created a Directorate of Intelligence with Thomson as director.\textsuperscript{6} Thomson took on anti-Bolshevik work and may have seen the value of international police cooperation in this connection.\textsuperscript{7} Lloyd George sacked Thomson in 1921 (after a report describing his special branch as wasteful and inefficient), but by this time, other police authorities in Britain appreciated van Houten’s argument as well. Sir Leonard Dunning, HM Inspector of Constabulary, remarked in 1922 about the ‘changing character of crime’. While the number of crimes of violence was decreasing, the number of crimes involving careful organisation and intelligent anticipation was increasing. ‘Modern crime is civilised and educated, because the criminal of to-day knows that it is far safer and more profitable to swindle hundreds than to rob one by knocking him on the head’. Recent developments, such as savings accounts by post, and forms of insurance, had opened the door to larceny and fraud.\textsuperscript{8}
Van Houten’s proposals did not take shape until Johann Schober organised the first International Police Congress. Schober was chief of the Vienna police, and when neither of the two largest political parties in Austria could win a clear majority, he was asked to lead a coalition government. When he completed his term as chancellor in 1921, he returned to the office of Polizeipräsident. Two years later, he welcomed 120 delegates from 20 states to Vienna to pursue international police cooperation. The delegates considered proposals to establish an international bureau, an international training school, a news service for police, and a means for universalising the Jorgensen system of criminal identification. Dr Bruno Schultz of the Vienna Police insisted that diplomatic channels for police communication should be abandoned in favour of direct communication within a network. The delegates agreed to establish national bureaus for dealing with counterfeit money, to maintain regulation communication with one another, and contribute to a central headquarters. They discussed whether to attach their international bureau to the League of Nations, possibly to the Secretariat in Geneva.

In the end, it was decided that Vienna should become the headquarters for the new International Kriminalpolizeiliche Komission (International Criminal Police Commission), owing to its growing reputation for expertise in dealing with international crimes. In the aftermath of the war, the city attracted an influx of cross-border criminals and received notoriety as the centre for international crime. The Vienna Police had specialised units for passport forgeries, fingerprinting, criminal records and counterfeiting. The government of Austria agreed to provide financial support and office space, as well as staff to run the Commission’s day-to-day activities. Schober became president, Schultz vice president, and Oskar Dressler, counsellor at Vienna police headquarters, secretary general. In London, The Times said the event signalled ‘a new era in the fight waged by the police against professional international criminals’.

Members of the new police organisation agreed to meet once a year for a congress. Police officials from across Europe returned to Vienna in 1924, and in 1926, went to Berlin, for a gathering to coincide with the International Police Exhibition to be held that autumn. The Berlin police exhibition extended across 20,000 square meters along the Kaiserdamm. The event drew more than 200 participants from police authorities in 29 nations along with half a million visitors. The public learned about methods of detection in murder cases, means of traffic control, and the latest in professional crime-fighting technology. During the Weimar era, telephones, teletype and motor vehicles became part of everyday policing. At this time, the Commission was composed of members from
Austria, Belgium, Bavaria, Bulgaria, Bremen, China, Cuba, Danzig, Denmark, Egypt, Germany, Greece, Hamburg, Ireland, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Portugal, Prussia, Saxony, Spain, Czechoslovakia, Wurttemburg, Sweden and Switzerland. In 1928, a system of annual dues based on population was put into effect. In 1930, at the international police congress in Antwerp, the members formally voted to become independent and choose their leaders by majority vote rather than having them appointed from the Austrian police. Great Britain sent a delegate, Leonard Dunning, to the Amsterdam congress of 1927. He followed-up with a favourable report and recommended future British participation by a senior member of CID. It became customary for the assistant commissioner of the Metropolitan Police to lead a United Kingdom delegation at the congress. France sent a delegate to Amsterdam as well.

Paul Servais opened the 1930 International Criminal Police Congress at Antwerp on behalf of the Belgian government. He dwelt on the necessity of close cooperation between the police services of all countries in the suppression of crime. The congress agreed to resolutions concerning traffic in dangerous drugs, suppression of the white slave trade and regulations for an international police wireless service. The participants also agreed to a resolution about the importance of investigating ‘the personality of dangerous criminals’ and of ‘instruction in criminal biology’ toward this end. At the congress, Dr Salvatore Ottolenghi, professor of legal medicine and director of the school of scientific police at the University of Rome, ‘spoke with great fire’ about criminal biology. Ottolenghi promoted the idea of the ‘real’ criminal as a biological phenomenon. According to the ‘constitutional school’ of criminology, hereditary abnormalities of individuals made it impossible for them to resist untoward influences of their environment. Ottolenghi’s bulletin included research based on prisoners from Regina Coeli and proposals for eugenic policies to eliminate physical abnormalities associated with criminality.

Although the names of van Houten and Schober became associated with the establishment of the International Criminal Police Commission, they were not the first to propose international police cooperation. Schober himself suggested the idea originated in America. In 1921, journalist Joseph Gollomb urged the sharing of police expertise as a hedge against international crime. The worldwide crime wave could not be met with national responses alone, he said, and counselled American police forces to study their European counterparts. ‘The police power of the world has been rudely shaken by events. It needs reconstruction, revitalization, and above all increased international cooperation’.
New Yorkers were prone to believe their police department to be the best on the earth, the mounting epidemic of unsolved murders and robberies proved there was much that could be learned from practises in Europe. Gollomb reviewed the methods followed by Scotland Yard, Paris police, and Berlin police department in tracking criminals. ‘As the criminal becomes more and more international in his operations, more and more cosmopolitan in his knowledge of the ways of the man hunters, so the latter, too, are forced to become broader in their hunting methods.’ Some day there might be realised the dream of several visionaries among police leaders: an international police headquarters in The Hague or some other city where policing in Europe could proceed on ‘a world-wide scope and with the combined skill of all nations’.17

Richard Enright, commissioner of police in New York City, took steps toward international cooperation. In 1921, Enright began talking about the establishment of an international institute of criminology to foster cooperation among nations in tracking and watching criminals.18 A year later, he made a European tour to meet with police in a number of cities, including Paris, Naples, Rome, Vienna, Berlin, Brussels and London. He returned with the vision for ‘a police league of nations’, the advantages of which would be ‘efficient hunting of criminals’ for whom there would be ‘no place of refuge’. He raised this proposal at the National Police Conference. Organised in 1921, the National Police Conference brought together police from 700 cities across the United States, Canada and Mexico. Enright told the press the New York conference would include several European police officials, including Paul Reichter of Berlin, Johann Schober of Vienna and August Eeffer of Brussels.19

American authorities persisted in their efforts toward setting up an international police network, at least in the 1920s. In 1923, Rush L. Holland, an assistant attorney general, toured European capitals with the aim of establishing links with the US Department of Justice. As planned, the Department of Justice would exchange information such as personal descriptions, fingerprints and other criminal records with European police organisations. By setting up working agreements for the direct exchange of information, law enforcement authorities could avoid the bureaucracy and delay of diplomatic channels. Holland visited William Horwood, commissioner of the Metropolitan police, in London, before meeting with officials at the Hague, Brussels, Paris and Rome.20 Later, he announced that a detective would be stationed in Paris as the department’s representative. He intended to set up inter-

The United States did not join the International Criminal Police Commission until the 1930s. In April 1930, the Chicago Crime Commission released a list of the city’s 28 most dangerous ‘public enemies’ and journalists across the country adopted the language. Al Capone became ‘public enemy number one’. Two years later, the loss of aviator Charles Lindbergh’s infant son raised awareness of kidnapping, and in early 1933, when President Franklin Roosevelt took office, there was interest in establishing a federal police force. Roosevelt took particular notice of John Dillinger, a notorious bank robber who had captured the public imagination through daring bank robberies, an escape from jail, and shoot-outs with police. Roosevelt pressurised J. Edgar Hoover and the Bureau of Investigation (which became the Federal Bureau of Investigation in 1935) to capture Dillinger who continued to evade law enforcement. In 1934, there were reports that America’s most notorious criminal was headed for England. Canadian, British and American authorities searched a number of transatlantic ships. Hoover made plans for posting one of his agents in London and opened a correspondence with the international police organisation in Vienna.

The US Congress approved membership in the International Criminal Police Commission in 1938, quite possibly, due to the efforts of the United Kingdom. In 1936, the office of Anthony Eden, Secretary of State, learned of the Hoover’s plans to station an agent in London. As he understood it, this agent would observe the enforcement of European methods and investigate apparent violations of American law. When the American embassy asked whether this agent would receive diplomatic status, Eden was willing to provide some assistance in explaining European practices, but asked for clarification about the investigations anticipated. The commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, Philip Lane, told Eden that as far as he was concerned, the study of British methods was ‘more a matter for a visit than for a permanent appointment’. And as for the investigative function, the amount of work that could be carried out in Britain concerning violations of US law ‘would be very small indeed’. The Metropolitan Police had a good relationship with the FBI so there was nothing to extending cooperation as needed. Lane suggested the British government encourage the American government to appoint a representative to
the Commission. If this hint could be ‘politely conveyed’ it might be a useful way of avoiding the appointment ‘which might well turn out to be embarrassing’. Further, the inclusion of American police on the Commission would also help deal with the problem of private police organisations, based in America, that tried to force their way into the organisation.24

Crime and the League

Van Houten, like the Hungarian countess aboard the Orient Express, thought international police should be linked in some way with the League of Nations. The League of Nations grew out the international peace movement in the late nineteenth century. In European politics, this was the time of ‘the great game’, when conspiracies flourished among the British, Tsarist, and French military officers as their empires jostled for position. Secret agreements between empires, espionage, coalitions and suspicions—the backdrop to the drama in Rudyard’s Kipling’s spy novel *Kim*—fuelled clashes and rumours of clashes. Pressure groups, like the League of Nations Union, talked of transparency in foreign policy and an end to the ‘old diplomacy’. Formed in 1918 by amalgamation of two peace organisations, the League of Nations Union sought to promote in Britain the ideals of the peace movement. The Union maintained a large office in London from which corps of enthusiasts distributed printed materials to schools, churches, social and political clubs about the League of Nations and its activities. League advocates benefitted from the swell of public revulsion against arms manufacturers and traders brought about by the slaughter of 1914–18. Military technology advanced by the war included tanks, wireless, submarines and aircraft.24 *Merchants of Death*, an exposé of the armaments industry, led to public support for international agreements aimed at regulating the flow of arms and munitions. The authors described ‘interlocking directorates’ of arms merchants who profited from the sale of arms around the world, even to potential enemies of their own countries. Not only did they control the industries associated with arms manufacture, but also newspapers, which they used to mould public opinion. Arms-makers engineered ‘war scares’ to excite governments and encourage people to fear their neighbours so that they might sell more armaments.26 ‘The next war’ George Bernard Shaw predicted, in 1919, ‘if permitted to occur, will be no “sport of kings,” no game of chance played with live soldiers and won by
exchanging them for dead ones, but a scientific attempt to destroy cities and kill civilians’.27

In 1916, Lord Robert Cecil sketched his plan for the League. As Parliamentary Undersecretary of State for Foreign Affairs and Cabinet Minister (Minister of the Blockade), he drafted a memorandum concerning the means of diminishing the prospect of future wars. Lord Cecil argued before a Cambridge audience that a post-war arrangement amongst nations was essential to avoid anarchy. The destruction of German militarism would not guarantee peace. He proposed the installation of permanent political technology for settling disputes between nations before these could trigger hostilities. He was hopeful that although the United States could not be expected to participate in European affairs, it would be willing to join coordinated economic action. Cecil attached tremendous importance to working with President Woodrow Wilson, in fact, he dreamed of an Anglo-American alliance. If America could be won over, the British point of view would dominate all international affairs.28

Cecil became the most important voice for the League within the government of David Lloyd George, who supported the idea of a League, but saw it in different terms. The basis of the League, in Lloyd George’s view, was to ensure that any nation that attempted to repeat Germany’s offence would face a combined force directed against them. This view regarded the League of Nations as an international tribunal for adjudicating conflicts between nations, backed by an international police force armed with power to enforce its decisions.29 Philip Noel-Baker, professor of international relations at the University of London, advocated a multi-national air corps to enforce decisions of the League. The international air police would draw on aviators organised into a force along the lines of the French Foreign Legion. He estimated that 400 or 500 of the most sophisticated aeroplanes, based in Geneva, could guarantee the peace of Europe.30 Lord Cecil did not favour making war to suppress war, but rather, saw the League as a moral force supported by the power of public humiliation. He appreciated the views of Gilbert Murray, an Oxford professor who chaired the executive committee of the League of Nations Union. In 1920, Murray authored a short book on the League idea in which he insisted that coercive power was a failure. A successful League would secure international justice by removing fear and ensuring security. This view found support among the pacifists who were prepared to run any risk to avoid another war.31

Lloyd George had the support of the French, who also wanted a League of Nations backed up by force, but Cecil won the United States, or rather, the American president, to his view. In May 1916, Wilson issued his first
public endorsement of American membership in a peace-keeping association. The United States could no longer ‘indulge in our traditional provincialism’, and in his address of January 1917, he outlined the principles for permanent peace, including formation of a society of nations. A year later, both allied and enemy governments agreed to make peace on terms laid down in his Fourteen Points. Wilson received enthusiastic receptions from crowds in Paris and London while waiting for the start of the conference at Versailles. But his vision of an ‘organised moral force’ disappointed those who wanted more and annoyed those who felt it was too much. The first day of the conference in Paris ended with newspaper correspondents around the world being kept out of the proceedings, in violation, they pointed out, of point one of the fourteen that diplomatic discussions between countries remain public. Wilson also fell out with the Republican-led US Congress who felt that in representing the United States at Paris, he had presumed too much. Leading Republicans insisted Wilson had no authority to speak on behalf of the American people. But he pressed on. At the Paris Peace Conference, Wilson chaired the League of Nations Committee, comprised of ten representatives, two from each of the United States, United Kingdom, France, Italy and Japan. Lloyd George left it to Lord Cecil, Clemenceau sent Léon Bourgeois. In about two weeks, the committee agreed a draft of the Covenant, largely because it had already been written by Cecil with the support of the Americans. The institution they created, the League of Nations, went into force on 10 January 1920 with 23 members. But a few weeks after 16 January 1920, when the League Council met for the first time, the United States announced that it would not ratify the Treaty of Versailles and would not enter the League.

The United Kingdom would have to make the machinery of peace work without formal assistance of the United States. When the Assembly met for the first time, there were 42 members, and by 1930, this number had grown to 54. All of the members sent representatives to the Assembly, convened on an annual basis. The Council was meant to consist of five permanent members (Britain, France, Italy, Japan and the United States) and four non-permanent members to be elected by the Assembly. Membership in the Council was reduced to four until 1926, when at a special session of the Assembly, Germany was approved for admission to the League and joined the Council. The Secretariat, organised along the lines of a report by Arthur Balfour, served the Council and Assembly as a civil service. The first Secretary General, Sir Eric Drummond, was nominated in the Covenant. In addition, to these organs, a number of organisations were established as auxiliary to the Council: the technical
organisations and advisory committees. The advisory committees were established as permanent structures, such as those dealing with opium and traffic in women, or, like the committee for codification of international law, meant to be temporary. Geneva became, as a British traveller remarked in 1923, the ‘capital of the world’, although a visitor could wander along the streets for hours and never find the League of Nations. The League headquarters was located a mile from the centre of the city, one of the last in a line of hotels.\textsuperscript{34}

The irreconcilable disagreement amongst the Leaguers meant that it could not function effectively as a police force operating for collective security. Essentially, it became a forum for ‘the great game’ rather than an alternative to it.\textsuperscript{35} There was no meaningful agreement on limiting arms trade, nor combined response to acts of aggression. The only areas in which League functioned were in those that could draw on public opinion and the power of international disapproval. Although only two of the 23 articles in the Constitution dealt with humanitarian and technical activities, these proved to be the most expansive, and more generally global, than the security or state-building operations. The United States cooperated with the work of health, opium and social sections; Germany and the Soviet Union worked with the health sections before joining the League; Japan continued to cooperate with technical commissions even after formal withdrawal. Philanthropic organisations and pressure groups proved surprisingly effective at bending the League framework to promote pre-war agendas with regard to combating drug traffic and human traffic. Voluntary organisations had access to an international forum to promote their interests, and League officials made use of private philanthropies to demonstrate that despite its failures in security and conflict resolution, the League functioned as a moral force for good. By late 1930s, more than 50 per cent of the League’s budget went for ‘technical work’.\textsuperscript{36}

As early as 1921, Arthur Balfour pointed to the success of the League’s social agenda as a worthy substitute for its failure as a political institution. Balfour was the second highest-ranking British representative at the Paris Peace Conference, and the following year, he presided over the first meeting of the Council in Geneva. The diplomats in Paris who framed the Covenant of the League, he explained, assumed the Treaty of Versailles would settle boundary issues remaining from the war and place the League in the straightforward position of maintaining clearly-established rights. But these hopes had not been realised. The boundaries of Poland had yet to be determined, as well as Galicia, which left much of Middle Europe unsettled. The framers of the Covenant had not realised the
difficulty in settling populations not under the Mandate. Those gathered at the recent Assembly were greatly excited and deeply moved about the plight of the Armenians, but quite helpless. Nothing was done, nothing could be done. There was also the matter of operating an institution for international cooperation without three of the greatest nations in the world: the United States, Russia and Germany. Possibly, Germany would become a member, but it was unlikely the Soviet government or the American government would ever join. And then there was the matter of money. The League had tried to raise funds for worthy projects, such as attending to the typhus outbreak in Eastern Europe, by voluntary subscriptions from members. But the effort failed to raise funds, owing to the financial difficulties experienced by governments throughout the world, and by the fact that most member states were remote from the peril of the disease.37

Despite these ‘embarrassments’, Balfour continued, the League of Nations could boast considerable success. There were many things the League had demonstrated that it could do, which the old secret diplomacy could not. ‘The first of these is the common international effort for objects which all admit to be good, but which are the special business of no national in particular’. There were ‘abuses which have to be stopped, the traffic in opium, the illegitimate traffic in arms, the traffic in women and children’. Attempts had been made to deal with these problems before the League came into existence, but not all had been satisfactory, and some completely ineffectual. ‘I cannot doubt’, Balfour affirmed, ‘that a far greater measure of success will attend the organised effort of the nations of the world, acting through the League organism, than by any machinery which the Diplomacy could set up’.38 Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin developed this theme in a speech at the Royal Albert Hall to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the League of Nations Union. Although Baldwin led the Conservatives, and much of the support for the Union came from the Labour party, he found a theme with wide appeal when he said that ‘some of the most valuable work’ of the League dealt with ‘graver social problems’. Had it not been for the League, the Hague International Opium Convention would likely have remained a dead letter. And although more work remained to be done on the problem of traffic in women, the League had carried out a thorough investigation ‘with a view to complete eradication’.39 Ishbel Hamilton-Gordon, president of the International Council of Women, also found cause for celebration in the League’s anti-crime work. The inquiry into traffic in women in children, she said, ‘assured hope that this evil is now delivered into our hands’ and offered proof of the
‘great things achieved by international cooperation’. She suggested further that ‘if the League of Nations had only existed for this purpose, surely it would have been worth its formulation’.40

By the 1930s, when the League had lost all credibility as a political institution, advocates emphasised its ‘non-political value’.41 Shaw explained this point after his visit to Geneva in 1928. True, he said, the only thing worthwhile about the speech-making in the Assembly took place when a young lady in a new dress decided to walk or stand during the proceedings—‘the effect is electric’. Yet he chastised the ‘popular impatience’ which regarded the League as nothing more than a vehicle for extirpation of war and was prepared to discard it altogether the moment it became apparent this was impossible. If the League of Nations did not exist, for example, organisations like the Howard League for Penal Reform would have no hope of success. The Howard Association had formed in the late nineteenth century around the memory of John Howard, the founder of the prison reform movement, and in 1921, merged with the Penal Reform League to form the Howard League for Penal Reform. Convicted felons and untried prisoners in many lands had a chance at humane treatment, Shaw said, because of the prison reform movement and the international agreements fashioned by the treaty-makers in Geneva.42

In 1934, the Manchester Guardian referred to a recent speech by Sir Arthur Haworth, a Manchester liberal who had campaigned for establishment of the League of Nations, in which he had pointed to the success of the League’s anti-crime activities as a primary justification for its relevance to world affairs. Thirty years ago, those leading the fight against the white slave traffic had wished for a coordinated system of agents at ports to watch for the traffickers. They had found suitable agents, raised the money to finance their efforts, but could not obtain permission from various governments. The League of Nations had brought into being a ‘great international organisation’ for securing the cooperation of all the countries involved, Haworth had said, and had succeeded in driving the white slave traffickers out of business. ‘If the League had done nothing else but sound the death knell of the white slave traffic’ Haworth concluded, ‘it would have been well worth calling it into existence’.43 But in case anyone was left with the impression that the League had nothing more to do, Frederick Sempkins, secretary of the International Bureau for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women, despatched a letter to the editor pointing out that there was still plenty of money to be made in commercialised prostitution. Recent proceedings of the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Women confirmed the
‘extremely valuable work’ of the League concerning the trade in women and children for illicit sex had to continue.\footnote{44}

Aubrey Leo Kennedy developed this argument with reference to the drug traffic. A foreign correspondent for The Times, he attended meetings of the Council in Geneva, throughout the 1920s. Privately, Kennedy was disappointed at the inability of the delegates to elevate their vision beyond petty political intrigue, but publicly, he insisted the League had directed the campaign against ‘the two almost universal evils which most degrade human life—the traffics in drugs and in women’. Despite successes in these activities, the League was scarcely appreciated. ‘The beneficiaries, scattered over the whole world, bear no public tribute to its beneficent agency and indeed often hardly known to whom they owe their better conditions of existence’. The efforts of the League to combat the drug traffic represented its ‘most important social and humanitarian activity’. The Central Opium Board reduced the lawful trade in opium to ‘a matter of international book-keeping in Geneva and national police action in the separate states’. It was a model for future League activity, and for that matter, the route to a peace as envisioned by Cecil. ‘How great an advance there would be in human happiness if the trade in arms were similarly controlled!’\footnote{45} Felix Morley, an editor at the \textit{Washington Post} in the 1930s, shared Aubrey’s analysis. At first, the League of Nations had been regarded as a ‘political organism’ and everyone was keen to discuss its political possibilities. There was little interest in Article 23 of the Covenant, the section that created the system of technical committees. ‘Yet Article 23, has, in fact,’ Morley said, ‘proved of greater practical import than Article 10 or 16, or any of the other controversial clauses which were so vehemently discussed in 1919’. The technical committees went to work, and because of the interest in debating politics and not technical matters, they avoided the spotlight of publicity. By 1932 most observers had begun ‘to realise that the non-political work is the most substantial, enduring and important part of the League’s activities’.\footnote{46}

Over the years, those working with, and those who advocated for, the League of Nations formulated the doctrine of international crime. This doctrine amalgamated a series of beliefs concerning the League’s anti-crime efforts and advanced crime prevention to the top of the list of reasons for its continued existence. First, international crime was a novel problem, without precedent in human history. Raymond Fosdick pressed this point in his defence of internationalism. Fosdick encountered Wilson at Princeton, and he became, when Wilson became President Wilson, the American Undersecretary-general in the League. When the
United States withdrew from the League in 1920, he started a law firm in New York City, began an association with the Rockefeller Foundation, and continued to champion an internationalist view. In less than a hundred years, he said, railroads, automobiles and aeroplanes had appeared, along with telegraph and telephone systems. ‘It has bound the world together by cable and wireless, so that all nations and all groups are in immediate and constant touch’. There was in 1923 more common interest between the United States and China, and between England and the South Sea, than between states within the United States. ‘Whether we like it or not, the race in that time has blazed a new trail—a trail which cannot be retraced’. There was hardly a social question that did not have international implications. ‘Is the question one of protecting women and girls from becoming victims of an illicit traffic? But here again this traffic is international in scope…Does the question arise of curtailing the devastating commerce in drugs? But once again we are confronted with a problem which knows no boundaries’.47

Second, international crime represented a conflation of threat. ‘Trafficking’ presented inter-locking and self-reinforcing activities that could only be addressed by multi-national coordination. The 1927 enquiry into the traffic in women, carried out by the League of Nations, reported that underworld figures engaged in the international traffic not only controlled the trade in women for commercial sex, but underground distribution of alcohol and obscene books. Police in different countries explained that use of opium and cocaine accompanied commercialised prostitution; prostitutes and souteneurs consumed these drugs.48 News correspondents in Geneva understood the value of such connections for conveying the gravity of the problems with which the League committees worked. The Manchester Guardian entitled a short article about the first day of the meeting of the Opium Advisory Committee: DRUGGED ‘WHITE SLAVES’. At the meeting, Sir Malcolm Delevingne drew the committee’s attention to the connection between the drugs traffic and the traffic in women and children. The Italian government confirmed that in many brothels, girls were made to take drugs in order to weaken their resistance to prostitution. The committee decided to refer the matter to other League committees on the traffic in women and welfare.49 Crime science writer Henry T.F. Rhodes agreed. The traffic in women overlapped the traffic in drugs; traffickers encouraged their victims to consume narcotics as addiction made them easy to control. Physical force was hardly necessary to keep them prisoner. The white-slavers not only became excellent customers of drug barons, but frequently took an interest in the drug business themselves.50
Third, crime problems originated ‘somewhere else’ on the map. Neither Great Britain, nor the United States, generated international crime problems; such problems began in Eastern Europe or South America. But, the problems in other continents would spill-over to Europe and North America unless the nations took action through international machinery. This logic can be seen in wrangling over drug traffic. The United States blamed Britain and its colonial practice, Britain pointed to disorder in China, China pointed back to European imperialism. The author of *Opium* (1925), John Michael Gavit, explained drug trafficking as ‘a vast organization’ with ‘tentacles reaching out into all corners of the earth’. Before the League of Nations intervened, the warfare on drugs had been carried out through the scattered efforts of individual nations, and without success. ‘The effort thus far has been chiefly that of each to protect itself from the output of others, while at the same time being careful to conserve its own commercial interests in the business!’51 The worldwide problem of traffic in women for prostitution, Bascom Johnson of the American Social Hygiene Association explained, resulted from the systems of licensed brothels in particular countries. At the international conferences convened by the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Women, efforts had been made to abolish regulationism but countries with licensed brothels, such as the nations of South America, resisted such reforms. Following the war, the United States, the United Kingdom and nations of Europe had practically ended the white slave traffic. But there was a danger of the problem returning owing to the existence of the licensed brothel in other countries. In other words, although the problem originated elsewhere, it required the United States working with the United Kingdom to stop, because international progress could not be made until these other nations agreed to make changes.52

Fourth, the nations of the world had become so inter-connected that a conflict anywhere was a threat everywhere. The League of Nations Union promoted the idea of the League of Nations as essential to tackling the problem of the international drug trade. A pamphlet entitled *The League and the Drug Trade* said the drug problem had been limited before the Great War to opium dens in London’s Limehouse and San Francisco’s Chinatown. ‘Nowadays, thanks to publicity by the League of Nations’, the world had come to know drug traffic was ‘far too big and deep-rooted a problem to be dealt with by means of police-raids in any one country. It is international in every sense of the word’. The pamphlet reviewed opium conferences of 1924 leading to the conclusion: ‘A new stage in the world’s war on the drug trafficker is just beginning. The fight will be hard and long’.53 Adriaan Sirks, chief of
the Rotterdam Police and a consultant to the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs, stressed that while ordinary criminal offences harm individuals or a relatively small group of individuals, ‘opium offences threaten the welfare of whole nations’. He welcomed the Advisory Committee’s efforts in 1925 to establish a license system for the manufacture and distribution of narcotics. This system, which afforded the possibility of tracking a consignment of drugs from country of manufacture to country of destination, represented a powerful weapon in the drug-suppression arsenal. But such measures would only lead to success ‘on condition that all of the countries of the world give them their whole-hearted support, and that all countries of the world exercise the closest control at home and work in close cooperation with each other abroad’.

Fifth, the solution to crime required wide-scale, far-reaching policies. Progress could not be made unless other nations joined together in a seamless effort. ‘Criminals of the present day,’ New York attorney Arthur Kuhn declared in 1934, ‘make use of the most scientific modern appliances in the accomplishment of their nefarious purposes’. Both the detection of crime and apprehension of criminals had been made more difficult by increased means of transportation and communication, which enabled escape across national borders. He spotlighted the importance of international organisations, specifically, the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission and the International Criminal Police Commission, in the war on international crime. Three years earlier, the League of Nations received a comprehensive report on responding to crime by means of international cooperation. Kuhn welcomed efforts of the League toward unification of criminal law owing to ‘modern civilization and the relative shrinking of the planet on which we live’. While it was a step too far to suppose uniformity of criminal law throughout the world could be achieved, cooperation could be achieved in specific areas, including traffic in women and children, traffic in dangerous drugs and counterfeiting of currency.

The Commission and the League

The working relationship between the International Criminal Police Commission and the League of Nations began with counterfeiting. In 1926, the League established a committee to investigate forgery of currency within Europe and called on the police to assist. France took the initiative following the counterfeiting in 1925 of large quantities of French francs in Hungary. French authorities believed Hungarian
authorities had acted with leniency in dealing with those responsible for the plot.\textsuperscript{56} The International Criminal Police Commission had voted to engage in the suppression of banknote forgery at their inaugural congress held in Vienna in 1923. Specifically, the delegates resolved to use their influence with their national governments toward the setting up in each country special offices to deal with counterfeiting of currency, securities and bonds; forging of cheques and passports, and with pickpockets. At a subsequent conference, commission members organised the International Office of Central Bureaus for the Suppression of Banknote Forgery to track developments in forgery, generate a list of counterfeiters, and transmit to the central bureaus information about activities and operatives. Within three years, 27 bureaus had been set up in cities across Europe, and in addition, Washington DC. The Vienna office distributed sets of banknotes to serve as authentic specimens in investigations along with a request for submission of their own banknotes. (Or tried to. In 1926, Germany had complied, the United States had not, and England only sent specimens of £10 and £1 notes.)\textsuperscript{57}

The League of Nations conference concerning counterfeiting, known as the Diplomatic Conference, took place in Geneva in 1929. Attended by 35 states, the International Criminal Police Commission participated in an advisory capacity. The police urged the diplomats to designate in the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting, their international bureau as the official central office of the League. But the diplomats, while appreciating the value of the police in the international campaign against counterfeiters and criminals in general, did not approve of the plan. It was a matter of the Constitution they said. It was impossible to incorporate into the international government at Geneva an organisation such as the international police bureau, the functions and administration of which were determined by a ‘national institution’ (League negotiators regarded the Commission as a national institution owing to the support it received from the government of Austria). The conference recommended a compromise position: states should continue to cooperate with the international bureau until a replacement could be effected within the framework of the League.\textsuperscript{58}

Meanwhile, Schober found additional areas for cooperation between Vienna and Geneva. In October 1928, he sent a letter to the League requesting places for police representatives on certain of the League’s permanent committees. The League had been invited to send a delegate to the Commission’s meeting in Vienna in 1923, and again, to its meeting at Berne in 1928. This invitation had been accepted, and the
police were pleased to welcome Jean J. Berg, a member of the Opium Traffic and Social Questions section, to its proceedings. ‘It is obvious’ Schober stressed, ‘that our ultimate aim is identical with that of the League itself’. The Commission promoted mutual agreements among police authorities and encouraged the formation of institutions to deal effectively with common law offences, and this assisted the League. ‘This is why I have constantly kept the League informed of our Commission’s work’ Schober continued. Suppressing counterfeit currencies and cheques was only the beginning. The Commission had adopted the following resolution, reflecting proposals of Major van Houten and Dr Wiess of the Berlin police: ‘The International Criminal Police Commission considers that it is essential that, in all matters connected with crime (such as the traffic in women, drugs traffic, obscene publications, juvenile crime, etc) the various Committees of the league should call in representatives of the International Criminal Police Commission as criminal experts’.59

Schober presented Rachel Crowdy, chief of the Opium and Social Questions section with more specific proposals. The Commission, he explained, aimed at the repression of crime in any form as practised on an ‘international professional scale’ by counterfeiters, so-called ‘international thieves’, or persons engaged in the traffic in narcotic drugs or traffic in women and children. In regard to the methods of cooperation, the police appreciated the difficulties of joint action. He suggested as a starting point that Crowdy’s section should share minutes of meetings with him, and the Commission would make the minutes of their meetings available in return. The police would welcome her delegates to future meetings. There was some resistance within the League of Nations to these overtures. Julia Lathrop, of the American National Conference of Social Work, apprised Crowdy of her scepticism. Since the major part of the attention of the Child Welfare Committee was, and should remain, directed to non-criminal matters, the police should be invited to join in proceedings solely when discussing criminal aspects.60 Schober emphasised that it would not be for police representatives on committees to lay proposals before the League, but that proposals would first need approval of the membership and would then be raised by means of a single representative.

In 1929, the League agreed in principle to form a cooperative relationship with the International Criminal Police Commission. The tenth Assembly of adopted Schober’s proposal for giving the police a seat on permanent committees related to opium and dangerous drugs traffic in women and child welfare. The resolution was adopted with a ‘view to securing the effective cooperation of the police authorities in the
various countries in connection with the League’s work’ on social ques-
tions. Crowdy gave Schober the good news and invited his suggestions
about how to make the most of the new partnership.\textsuperscript{61} Schober raised
the issue at sixth international police congress that year, and the mem-
bership came up with several means. The Commission could assist the
League by helping prepare suitable material (‘facts established beyond
dispute’) for discussion and personal contacts between League author-
ities engaged in planning and police officials in a position to carry out
such plans. Some possibilities for joint action were: compilation of
international lists of traffickers in narcotics using an ‘internationally
approved form’; establishing national offices along the lines of that for
suppressing counterfeiting, to be coordinated by an international head-
quarters at Geneva; organisation of an international vigilance service
to deal with drug smugglers and traffickers in women; agreement con-
cerning an ‘internationally approved definition of the expression “white
slave traffic”’ to be as comprehensive as possible; a coordinated world-
wide campaign against brothels and employment agencies seeking
dancers, female artistes and concert hall attendants; and arrangements,
in the sphere of child welfare, for repatriation of victims through the
shortest channel possible rather diplomatic channels.\textsuperscript{62}

The Commission joined forces with the League in the war on drug
trafficking. Sirks proposed an international network of national nar-
cotics bureaus enforcement agencies pattered after the paradigm estab-
lished in the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeit Currency
concluded in 1929. The narcotics bureaus would unify administration
over the drug trade within each country, exchange information with
other national offices, and collectively promote improved means of
extradition of offenders against narcotics laws. But the drug proposal
embodied provisions for heavy penalties for drug offences, extradition
and punishment of offences abroad, and the diplomats in Geneva decided
it exceeded their recommendations.\textsuperscript{63} Sirks also pushed for the establish-
ment of a central bureau at the League Secretariat for the Commission.
The League did not readily agree, but later accepted much of what Sirks
had come up with in 1931. The Advisory Committee on Opium and Dan-
gerous Drugs provided for uniform application of police measures against
narcotics crime, called for extradition of narcotics criminals, and provided
for the organisation of police and conferences of police chiefs of several
countries to discuss drug trafficking.\textsuperscript{64}

The International Criminal Police Commission contributed to the fight
against traffic in women and children. In 1932, the Secretariat received a
report from the Commission about its work concerning traffic in women
and children. The Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Women and Children explained that ‘the Commission acts as an international central bureau for exchange of information on cases of traffic’. Specifically, the Commission maintained in Vienna a register of persons connected with the traffic (more than 1,000 names); published the *Sûreté public international* in several languages, which included information on anti-traffic activities; focused on the traffic at several of its recent congresses; and was developing an ‘international service for arrest of traffickers’. At the international police congress of 1935, Florent Louwage, inspector-general of the Belgian police, credited the Advisory Committee with initiating the international campaign against traffic in women and children. The police shared in two important aspects of this campaign: the elimination of the age limit from conventions of 1910 and 1921, and the punishments for souteneurs. The Commission had always favoured extending the convention to women of full age and believed the term ‘souteneur’ did not encompass a large field. Nevertheless, it was important to bear in mind the dangerous character of the souteneur and that efforts to eliminate them had to include national as well as international efforts.

The Commission also contributed to the movement concerning an international definition of terrorism. In 1934, the Executive Bureau submitted a draft convention to the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism, established by the League earlier that year. The commission’s draft convention elaborated an outline submitted earlier by the French government which called for coordinated efforts to suppress attempts to assassinate heads of state and for the extradition of persons charged with assassination. The draft also called for measures to improve the integrity of passport identification, for sharing of information about persons suspected of planning terrorist acts, and for curtailing possession of explosives with a view to commit terrorist acts. As far as the Executive Bureau was concerned, ‘acts of terrorism’ did not constitute a special category of offences, but offences punishable ‘as ordinary crimes’. In April 1935, the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism sought the advice of the police on the establishment of an international bureau in Vienna for the collection and circulation of information on terrorists.

However, the police did not follow through on this proposal and declined further involvement. The Commission considered the interim report and draft convention on terrorism at its meeting in Copenhagen in June 1935 and resolved the question would not be discussed further ‘unless and until a request for advice is received from the League of Nations’. The Copenhagen resolutions further specified that if such as
request was received, the secretary of the commission should ‘inform all members’, and in the meantime, members of the commission ‘should study this question for themselves’. The Diplomatic Conference, which met at Geneva in November 1937, invited the Commission to join them, but the Commission declined. The police said they had already started their annual congress and could not find an opportunity to consult their membership. The main reason for the Commission’s change of tune had to do with the involvement of the Nazis, who made themselves conspicuous at the Copenhagen meeting. Kurt Daluege, Hitler’s General der Polizei, stepped out of his Mercedes in a fabulous lime-green uniform.

The myth of international justice

In the 1930s, the dream of international cooperation in the fight against crime confronted the National Socialist vision of a world empire. Nazi officials craved support for their programme and co-opted international organisations dealing with crime and criminal justice. Various police and security services, acting in the name of domestic order and state security, became important for genocide. Nazi operations took place with support from the ‘police’ in the Baltic States, Belorussia and Ukraine, France, Belgium, Norway and the Netherlands. The Nazi takeover of the International Criminal Police Commission occurred amidst a wider effort to absorb international organisations, including the International Bureau for the Suppression of Traffic in Women and the International Penitentiary and Prison Commission.

Following the announcement in 1933 of Hitler as German chancellor, Herman Göring became Minister of the Interior. In Prussia, he reorganised the police headquarters staff with nationalists and Nazi sympathisers, then weeded out police personnel, leaving only those loyal to the regime. On 26 February, the police raided the communist headquarters in the Karl Liebknechthaus and seized what appeared to be plans for a coordinated communist uprising across the country. On the following day, the Berlin police arrested a young Dutch communist, acting in conjunction with socialists, for setting fire to the Reichstag building. Göring’s Ministry of the Interior immediately announced the suspension of all articles in the Constitution guaranteeing personal liberty, rights of free expression and freedom of the press. The special edict imposed the death penalty for political offences, such as inciting to murder members of the government, disturbances of the peace, treason, incendiaryism and poisoning. Hitler’s government initiated a drastic campaign against communists, socialists and pacifists. All communist deputies were arrested and communist and socialist newspaper shut down. Foreign correspondents who dared report
the events were told to leave or threatened with expulsion. The Brown-shirts went on a rampage of shootings, whippings, raids on houses and other forms of state terrorism took place. They closed Jewish shops and assaulted individual Jews on the streets. By March, more than 200 persons had been killed by acts of political violence.\textsuperscript{72}

The International Bureau for the Suppression of Traffic in Women was meant to hold their annual conference in Berlin later that year. The London-based International Bureau grew out of the Victorian-era campaign against the white slave trade; specifically, out of a voluntary conference convened by Britain’s National Vigilance Association in 1898. The International Bureau represented an association of national committees from cooperating countries. Each sent two representatives to sit on the international committee and together they formed the international bureau or central governing body. Frederick Sempkins, the Bureau’s secretary in London, discussed the idea of calling off the conference with Claude Montefiore, a board member and leader of the Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls and Women. ‘No doubt you have shared my anxiety about the position of affairs in Germany’ he said, ‘and I cannot help wondering whether the Congress will be held at all’. The German national committee, led by Dr Ernst Kundt, had few arrangements in place, and ‘such staff as stenographers and interpreters’ could not be arranged at the last minute. The German national committee was ‘hardly likely to appeal to the Nazis as it did to the previous governments, as a suitable piece of propaganda machinery’.\textsuperscript{73} Sempkins also shared his concern with Ewart Greaves, chair of the National Vigilance Association. Specifically, he informed Greaves that neither Montefiore, nor Samuel Cohen of the Jewish Association, would attend the Berlin congress ‘for obvious reasons’. Montefiore had suggested the congress might be postponed on financial grounds, and they had decided to give the Germans a chance to back out. Sempkins informed Kundt the congress would be a ‘complete failure’ without the goodwill of the present government in Berlin to provide necessary resources.\textsuperscript{74}

Kundt’s role in hosting the conference poisoned any fruit to be had from the proceedings. In November 1926, he had joined members of the Berlin police on a trip to upper Silesia to investigate claims of illegal traffic in Polish women. Kundt, an administrator in the Foreign Office, produced a report consistent with claims by Nazi officials about Jewish superiority in \textit{Mädchenhandel} (trade in girls). Although he could not point a single case of white slave trafficking in the region, he claimed that Jews had a central role in ferrying Polish immigrants across the border, and worked into his narrative a catalogue of anti-Semitic stereotypes. He said the list of ‘traffickers in human beings’ contained ‘overwhelmingly Jewish names’.
Members of Jewish welfare organisations objected as did international anti-traffic workers. The Central Organisation of German Citizens of the Jewish Confession protested to the Foreign Office that Kundt’s ‘findings’ amounted to nothing more than false, irrelevant and outdated statistics. They supplied figures contradicting his claims about the size and origins of Germany’s Jewish population. In 1927, a report prepared by the Prussian ministry of the interior confirmed that Berlin police officials had been unable ‘to detect a single case of white slavery’ in Upper Silesia and characterised Kundt’s statistics as ‘a boundless exaggeration’. The Foreign Office allowed Kundt to remain in post, but declared his report could not be circulated outside of Germany.  

The German National Committee proved unwilling to surrender their chance to convene the congress. Kundt told Sempkins there was no reason to postpone the gathering other than economic reasons and these reasons were likely to present a similar problem the following year. Sempkins continued to pressurise Kundt into abandoning his plans. He pressed Kundt on particulars for interpreters, stenographers, accommodation, local transportation and other arrangements. There was likely to be no delegate from the United States and other countries might neglect to participate as well. When Kundt refused to give in, Sempkins despatched a circular to the national bureaus with the suggestion that the congress without the majority of national committees in attendance would be ‘not really representative’. He asked national bureaus for their view of whether the congress ought to be postponed, and if the Germans did go ahead, whether a representative would make the trip to Berlin.

In mid-March, Göring signalled Nazi activists to carry on their anti-Jewish violence. Göring, who controlled the Prussian police, announced during a speech at Essen that he rejected the idea that ‘the police are a protection squad for Jewish shops’. Nazi activists enforced a growing number of boycotts against Jewish-owned shops, intimidated Jews on the streets, and took a number of Jews into custody. Other National Socialist leaders, including Hitler, called for discipline and an end to interference in Germany’s retail trade. Seeing that the storm troopers did not heed calls for discipline and moderation, and faced with vociferous protests about the violence from abroad, Hitler and Goebbels decided to direct activities from the top. Unable to reign in Nazi activists, Hitler and Goebbels called for a nation-wide boycott on 1 April. Brown-shirted young men took up posts outside Jewish businesses, admonishing people not to go inside and the ‘co-ordinated German press praised the orderly way in which the boycott had been implemented’. Sempkins decided to see the situation for himself and he made a trip to Berlin in April where
he met with Kundt. In a follow-up letter, he tried again to coax the Germans into backing out. Sempkins hinted at ‘certain official difficulties’ which had come up since his visit to Berlin and was concerned that ‘such incidents’ would recur. He pointed to Nazi censorship of the press. ‘Certain possibilities might arise through a lack of discipline, or perhaps from discipline. They might report our proceedings in a way which would do us a great deal of harm’.78 Still, Kundt and the Germans refused to give in. Kundt claimed to be ignorant of any difficulties or incidents that might be of concern, and declared: ‘No such events are known to us. Perfect peace and order reigns in Germany’.79

The meeting took place at Berlin with delegates from national bureaus across Europe. The United States avoided the meeting, but the United Kingdom did not. The American Social Hygiene Association’s international committee had corresponded with Dr Kundt in 1932. He had inquired about a film produced by Association entitled Wanted: Female Dancers for South America. In December of that year, the Association expected to continue cooperation with the International Bureau for the Suppression of Traffic in Women.80 But by May 1933, the leadership decided it would not send a delegate to Berlin.81 The Association recommended the congress not be held, but postponed until 1934, and suspended contacts with Sempkins and the International Bureau until 1935. During 1934, the Association’s international committee discussed employment for noted scientists and clinicians ‘who have found it necessary to leave Germany’ and assisted in placing at American universities two ‘German physicians who have come to this country as a result of conditions in Germany’.82 Britain did send a representative. Sybil Neville-Rolfe, of the British Social Hygiene Council, reported on the proceedings for the International Bureau.83 Neville-Rolfe, a founder of the Eugenics Society, promoted eugenics policies as a matter of public health and ‘national efficiency’. Her advocacy included support for the Society’s policy of voluntary sterilisation of ‘mental defectives’ as this would allow the ‘mentally abnormal’ to marry legally. She defended her decision, in a 1935 publication, to attend Kundt’s Berlin congress, by insisting that her view of sterilisation was utterly unlike the ‘drastic, entirely unscientific and non-ethical methods by which biological knowledge is reported to have been misapplied for political ends in Germany’.84

The promise of international justice deteriorated as National Socialist efforts to gain control of international organisations continued. In 1935, the eleventh congress of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission convened at Berlin. Formerly known as the International Penitentiary Commission, this organisation had been around since 1870s.
Although it had no official standing, the majority of its members were administrative and judicial officials. It became the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission in 1929 when it re-organised its mission around promotion of a universal set of minimum rules for confinement and achieved some recognition five years later when the League of Nations adopted these rules as the international standard. The venue for the congress had been decided five years earlier, and after Hitler became Chancellor, there were a great deal of controversy about Britain’s participation. In August 1935, the Howard League learned that should its chairman, Dennis Pritt, attend the congress, he would not be allowed to speak. A London lawyer who had campaigned unsuccessfully in 1931 for a Labour seat, Pritt had travelled to the Soviet Union and was taken by Soviet socialism. In 1933, he joined the Relief Committee for the Victims of German Fascism responsible for the *Brown Book of Hitler Terror*, which proclaimed the innocence of the communist defendants and pointed to the culpability of the National Socialists. As far as the Howard League was concerned, the usefulness of an international gathering depended on freedom in the choice of delegates, freedom in discussion of topics, and freedom in reporting the proceedings. The Berlin congress would allow for none of these; there was reason to believe the forum would be packed with German delegates, the delegates muzzled, and reports of proceedings sent abroad limited by German censors. It was worthless to participate.\textsuperscript{85}

Alexander Paterson, of the English Prison Commission, pursued a different strategy. Paterson had been president of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission and firmly believed in the value of international cooperation. In 1934, he agreed to an exchange of prison personnel with Germany. In June, ten members of the German prison administration spent ten days in England listening to lectures and touring eight prisons. In September, a team of English administrators visited Berlin. Paterson defended the agreement as a worthwhile exchange among two countries with different approaches to a common problem: ‘It is impossible to say what both Germany and England will gain from this interchange of visits. A different point of view is appreciated, new methods are studied, a different solution of a common problem is suggested’. Even into 1935, Paterson went on to defend the aims and activities of the international prison commission. The commission represented the greatest means in the world for improvement of prison administration through training of personnel, encouraged reform through consideration of alternatives to
imprisonment, represented a forum for study and discussion of common problems, and promoted a means of identifying inappropriate methods and ensuring minimum safeguards. Although Paterson persisted in his belief that reason would prevail, those attending the conference realised they had been used as a means of propaganda.

The plenary sessions of the congress took place in the Kroll Opera House where they presented their methods to the polite applause of their international audience. ‘The German government’, Geoffrey Bing, a London barrister who was there, remarked ‘no doubt reckoned the lingering atmosphere of the theatre together with the dictates of international politeness would prevent any expression of disagreement with the Nazi policy as explained by speakers standing on what was once the stage.’ The conference opened with a speech by Franz Gürtner on ‘The Idea of Justice in German Penal Reform’ in which he said legal changes had empowered judges not only to interpret, but create law, consistent with National Socialism. ‘The Fürhrer’ articulated the will of the entire nation and judges gave precise form to these ideas in specific cases decided. National Socialism replaced the idea of ‘formal wrong’ with that of ‘material wrong’ in that it regarded as wrong any attack on the interests of the national community. Gürtner mentioned how happy he was to welcome the congress because he ‘knew’ the foreign press had not provided an accurate reform of developments in Germany. He invited international delegates at the congress to see for themselves and become allies in promoting the aims of the new German state.

Those in Germany, the legal profession and the press, doubted the new German penal code could be confronted once the National Socialist government possessed photographic evidence of foreign prison officials, criminologists and reformers cheering their proposals. The government had been criticised for not observing the minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners. The congress provided an official forum in which the government marshalled a defence to these charges, and in which members of the British delegation remained quiet as allegations were made against their own prisons and press. When votes of individuals members were taken on National Socialist proposals, confusion in the voting system as well as the sur-feit of German delegates, made it appear as if there was overwhelming support. Only a few hands were raised in the assembly in opposition. On Wednesday, 21 August 1935, Erwin Bumke, president of the congress, read a message he received from Adolf Hitler: ‘I thank you as well as the members of the International Penal and Penitentiary Congress for the greetings
you sent me. I respond to them in expressing the best wishes for the results of your deliberations and the hope that the foreign members by staying over here may get to know the new Germany and its work'.

Nazification of the International Criminal Police Commission began that same year when Nazi police officials appeared at the annual meeting in Copenhagen. European police gathered in Belgrade for the international police congress of 1936. All resolutions tabled at Belgrade passed unanimously, except for those urging cooperation with the League of Nations. The German delegation declared that since Germany was not a member they would rely on a statement by ‘their Fuhrer’. At the London meeting in 1937, the implications of Nazi control were becoming clear to police commission membership. To avoid the awkward spectacle of swastikas paraded on the streets of the British capital, the organisers advised delegates no uniforms would be worn at the meeting. The meeting went ahead without any German delegates, a development that did not go unobserved. In his opening speech, Home Secretary Sir Samuel Hoare, spoke of the need to deal with crime and how the police forces of various nations had managed to cooperate. The International Criminal Police Commission had brought police forces together to ‘defeat the enemies of society’ and regretted this effort had acquired ‘unfortunate associations’ which detracted from its realisation. In his address, Michael Skubl, the chief of the Austrian police and president of the International Police, expressed appreciation for the venue and pronounced London ‘the Mecca’ of police. The audience included other delegates from Austria, as well as Finland, Rumania, Ireland, Belgium, Italy, Poland, France, China and the United States.

In March 1938, the German army invaded Austria. On 12 March, Skubl was summoned to the Austrian federal chancellery where he learned that Himmler demanded his resignation. He was placed under arrest and imprisoned until freed by Allied forces in 1945. By a procedure agreed at the London meeting, in which it was decided the presidency of the Commission would reside with the Federal Police Directorate in Vienna, Skubl’s replacement was named as Otto Steinhäusl, loyal to Nazi Germany. When, two years later, he died of tuberculosis, Commission members were asked to support the chief of the German Security Police for presidency. Although less than the required two-thirds voted in favour of the resolution, Chief of the Security Police, Reinhard Heydrich was announced as the new president (and that his nomination had ‘passed unanimously’). Heydrich declared he would lead the International
Criminal Police Commission ‘into a new and successful future’ and that headquarters would relocate from Vienna to Berlin.93

Conclusions

The interwar period institutionalised the dream of international crime prevention. The International Criminal Police Commission formed in response to the threat of international crime, and leadership pursued a working relationship with the League of Nations. The League began as an institution for promoting peace among nations, but became increasingly focused on issues of crime, particularly traffic in women and traffic in drugs. Within a few years, crime prevention became the primary rationale for the League’s relevance to international affairs. But the League could not find a response to the rise fascist regimes, and the Commission became a tool of the Nazi party. A disturbing number of the Commission’s founders remained in service during the Nazi period including van Houten, Dressler, Shultz and Louwage. The experience demonstrated the power of crime as a political theme in international relations. In the idea of thwarting international crime, advocates for the League had found an organisational myth powerful enough to justify the commitment to international government. But it collapsed under the weight what proved to be a more powerful legend about international crime, that of ‘Jewish criminality’.
4 Traffic in Women

The murders of several women in London’s Soho district during the 1930s caused a political furore. News-writers created drama around one of the victims, French Fifi, said to be a prostitute under the control of Max Kasel, the leader a fearsome gang of international white-slave traffickers. In the House of Commons, several MPs asked the government how it was possible for such wickedness to occur in the capital of a great empire. The Metropolitan Police maintained that press accounts ‘hopelessly exaggerated’ the extent of the white slave trade and blamed the affair on ‘greedy, foreign prostitutes’. They also complained about the role of anti-traffic organisations in amplifying the inaccuracies. Superintendent Arthur Askew of the Criminal Investigation Division protested to the Home Office about a pamphlet circulated by the Association for Moral and Social Hygiene. *Traffickers in London: Danger Ahead* was ‘very carelessly worded and obviously based on lurid press accounts’. The suggestion that the police were incompetent was ‘an insult to English police forces’, and the insinuation of police corruption, ‘indicative of the prejudiced minds of the persons responsible for issue of the leaflet’.¹

The claims and counter claims exchanged over the Soho murders suggest some of the wider politics in the interwar era surrounding the issue of cross-border travel of women for the commercial sex trade. A number of organisations took an interest in the issue and had an equal number of reasons for doing so. The British Social Hygiene Council worried about the transmission of venereal disease and the threat to public health. Professional associations, such as the Variety Artistes Federation, weighed its impact on the music hall industry. The International Criminal Police Commission pointed to trafficking in women as another good reason for merger with the League of Nations; the Council for the
Representation of Women on the League of Nations regarded it as another good reason for more women in positions of international leadership; and leaders of the League of Nations Union saw it as a important justification for the League’s continued existence. Meanwhile, in Germany, the National Socialists, who led the attack on prostitution, coveted international approval for their actions. The Nazis insisted that Jews controlled the worldwide traffic in women for prostitution and alleged that increases in traffickers confirmed the moral superiority of their campaign to eliminate ‘Jewish criminality’.

The politics of the white slave trade was nothing new. International charities, police and other groups had for decades jostled against each other in pursuit of anti-trafficking activities. But the interwar period saw a new entrant into the public arena, the League of Nations, and League involvement changed the basis on which the whole issue would be contested. In passing the 1921 convention, the League formally replaced references to the ‘white slave trade’ in international policy with ‘traffic in women’ and introduced the conceptual language to be used throughout the rest of the twentieth century in understanding traffic in women as an international problem.2

Real or imaginary?

In Decline and Fall (1928), Evelyn Waugh’s first novel, Paul Pennyfeather becomes the proprietor of Latin American Entertainments Ltd. Coaxed into partnership by the enchanting Margo Beste-Chetwynde, Pennyfeather believes himself to be in the business of interviewing singers and dancers for cabarets abroad. But the company is only a front for traffic for women in prostitution, and Pennyfeather winds up in prison. Waugh’s primary objective is comedic satire, not social criticism, but he could make humour out of rather grim subject matter because of the intensity and persistence of the anti-trafficking crusade. The situations provoke humour because of the readers textbook knowledge of the motivations and methods of the white-slave traders. His characters take notice of international efforts by the League of Nations to end the commercial sex trade, but this only assures the wrong people are arrested and punished. Margo Beste-Chetwynde, whose name is not even mentioned at Pennyfeather’s trial, marries the Home Secretary.3 The novel raised serious questions: Was the white slave traffic a substantive social problem of international scope? Or merely a convenient fiction, useful for advancing political agendas of one sort or another?
In the late Victorian era, when the white slave trade first made newspaper headlines, it motivated armies of sincere volunteers. Catholics, Protestants and Jews formed anti-traffic associations, along with morality purity crusaders, suffragists and women’s organisations, to spur government action. Britain produced two major legislative acts: the criminal law amendment acts of 1885 and 1912. Voluntary organisations also teamed up across borders to promote international awareness and push national governments into treaties for suppression. Britain’s National Vigilance Association convened the first international conference in London in 1899, and the International Bureau for the Suppression of Traffic in Women organised official conferences at Paris in 1902 and Madrid in 1910. Governments across Europe signed an international convention leading to the creation of national bureaus coordinated by an international agency. But after the Great War, the issue no longer had the power to generate mass political action or move national politics. The war altered public sensibilities about moral issues and introduced sexual discussion into public policy. Anyone who read newspapers knew the stories of giddy girls who chased men in uniform in the early days of the war and of ‘amateurs’ who spread venereal disease amongst the troops. ‘Morality naturally decays in wartime’ Margaret Wynne Nevinson observed, ‘men facing death clutch at every joy...before they go into the darkness’. Women were both lauded and extolled for easy virtue: ‘The poor girls had so little to give, so they gave all they had’. Few dared to criticise the women during the years of conflict and the depth of this charitable outlook made it hard to recover the higher moral standard of pre-war days.4

Five years of war, it seemed, had achieved what decades of campaigns had failed to do: end the traffic in women for purposes of illicit sex. As the Manchester Guardian explained in 1921, ‘The war and the passport system which resulted therefrom had at least this advantage, that it rendered all traffic in women and children practically impossible for several years’.5 The international voluntary associations that formed in the late nineteenth century shared this conclusion. The Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls and Women reported in 1919 not to have come across a single Jewish girl actually in need of protection from white slave traffickers. ‘We are glad to be able to say that what is known as the White Slave Traffic has, for the time being, practically ceased to exist in this country, as far as our own Community is concerned’. As for non-Jewish women, the Jewish Association investigated some 62 cases of girls missing from home. Of these, 12 were found to have satisfactory surroundings, 20 returned home of their
own accord, and six were relocated to more suitable surroundings. While eight could not be traced, only 16 were found to be leading an immoral life. The Jewish Association attributed the disappearance of the white slave trade to wartime restrictions on travel and limits on immigration, as well as the effectiveness of prevention efforts. The anti-trafficking organisations, working in conjunction with the police and shipping companies, had made it very difficult for a girl to be taken abroad for immoral purposes. ‘So far passenger traffic by steamship from the Continent to the Port of London does not bring many cases that need help, but we are again on the Continental trains and on several occasions have been able to render services to girls and women arriving in England’.6

In 1924, the International Congress for the Suppression of Traffic in Women and Children convened in Graz, Austria. The congress, organised by the National Vigilance Association and the International Bureau for the Suppression of Traffic in Women and Children, included representatives from 25 countries, 12 of which appeared on behalf of their governments. Johann Ude, a representative to the League of Nations, declared the war against the white slave trade had been won. ‘The infamous international traffic was necessarily broken up by the war, and does not seem to have resumed on any considerable scale…’. But, he added, that ‘constant vigilance’ was necessary to prevent its return, and he welcomed the establishment of an Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Women and Girls by the League of Nations to enforce its conventions.7 German and French delegates confirmed the lack of traffic. Dr Jung, who presented the report of the German National Committee, said they had conducted anti-traffic work for years with ‘great success’. Thanks to the energetic campaign, ‘cases of International Traffic in Women and Children have become rare in Germany’. While he stopped short of claiming there was no traffic at all, he stressed that press statements about a ‘brisk traffic in girls to foreign parts’ were ‘absolutely without foundation’. In the previous year, there had only been two cases; in the current year, none.8 Mr Hennequin, of the French National Committee, reported a similar situation. In France, which had established one of the first national committees, the character of the work had changed. ‘During the war, there was no traffic in women and we were able to drop the work for a time… Since the war there has not been the same need to deal with it as there was formerly’. So, the committee had taken up a variety of other activities, such as a study of venereal disease in the French army in response to a request from an American organisation. ‘We have no
cases of international traffic in the sense in which the word is used in international conventions’. 9

Such good news was hard to accept. Anti-trafficking activists worried that as governments relaxed control over international travel and monitoring of foreign residents, the old trade would return. Economic and political conditions in Europe meant the problem was bound to become ‘worse than it was before the war’. 10 Professor Gilbert Murray insisted in a letter to The Times in 1923 that although the war had made traffic in women impossible, ‘the evil had now recommenced in many places with alarming rapidity’. He had been motivated to write by a story several days earlier about a trial in Berlin and the conviction of a Dutchman for an offence against emigration laws involving a woman. The article had included a statement by the commissioner in police for Berlin, Dr Kopp, which denied that ‘such a thing as white slave traffic existed’. The police commissioner must have meant, Murray insisted, that white slave trafficking in the narrowest sense did not exist, that is to say, there was no evidence of girls in Berlin being kidnapped from their homes and sold into commercial vice abroad. 11 As evidence that the traffic in women existed in a wider sense, Murray referenced the anti-traffic activities of the League of Nations. He recalled the pre-war study of prostitution across Europe by Abraham Flexner, and added that a more recent report by ‘one of the South American governments’ confirmed Flexner’s conclusions. This government acknowledged that within its borders ‘99 per cent of the women of easy virtue are foreigners, and 99 per cent of the white slaves are also foreigners’. 12

Murray might have been expected to defend the international effort. From 1923 until 1938, he chaired the executive committee of the League of Nations Union and despatched letters to newspapers when he thought they had printed material encouraging the British government to ignore obligations under the Covenant. The Times listened to Murray and echoed much of his message in a commentary about a report the Children’s Branch of the Home Office released the following day. 13 The Dutch authorities supported Dr Kopp. At a gathering of the International Bureau for the Suppression of Women and Children in London in 1923, the representative from the Dutch National Committee, Dr Andrew de Graaf, took exception to press reports about the traffic in women. He denied that thousands of German girls had been exported to South American brothels via Dutch harbours. As there was only one shipping line from Holland to South America, Royal Dutch Lloyd, and it operated under very strict control. In fact, there had only been one recent case of trafficking in
Holland, that of a Frenchman and his daughter suspected of links to the white slave trade.\textsuperscript{14}

It was, then, by no means clear that the problem of the international ‘white slave trade’ was even a problem, except that the machinery for its continued suppression had been built into the bureaucratic structure of the League of Nations. Article 23c of the Covenant, inserted at the request of the British government, included reference to the traffic in women and children. By this article, the League was entrusted with responsibility for supervision of international agreements made before the war. The clause at the beginning made clear that the signatories were binding themselves to nothing further than what had already been agreed by existing or future conventions.\textsuperscript{15} This meant the measure did not draw controversy. It also meant that ‘supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to the traffic in women and children’ was on the agenda for the first session of the Assembly.\textsuperscript{16} In December 1920, the Assembly adopted a resolution calling on the Secretariat to send a questionnaire to member states about the present status of their legislation and about their future programme on the subject. The United States government did not answer the questionnaire, although Major Bascom Johnson of the American Social Hygiene Association put together a response gleaned from official documents.\textsuperscript{17}

The League of Nations invited the governments of each nation to Geneva for a conference in 1921 to discuss steps to be taken with reference to the information received. Thirty four states were represented, a larger number than had conferred on this subject than ever before. Major Johnson attended as an American observer. Once the discussion got underway, the British representative, Arthur Balfour, argued for adoption of a new convention against the opposition led by Mr. Hanotaux. Great Britain, which led the drafting of this document, pressed its immediate adoption, while France favoured time for analysis. The British wanted a definition of ‘human trafficking’ that included ‘coloured women’ and the French objected. The French preferred the traditional language of ‘white slave trade’ (\textit{trait des blanches}) as the new language had implications for the colonies. British observers suspected deeper motives for French resistance. Throughout their efforts to delay, the French paraded their historical leadership on the issue and emphasised their sympathy with those who wished to abolish the traffic. France had an important role in drafting the conventions of 1904 and 1910 and because of this, found it difficult to accede to leadership by Great Britain. The French had furnished the conceptual language of human trafficking—\textit{trait des blanches, souteneur,
madame, maisons tolérée—and the British suspected they wanted to keep it that way.\textsuperscript{18}

While the British representative sought to isolate France for quibbling over the minor details, there was some support for the argument that the British had got the cart before the horse. A representative at the conference from the Red Cross Societies complained that their first business should have been to determine the truth of allegations about the white slave traffic. The representatives had assumed the existence of the traffic on a wide-scale without bothering with anything like statistical or documentary proofs. A significant number of those with expert knowledge doubted whether the white slave trade existed at all in the sense of traffickers procuring innocent girls under false pretences.\textsuperscript{19} In the end, the British got what they wanted. The 1921 Convention on Traffic in Women included provisions for extending protection to native populations in colonial possessions of European states, recommendations for widening the scope of criminal prosecutions, and declared the problem at issue should be officially regarded as ‘traffic in women and children’ rather than the ‘white slave trade’.\textsuperscript{20}

The 1921 Convention included commitments to investigate and prosecute traffickers in women and children, secure appropriate punishments and provide for extradition of those convicted. The recommendations also included statements concerning the need for regulation of employment agencies, and for regulation concerning protection of women and children emigrating by ship. The Canadian delegate, John Obed Smith, had proposed that every government should make it illegal to sell a ticket for a sea voyage to a woman of any age unless accompanied by her father, mother or husband, or otherwise obtained permission to land as an immigrant from the country of destination. The British delegate, Sidney W. Harris of the Home Office, suggested that no woman under 21 years of age be allowed to leave her country without a passport and no passport should be issued without an investigation into her background. The applicant for a passport should be required to declare the reasons for travel, and if for employment, provide written evidence from her employer about the nature of the work. Further, no passport should be issued to a woman under 18 years of age without the consent of her parents.\textsuperscript{21} In the end, the signatories pledged to post notices warning women and children about the danger of the traffic and indicating places where they might obtain assistance if threatened.

The most important aspect of the 1921 Convention directed the Council to create a permanent special committee, the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Women and Children. France, Great Britain, Japan, Poland,
Spain, Rumania, Denmark, Italy and Uruguay were invited to appoint representatives. In addition, there were to be five unofficial representatives or assessors: one from each of the International Bureau for the Suppression of the Traffic, International Women’s Organisation, International Catholic Association for the Protection of Women and Girls, the Federation of National Unions for the Protection of Girls and the Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls and Women. The Advisory Committee was meant to become the centre for information about traffic from all parts of the world. It would have the authority to recommend, via the Council of the League of Nations, to all members of the League, new legislation and new administrative arrangements. In June 1921, the Assembly approved a recommendation calling for creation of a permanent advisory committee and annual reports to be issued by the League. The Advisory Committee was appointed in June 1922 and issued its first report the following year.22

It is problematic to say the issue of human trafficking would never have found a place on the international agenda had it not been for the role of women in the League of Nations. But it is clear that the League opened the door to women in positions of political leadership and that women working within the League championed the issue of human trafficking.23 In Britain, the general election of 1918 gave women their first opportunity to participate in the electoral process, both as voters and candidates for parliament. The suffrage societies had much of the campaign machinery in place and the women’s movement fielded their candidates with optimism. The Women’s Freedom League stressed the historic, symbolic nature of the election and the need for women to carry out the responsibility they had fought for. The 17 women on the hustings ranged across the political spectrum. The election did not produce a victory for a woman candidate, but it had demonstrated that women were able to carry out a vigorous campaign. After the disappointment in the 1918 election, the Women’s Freedom League sought alternative avenues of power in public office. They encouraged women to stand for local council and provincial county elections.24

Nancy Astor became the first woman MP as a result of a by-election, fighting for her husband’s Plymouth seat in the course of acquiring his title. Many MPs ignored her. But Astor’s great wealth meant that she could hire staff. In the House of Commons, Lady Astor, and others, pressed the government to send women to Geneva. In 1921, she parried with Edward Shortt, the Home Secretary, over appointment of a woman to represent the UK in matters concerning the traffic in women.
Would he consider appointment of a woman as a technical advisor? Shortt replied that it was unnecessary to appoint a woman as technical advisor as two representatives from the National Vigilance Association had been invited, and one of them was a woman. Later that same month, Astor raised the issue again. Was the government aware that Denmark had appointed a woman as a full voting delegate to the conference on traffic in women? Was the government aware the French government had appointed a woman as an alternate delegate? Shortt knew about the Danish appointment, but had no information about the French situation. In any case, there was no need to appoint a woman. But Astor, among others, continued to press, and secured in 1922 a statement from Lloyd George in the House of Commons that he would consider the request to appoint a woman as delegate, alternate delegate or technical advisor.25

Lloyd George made good his promise and sent Winifred Coombe Tenant to Geneva. Tenant chaired the women’s agricultural committee from Glamorgan during the war, and afterwards, became the first woman to serve on the Glamorgan bench when she was appointed a JP. In 1922, she campaigned unsuccessfully for Parliament as a Liberal candidate, but through her links to Lloyd George, won appointment as a deputy delegate for Britain. She attended the fifth commission dealing with social questions including opium and traffic in women. The Council for the Representation of Women on the League of Nations formed of representatives from women’s societies across the country. The Council wanted to see a woman as a full delegate. But its president, Mrs Ogilvie Gordon, welcomed a Coombe Tenant’s appointment to deputy delegate as a ‘first instalment’.26

The first draft of the Covenant of the League of Nations had excluded women from office. But after a sustained effort, a committee representing the International Council of Women and the Women’s Alliance for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship secured a 30-minute interview with President Woodrow Wilson. This resulted in Article 7 which stipulated that all positions created by the League, including the Secretariat, would be open equally to women. Throughout the 1920s, no women held seats on the Council or in the Assembly; rather, they arrived in Geneva with national delegations. Sweden, Denmark and Norway sent women to the first assembly in 1920, and by 1928, Rumania, Great Britain and Germany sent women as technical advisers and substitute delegates. It became the tradition to appoint all women delegates to committees dealing with social questions including traffic in women and children and traffic in opium and dangerous drugs. In fact, the first speech made
by a woman in the Assembly was that of Fröken Forchhammer of Denmark who spoke about the traffic in women and children. She convinced the Assembly to call for an international commission to study the question; the commission recommended the creation of the permanent Advisory Committee.27

Women found relatively fewer obstacles within the League of Nations compared to national public administrations, at least at first. ‘The staff is predominantly feminine’ remarked a visitor to Geneva in 1923, ‘There are ladies, ladies everywhere, on the stairs, along the corridors, out on the verandas’.28 During the 1920s, more than a dozen women held positions of administrative rank. The first secretary-general, Eric Drummond, appointed Rachel Crowdy to head the combined opium and traffic in women sections, the only woman to head a section. Crowdy established her credentials in social welfare during the war in connection with her work with volunteer nursing units attached to the Territorial Army. She organised rest stations for wounded soldiers, ambulance depots, hostels for nurses, and field hospitals in France and Belgium. In 1919, she was named Dame of the British Empire. She also presided as secretary-general over the conference that produced the 1921 Convention on Suppression of Traffic. When the Secretariat passed from Drummond to Joseph Avenol, the importance of women administrators declined steadily. Women who left posts were not replaced by women (Crowdy had in fact already been replaced by a Swedish man during Drummond’s tenure). By 1938, the number of women had been cut in half, and those that remained were employed as technical advisors. Avenol took less interest in advancing women to positions of leadership, but there was also the larger problem of the decline of democratic government in Europe. More women were disappearing from European administrations, which reduced the pool from which to appoint qualified women.29

Participation of women became a justification in itself for League of Nations’ activities. The League of Nations Union reported that many of the 34 states represented in Geneva at the international conference had sent women as delegates, one of whom (Forchhammer of Denmark), was chosen vice-president. ‘It is worth remarking’ a pamphlet of the League of Nations Union stated, ‘that four of the five assessors were women, the representative of the International Women’s Organisations being Mme. Avril de Ste. Croix, a French-woman whose name is revered by all who are interested in the fight against the traffic’. The debate at the third assembly in September 1922 was of some ‘special interest to British people, for two British women took part in it’: Mrs Coombe-Tenant of the British delegation and Mrs Dale of the
Australian delegation. In 1932, a subcommittee to the Assembly, chaired by Kerstin Hesselgren of Sweden, talked up the importance of women members of the League. In countries where women had been sent as representatives to the League, women took more interest in activities. Hesselgren's subcommittee despatched a resolution to the Assembly expressing gratitude for work of women in support of the League of Nations, and urging governments, the Council, and Secretary-General to appoint more women. One woman, Grace Abbott, succeeded in bringing about the first worldwide study of human trafficking—the first ever social-scientific study of a global social problem.

The special body of experts

The Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Women met for the first time in June 1922. The first session invited Germany and the United States to send unofficial representatives to sit with them in Geneva. Germany had no reply, but President Warren Harding authorised Grace Abbott, director of the Children’s Bureau in Washington, DC, to attend the second session. Abbott took the view, shared by British representatives, that the traffic was a side effect of licensed prostitution. She was disgusted at the European system of maisons tolérée, and she regarded some of the delegates to the League as apologists for this system, concerned solely with avoiding scrutiny.

In March 1923, Abbott challenged the Advisory Committee to confront the spectre that had haunted their proceedings from the beginning. She urged them to investigate into ‘whether there is an international traffic in women and girls for purposes of prostitution’. The investigation would enable the Advisory Committee to find out ‘between what countries the traffic is being carried on, by what methods, and about the effectiveness of national measures undertaken to suppress the traffic’. She explained that this information could not be obtained via official correspondence with governments because governments did not own the tools for a proper social inquiry. Such an inquiry had been carried out in the United States during 1908–1909 by the Immigration Commission, but nothing had been undertaken since then, particularly on an international scope. Samuel Cohen, the representative for the Jewish Association, agreed with the need for Abbott’s proposal, but wondered where the money and staff for it could be found.

At the third session in April 1924, the Advisory Committee announced it had accepted Abbott’s proposal and that it would be underwritten by a grant from the Bureau of Social Hygiene, the research branch of the
American Social Hygiene Association in New York City. This organisation had been formed in 1913 by amalgamation of several organisations concerned about prostitution and venereal disease. It enjoyed the support of leading figures, including John D. Rockefeller Jr, the initial financial contributor. The Advisory Committee welcomed the American Association’s support in establishing the truth of commercialised vice. ‘It was pointed out that from time to time extravagant and baseless stories’ circulated in the public. While these were easy enough for workers in the field to see through, such stories ‘misled others and produced mischievous results’. The Advisory Committee acknowledged that provisions to suppress the traffic in women made by governments, along with supervision over intercontinental travel, had made it much more difficult for traffickers to operate. As a result, allegations as to activities on a large scale by systematic methods ‘may be perceived with caution and even incredulity’.34

The Council appointed eight individuals—the experts—to oversee the enquiry: William F. Snow, United States, president; A. de Meuron, Switzerland; M. Christina Giustiniani Bandini, Italy; Isidore Maus, Belgium; P. Le Luc, France; Sidney W. Harris, Great Britain; Tadakatsu Suzuki, Japan; Paulina Luisi, Uruguay.35 Snow, professor of preventive medicine at Stanford University and director of the American Association, had, during the war, served as a principal adviser to the US Army on the prevention of venereal disease. He presided over meetings of the experts in Geneva and Paris. He appointed Bascom Johnson to carry out the research. As director of investigations on the trafficking survey, Johnson led a staff of experienced assistants who made field visits to describe ‘on the spot conditions’ in cities and countries of interest to the experts. They produced reports on 28 countries, including 112 cities and districts, for the most part, located in Europe and the Americas. As a matter of project design, the experts decided to investigate the substance behind current understandings about the centre of the traffic. Specifically, they chose to begin enquiries ‘in cities and countries to which women are alleged to have been sent for purposes of prostitution’.36 From the nineteenth century, Buenos Aires had a terrible reputation as the port of missing women. Horrendous stories circulated of kidnapped women, forced to dance the tango with strange and sinister partners.37

The experts collated information from regulations, reports and other documents submitted to the Secretariat. They circulated a questionnaire and visited a number of countries, including the Nordic countries and the British West Indies. They carried out interviews with local authorities including chiefs of police, migration and health officials;
and asked police for information about known traffickers. The researchers collected reports from voluntary societies and private individuals working for the welfare of women. They interviewed about 250 social welfare workers. In addition, Johnson’s investigation attempted to ‘get in touch with the underworld’ and ‘ascertain what was going on behind the scenes’. They found some 5,000 persons engaged in provision of sexual vice for interview. To identify this population, they began in countries in which prostitution was licensed, specifically, ‘certain prominent characters in the underworld of some of the cities of South America’. Johnson’s researchers frequented clubs and cafés where they met prostitutes and souteneurs, and they visited houses of prostitution to gain the confidence of the madams and prostitutes. They also spoke with managers and artistes in cabarets and music halls. From these contacts, they extended their sources to members of the underworld in other countries. As Johnson explained, collecting evidence about the means by which such persons evaded legal restrictions required ‘skilled investigators’ who were ‘able to extricate themselves from difficult situations’ and were ‘prepared to risk the dangerous consequences which would follow detection’. The investigators wrote up their notes at the earliest moment and passed them on to Johnson who tried to find corroborative evidence.38

The Report of the Special Body of Experts concluded that there was a reality to the traffic behind the melodramatic images in novels and cinema. The experts ruled out the existence of any single organised group worldwide, and instead, described international networks linked by a ‘worldwide camaraderie’ among traffickers. They also sought to distance their findings from the ‘myth’ of women kidnapped or lured into the life of commercial sex.39 ‘We do not wish to give the impression that all or most of these were unsuspecting or defenceless women who had been decoyed to a foreign country in ignorance of the real purpose of their journey’. The method of the white slave traffic of concern before the war had changed. Such methods have been precluded by national and international efforts leading to greater protection for the ‘honest girl’. While the investigators found ‘inexperienced girls’ who had been fooled into false marriages, for the most part, the world of trafficked women was peopled with professional prostitutes, semi-professional or part-time prostitutes, ‘compliant girls’ willing to give away their virtue. The economy of music halls, cabarets and cafés where girls found employment represented a gateway into vice for young women. Many were drawn to the glamour of life on stage and adventure of life in an exotic location. As one souteneur put it, ‘All these kids are wild about the stage, the movies, cabarets, anything that makes them think they are artistes. They are the kind that fall easy’.40
In estimating the extent of the traffic worldwide, the experts team relied on an admission by the Brazilian government that most of its brothels were filled with women from Europe. The foreign element exceeded 80 per cent. Montevideo and Buenos Aires reported similar figures. As far as Rachel Crowdy was concerned, the Report established beyond doubt that traffic in women was an international problem worthy of the League of Nations. The experts had determined there to be a trade in women from one country to another for commercialised prostitution. They had based their conclusion of two findings. First, that in many brothels, particularly in Central and South America, as many as 70 to 80 per cent of women were foreign. Second, when the experts asked underworld informants about how foreign women got to such places, they were told women seldom came on their own. Individuals lacked the will and resources and only arrived because someone provided an organisation. ‘On the strength of these two facts, the experts state very definitely that they find such a traffic exists’. 41

The Report offered a baseline of facts and statistics with estimates about the extent of victims and perpetrators, developments in methods used by traffickers (such as the role of false passports, bogus offers of employment), and updates on legislative measures and efforts of voluntary organisations. More importantly, it promoted a conceptual vocabulary for analysis. The Report identified routes, including main routes, indirect routes, and stages on routes; sources of demand and supply, categories of victimhood, and typologies of traffickers. The traffickers and their associates ought not be regarded as a ‘formal organisation’ but rather ‘local associations’ linked together. Among the traffickers, there were four roles: principals, often men too old to be procurers; madams, who operated brothels or boarding-houses; souteneurs, who procured women for entry into the trade; and intermediaries, the ‘middle men’ who brought likely girls into arm’s reach of souteneurs and madams.42 There were in addition to these four primary classes, other figures, such as doctors or lawyers, who carried out assignments on commission. The market for trafficked victims included theatres and clubs. Vice districts in major cities, including those with licensed houses of prostitutions, created a steady demand for foreign women. The market was also created by ‘temporary assemblies’, that is, events that brought large numbers of men to various places in the world. This included the movements of soldiers and sailors, and also migration within the industrial population. Work shifted large numbers of men, separated from their wives and families, to cities and districts.43 The Report identified an emerging correlation
between international sporting events and the sex trade. Two years earlier, the Strasbourg scandal drew attention to prostitution. Young athletes from across the continent had gathered in the city for a gymnastic competition. Strasbourg possessed a street of *maisons tolérée*, and for three nights, young men between 13 and 18 years of age queued outside. The organisers appealed to the police, but they stayed away, and the ‘affair…created a great sensation among the inhabitants of the town’.44

Critics took exception to ‘facts’ in the *Report* as well as the implications for intervention. Some of this could be deflected. Italy’s criticism could be read as an attempt to justify its system of licensed prostitution. The Mussolini government’s dismissive response contained contradictory statements about Italy’s approach, characterised in one place as one of the ‘anti-abolitionist countries’ and in another, denying the country could be fairly categorised as an abolitionist country. The Italian response reverted to legerdemain invoking a distinction between ‘authorisation’ and ‘toleration’ of prostitution.45 Other denials could be attributed to national pride or boasts about formulas for success in dealing with the traffic. In Paris, préfect de police Alfred Morain ignored information about white slave traffic in relation to France. The year after the *Report* appeared, he dismissed the very idea of traffickers luring European women, or rather Frenchwomen, into forced prostitution in South America or anywhere else. He declared the number of cases of white slave traffic which really occurred was far less than the issue received in certain newspapers. ‘The average Frenchwoman is too intelligent and well-educated to allow herself to be easily duped by the marvellous promises of remunerative employment which form the usual bait of the white-slave merchant’.46

But other criticism was more difficult to deny. H.J. Versteeg, chief commissioner of police in Amsterdam, told how the Dutch government had carried out an in-depth enquiry into suggestions in the *Report* that the victims of traffic found their way to South America on Dutch ships. The allegations had been made by a former employee of Royal Dutch Lloyd cruise line. He claimed to have seen in the brothels of Buenos Aires European women he recognised from ships of the line, and that he had seen men who travelled back and forth from Europe to South America taking girls to these brothels. As it turned out, Versteeg explained, ‘this person merely desired a salaried position as detective’. There was also the question about how the facts were to be interpreted, as conclusions assigned responsibility. To be sure, women who desired to become prostitutes in South America could book passage on the
Dutch line. But so long as they had valid passports and visas from their home country, what could the Dutch government do? It was unfair to blame Holland in general, or Dutch shipping in particular, for a situation it was powerless to change. There was no way to end traffic from Europe of women intending to work as prostitutes so long as the Argentine government maintained its licensed system of brothels.47

The decision to focus on alleged traffic between Europe and South America proved controversial. The experts began with a review of existing information about traffic routes from Western Europe to Central and South America and found significant evidence to confirm this assumption. Foreign prostitutes were evident in the principal cities of South America and in Egypt, Algeria and Tunis. Most of the foreign women in these countries were found to have come from Austria, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Rumania, Spain and Turkey.48 Afterwards, it appeared that three years of effort merely repeated claims that had been made beforehand. The year before Johnson’s researchers got underway, Annie Baker, speaking for the International Bureau for the Suppression of Traffic in Women, foreshadowed the conclusions they would reach when they had finished. ‘Owing to rigorous action taken by the United States and Canada in relation to immigration, it can fully be assumed that those countries will not be the objective of the traffickers. As in former days, their eyes will doubtless be directed to South American ports even more than to Egypt’.49 According to the New York Times, ‘the chief complaints, made against the American chairman, William F. Snow, are, in effect, that the expert investigators were handpicked by himself and have given a rough whitewashing to the Anglo-Saxon nations while the Latin nations come in for bitter and unjust criticism’. Delegates from Italy, France, Poland, Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay charged the report amounted to an incomplete and inaccurate portrait, because investigators despatched to these nations spoke only English and as a result could not make accurate statements.50

The contents appeared in two stages. A brief report, Part 1, containing a summary and conclusions, appeared nine months before the hefty Part 2 with details of interviews and site visits. In April 1927, the Advisory Committee met in Geneva to review the work of the Special Body of Experts. The representative from Rumania charged the Report contained too many unchecked statements by souteneurs. The delegate from Poland agreed. Traffickers had an interest in spreading false information about their activities and he noted inaccuracies with respect to Poland. Part 2 of the Report cited a report of the Polish government as the source for information when no such document
existed. Sidney Harris of Great Britain reminded the group that governments had been given a chance to review the information in Part 2, and there was no reason not to publish the full report. Rumours circulated Part 2 had been delayed owing to editing for political reasons and the desire to spare embarrassment to particular countries. If so, there were those who felt they had been singled-out for undue attention and recrimination.

It proved embarrassing for the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Women and Children, when one of the experts distanced herself from the findings in the report. Paulina Luisi was the first woman in Uruguay to receive a baccalaureate degree and the first woman physician and surgeon. Luisi, who drew her inspiration from Josephine Butler, was for more than ten years president of the International Council of Women’s commission against the white slave trade. She developed a deep concern for the individual prostitute and challenged the government’s do-nothing attitude about the public health of women. Uruguay’s ratification and adherence in 1921 to the League of Nations convention reflected her initiative. She used public lectures, radio interviews, magazine and newspaper articles to motivate reform. The cover page for Part 1 hints at reluctance to endorse its contents. A footnote announced that she had been ‘unable to attend the final meeting of the Committee’. Before Part 2 appeared, she informed the Special Body of Experts that important legislative changes had been made by the Uruguayan government that affected the illicit traffic in Montevideo. These facts developed too late for inclusion in Part 1 but it was important that they appear in Part 2. In March 1927, the government decreed an anti-trafficking law. As a result, all foreign procurers/souteneurs had been expelled and all licensed houses had been closed. She could account for the effectiveness of the legislation personally—when she left Montevideo she witnessed the migratory flight of prostitutes to Buenos Aires.

The music hall affair

One of the recommendations in the League of Nations report of 1927 to arouse significant interest had to do with the dangers of music halls. The Times, which provided summaries of Parts 1 and 2, quoted the experts’ warning to young women considering a career in cabaret. Using bogus newspaper ads, white slave traffickers lured would-be singers to foreign locations where they became trapped in immoral lives. Music hall owners maintained prostitutes to increase their profits. By requir-
ing artistes to drink with patrons, they enticed young men into the promise of sexual encounter, and then referred them to the professional prostitutes waiting nearby. At the seventh session of the Advisory Committee for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People in 1928, Louis Varlez of the International Labour Office tried to frame properly the music-hall threat. The number of young women artistes touring in music halls abroad, he pointed out, did not exceed 2,000–3,000, and so music hall dancers represented a ‘microscopic part of the whole field of women’s employment’. The Advisory Committee felt, never-the-less, that although the number of women performing in music halls was ‘relatively small’, they were specifically exposed to moral danger owing to conditions of their employment and so the matter should be regarded as a special problem to be addressed.

Music halls in Britain enjoyed a resurgence between-the-wars and ‘variety artist’ became something of a profession. The rapid growth of films after the Great War threatened the music hall with extinction and professional unions such as the Variety Artists Federation met each new entertainment medium with defensiveness. But in the 1930s, the music hall flourished as a popular entertainment venue and enjoyed greater currency than it had in the nineteenth century. The number of full-time houses and performers employed doubled as new houses opened and established houses added the variety format. The music hall acquired a particular fascination as the setting for popular French films of the 1930s. As a matter of mise-en-scène, the music hall presented the dangerous, cosmopolitan world of night-time leisure, alongside the casino and nightclub. From the beginning of the white-slave-trade scare, there had been an association between sexual slavery and music halls. The film The Blue Angel (1930), one of the first German-made ‘talkies’ shown in Britain, featured Marlene Dietrich as cabaret singer that lures a middle-aged man to his death. Lola Lola is the star of a troupe performing at the Blue Angel Inn, and her charms distract schoolboys to the extent their professor comes to investigate. But he too falls for her. Once under her spell, he must undergo humiliation after humiliation, beginning with being late for class and resigning his position. When reappearing in a town in which he was once a respected scholar, and finding her in the arms of another man, proves too much, death liberates him from his misery.

Following public release of Part 1 of the Report of the Special Body of Experts, rumours appeared in several British newspapers about Malta’s music halls as the major Mediterranean route for white slave traffic. Malta, an island colony situated midway between Gibraltar and Jerusalem,
served as the home for the Royal Navy’s Mediterranean Fleet. There were, in 1931, more than 1,600 military personnel in Malta, including members of the Royal Navy, Army, and Air Force, and by the late 1930s, this number increased to 35,000. These soldiers and sailors generated a significant night-time economy of bars and music halls. During the 1930s, of 1,300 or so licensed premises, there were about 100 cabarets employing some 300 artistes. The most notorious entertainment district was ‘Straight Street’ in Valletta, although there were other districts in Floriana and Sliema. Evelyn Waugh, who toured Valletta in the late 1920s, found it odd to see the ‘most ardently Catholic people in Europe’ alongside a British naval base and garrison. In between baroque buildings of the city, where ‘monks, nuns, priests...emerged in serried masses at every corner’, he spied sailors ‘swaggering down precipitous alleys with prostitutes who talked a mixture of Arabic and Italian’. The cafés call themselves ‘music halls’ he said, and instead of public houses there were cafés ‘with a row of handles behind the bar and barmaids who draw up pint glasses of metallic tasting draught bitter’.61

The source of the rumours was Monte Bayly. He was Variety Artists Federation general secretary and member of the executive committee of the League of Nations Union. The Federation sounded the alarm at every possible threat to the status of British music hall performers and Bayly distinguished himself as the alarmist-in-chief. The Daily Mail quoted Bayly as saying ‘Malta is one of the blackest spots in the world and has been responsible for many girls being caught in the net of the white slave organisation’. When Malta’s Prime Minister, Ugo Mifsud, was asked in parliament what steps he intended to take to address the situation, he declared the claims were ‘wicked and false’. Of the 45 artistes that had arrived from England during the past three years, all except for one had been happy with their contracts. All artistes arriving in Malta had regular passports and received careful supervision. ‘On a previous occasion’, Mifsud added, ‘Mr Bayly had shown hostility toward Malta’.62 At the Trades Union Congress of 1922, the Federation asked for resolutions concerning registration of theatrical employers, licensing of entertainment agents, and unionising places of amusement. To support this request, the Federation’s delegate read a letter from an employer to an applicant about the attractions of life as a vaudeville performer in Malta. He described the employer’s letter as nothing more than an attempt to obtain women for the white slave traffic. The Federation claimed the bogus theatrical agent flourished in Britain, and that the white slave traffic to Malta flourished as well
given all that was needed was a shilling to place an advertisement in a newspaper.63

In April 1927, the British consulate general at Tunis, J.M. Macleod, wrote to Thomas Best, acting governor of Malta, with reference to the exchange between Bayly and Mifsud in the *Daily Mail*. As it appeared the matter of the white slave traffic had come up in Malta’s parliament, he thought it the right occasion to mention information he had from the French consul about the ‘numbers of French girls of low character who were allowed to go to Malta’. Macleod said that police and civil authorities continued to give French women passports for Malta but would welcome Malta’s refusal to give them visas. He had kept quiet earlier, as it would have been embarrassing to deal with. But, he concluded, ‘It seems quite certain that Tunis is a notorious centre for that traffic and that employment offered at Malta is one of the means by which it is carried on’. He also admitted the absence of evidence. ‘That something like a “traffic” exists I feel certain, but of course, we have no legal proofs to show’.64 Best was nonplussed. He insisted that if girls of ‘dubious morals’ desired to come to Malta, it was the responsibility of the French authorities to deny them passports. The Italian authorities had cooperated with Malta and this had achieved very satisfactory results.65 To bolster his case, Macleod referred to the Report of the Special Body of Experts. He sent Best his notes on Part 1, underlining references to the traffic from Tunis and Algeria. The Report itself did not include reference to Malta, but he felt that paragraph (b) on page 13, which described foreign prostitutes advertising their services from the balconies near the theatre in South America, ‘appears to fit exactly the case of those establishments in Malta’. He directed Best to further references to artistes and entertainers, employment of girls abroad and remedies for regulating the music hall industry. He also mentioned his suspicions about a particular establishment, the Rexford Music Hall, and the Maltese proprietor he believed to be involved in ‘traffic of the most detestable kind’.66

Rumours about the white slave trade in Malta persisted. In 1932, two London papers, *Daily Herald* and *News of the World*, printed stories about English women lured to the island by agents for music halls and cabarets. These women were, according to the stories, trapped in ‘filthylodgings’ and forced to purchase food from restaurants owned by their employers. They were denied the salary they had been promised, made to drink with soldiers and sailors, and to give private performances in ‘dancing rooms’. The lodgings were little more than brothels, the music hall industry a thinly-veiled front for ‘white slavery’. In response, Malta’s
minister for police, Dr Mifsud Bonnici, directed the police to carry out an enquiry and they presented their findings in 1933. The police identified 78 English artistes and interviewed each of them. They visited 13 cabarets in which English girls performed and the boarding houses where they resided. They found no evidence of mistreatment. Not only did the women deny the London newspapers’ assertions, they declared working conditions to be better in Malta than in England. One woman, at the John Bull Music Hall in Valletta, said that English women-artistes had far more protection than what they had been accustomed to. The lodgings, provided free of charge, proved to be ‘much better than some of the rooms we have to put up with when travelling in different towns in England’. Mifsud Bonnici made a specific point of denying the white slavery allegation: ‘While carrying out this investigation, I had occasion to peruse the 14 files bearing on this matter, and dating back as far as to 1924, from which it appears that to the credit of this island and its people not one single case of White Slave Traffic or of ill or improper treatment of girl artistes, particularly English artistes, had been substantiated’.67

The allegations of white slavery occurred at a time when the Maltese were particularly conscious of their image in the public mind. Part of this reflected a desire to establish the tourist industry, in part it reflected growing nationalism. While newspaper editors in Malta disagreed about the extent of prostitution, they shared a denunciation of London papers for raising the issue. The Mid-Day Views and People’s Gazette, a nationalist paper, questioned why ‘little Malta’ should be held up to the world as a sink of iniquity, white slavery, wholesale betrayal of European women and the like’. This was so, the editor concluded, because Malta was ‘a small British colony, to be kicked and whipped as the mighty see fit’. The English press need only take a few steps from their offices in London to witness ‘graver scandals’.68

In 1938, the British Social Hygiene Council made a visit to Malta to examine matters of public health. Members of the council visited the entertainment districts, including Straight Street. The street was lined with bars and music halls, many with flamboyant titles, but to a ‘sensation-monger’, they reported, ‘a casual tour of inspection must be disappointing…during the day all is quiet and even listless’. The artistes in the sailors cabarets were recruited from all over the world. Members of the council saw ‘Chinese, American, Swedish, German, Austrian, Russian, African Negroes and half-caste girls from Hull and Glasgow’. There were only 34 English artistes because, as they explained, Malta had a poor reputation in the variety world. The two English associa-
tions, Variety Artistes Federation and British Equity, as well as the Paris agents, shunned Malta. ‘But the reason is not, as has been repeatedly alleged, because Malta is a centre of the “White Slave Traffic”’. The Council’s enquiries in London and Paris failed to turn up details of a single incident, even amongst the island’s most severe critics. ‘The objection is the practice of drinking with customers, which is a violation of the strictest professional code of the variety artiste’.69 Malta’s music hall scandal demonstrated the politics of international campaign against trafficking in women, but the affair was of much less consequence than the black clouds gathering over white slave traffic in Germany.

‘Jewish trafficking’ in Hitler’s Germany

In Weimar Germany, prostitution was illegal outside particular cities. Cities with Reglementierung (regulationism) tolerated prostitutes subject to a registration system including compulsory medical examinations and other restrictions on personal freedom. A special section of police, Sittenpolizei (morals police), maintained supervision of prostitution. But in 1927, the Reichstag promulgated the Law for Combating Venereal Diseases and abolished Reglementierung. Popular support for licensed prostitution had waned for several reasons. The double-standard maintained under regulationism became exposed by the extension of women’s suffrage in 1919, and feminists had long criticised the rationale in which women remained subject to the law but not the men. Social democrats and liberals objected to the discretionary powers of the morals police, and abolitionists argued that unlicensed streetwalkers outnumbered licensed prostitutes and posed a greater threat in terms of venereal disease. The decriminalisation of prostitution in 1927 brought a backlash, however, from the police and Catholic right. This allowed the National Socialists to argue against ‘moral decay’, ‘sexual Bolshevism’ and ‘racial pollution’.70

The Nazis accused Jews and Marxists of being the primary beneficiaries of prostitution and the spread of venereal disease. In Mein Kampf, Hitler declared that his revulsion at the sight of Jewish procurers in Vienna had made him anti-Semitic. ‘When thus for the first time I recognised the Jew as the cold-hearted, shameless, and calculating director of this revolting vice traffic in the scum of the big city, a cold shudder ran down my back’. Nazi-controlled newspapers filled their columns with propaganda about the alleged Jewish-controlled Mädchenhändle (trade in girls). Der Angriff, a weekly paper edited by
Joseph Goebbels in Berlin, attacked deputy police president Bernhard Weiss, a Jew and a Democrat, for protecting Jewish white slave traffickers.\textsuperscript{71} Germany became the only country, aside from Uruguay, to report an increase in trafficking. At the meeting of the International Bureau for Suppression of the Traffic in Women at Berlin in 1933, Nazi officials announced that activities by traffickers had reached ‘terrible dimensions’ during the past three years. The prostitute quarter in Berlin had spread; police had identified 68 new premises where traffic took place.\textsuperscript{72} Leaders of Jewish organisations took steps to defend their communities.\textsuperscript{73}

The London-based Jewish Association for Protection of Girls and Women became more focused on deflecting and refuting anti-Semitic claims. ‘To us Jews, the Traffic is an evil, which should be brought home as vividly and poignantly as possible, for, alas, it concerns us nearly. Through persecution, disabilities and poverty too many of our sisters are victims of that Traffic, and too many of the villains who conduct it are members of our “race”—we refuse to say, of our “faith”’. The Jewish Association sent Cohen on a tour in autumn 1926 of 18 cities throughout Europe: Rotterdam, Amsterdam, Berlin, Danzig, Riga, Kowno, Wilna, Warsaw, Lodz, Cracow, Lemberg, Czernowitz, Bucharest, Budapest, Vienna, Prague, Brussels and Antwerp. Cohen addressed existing Jewish anti-traffic committees or worked to form committees. He met with Christian groups, with police and other authorities, to arrange for international communication, protection of migrants, tracking missing girls and rescue of victims. While the leaders of the Jewish Association judged the tour a success, they noted great difficulties to be overcome in Poland and Rumania. Jewish relief committees already faced heavy demands from economic conditions and cooperation with national bodies and other relief committees had been hard to realise. ‘Political conditions, and anti-Semitic influences, stood in the way’.\textsuperscript{74}

The \textit{Report of the Special Body of Experts} did not single out Jews. Although there were references to places well-known for their Jewish populations, such as Czernowitcz and Lodz, there were many more references to places notorious for the traffic, that is, Montevideo and Buenos Aires. At the same time, individuals involved in the traffic in various countries were identified as Jews, while other ethnic or religious groups were not tagged in this way. In a discussion of routes of travel, the \textit{Report} quotes an informant in Algiers about the process of ‘breaking in’ a new girl en route. ‘I know a boy who went to Constantine [Constantinople?] and got himself a beauty—only 17 years old—a Jewish girl. He brought her here and put her in the game. She at
first raised hell, but he took her to another country, and now they are both getting along fine’.75

Jews were said to command the main methods of conducting the traffic. In the international underworld of traffic in women, the role of ‘intermediary’ was linked to Jewish identity. The Report claimed that traffickers evaded regulations regarding travel with the ‘connivance of an unscrupulous doctor or lawyer’ specialising in false marriage certificates and forged passports. ‘One of these is known as “the Rabbi”. To the casual observer, he is a benevolent old man, living simply and picking up the means to do so by executing small commissions for his fellow-citizens. His real business is the doctoring of official documents and papers for *souteneurs* and others who want to travel, but cannot do so without concealing their identity. This old man has had a long experience as a *souteneur* and understands the traffic thoroughly’.76

Jewish traffickers also had at their disposal the ‘marriage method’ of entrapping girls. The religious ceremony performed by a rabbi represented a means of concealing the relationship between a trafficker and his victim. The Report told of a souteneur in Lodz who became engaged to a girl, and then paid his father $50 to smuggle himself, along with three other girls and ‘a Jewish man’, across the border. Once in Germany, this souteneur then appeared at a rabbi’s house, and persuaded the rabbi’s wife, in absence of her husband, ‘to perform certain rites of Jewish ritual’. She then said to them: ‘Now you are married’. After three days, the souteneur beat his ‘bride’, threw her into the street saying she was not his wife, but that she could reside with him provided she would go into the streets and return with money.77

Further, in relying on the alleged over-supply of foreign prostitutes in Buenos Aires, the experts of the League of Nations simply reproduced the simplistic explanation of the commercial sex trade professed by Argentine authorities. The Buenos Aires police assigned blame for the problem to the immigrant population. Jewish women, in particular, became targets for xenophobic reaction. Julio L. Alonsogay, inspector of police, turned to the Jewish element in his *Trilogía de la trata de blancas: Rufianes—policía—municipalidad* (The White Slave Trilogy: Pimps—police—prostitutes). Rachel Liberman, who had been involved in the Buenos Aires sex trade for four years, denounced the Zwi Migdal organisation to Alonsogay in 1929. Named after its founder, the Zwi Migdal gang maintained a network of procurers and prostitutes. Despite the notoriety from this affair, arrest statistics revealed few Jewish women involved in clandestine prostitution. Most of the women arrested for scandalous behaviour were of Spanish, French or Italian background.78
The Jewish Association welcomed the *Report of the Special Body of Experts*, at least initially. The leadership hoped that Parts 1 and 2 would be read by an immense number of Jews. The contents should encourage Jews in Eastern Europe to make fresh efforts and help the general Jewish public to become more anxious and concerned. ‘What is told there, and in more detail in Part II, is trustworthy and objective’. But, the Jewish Association had some concerns about discussion of the *Report* at the upcoming congress of the International Bureau for the Suppression of the Traffic to be held in London in 1927. As the *Report* was likely to set the agenda, the Jewish Association advised its supporters ‘we shall have to watch carefully that, if the Jewish element in the traffic is mentioned, it shall not be exaggerated, on the one hand, or the causes of it ignored, upon the other’. Press across the world had quoted extensively from the *Report* and the leadership of the Jewish Association was pleased with the attention the association received as an assessor to the League of Nations and the Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People.

In June 1927, the Jewish Association convened an international conference at Rudolf Steiner Hall in London. The conference included rabbis and workers from across Europe. Claude Montefiore, president of the Jewish Association, regretted that Lady Battersea, who had founded the organisation in 1885, could not attend owing to poor health. He was pleased to announce a talk by Rachel Crowdy who discussed cooperation between the Jewish association and other organisations. The conference reaffirmed the programme adopted at the first international Jewish conference seventeen years earlier. Montefiore stressed that many of the traffickers, and many of their victims, were Jews. The *Report* mentioned Jews by name in only a few places, but ‘we know that several of the evil persons spoken of probably belong to our race’. It was especially important for it to be known that Jews from many countries had banded together to remove this stain from their community. The conference included a recommendation that the committees in all countries rouse Jewish public opinion against the traffic in ‘every possible way’, but particularly by leaflets, pamphlets and warnings printed in Yiddish and other languages. Montefiore praised the work of chief rabbi, Samuel Halphon in Argentina. Dr Halphon had worked with city authorities, police and Christian societies to carry out protective work.

But those from Germany attending the conference disagreed with the Jewish Association’s strategy and its regard for the League of
Nations’ report. Rabbi Felix Goldmann of Leipzig said, on behalf of the German Union of Rabbis: ‘We rabbis are of the opinion that it is dangerous to talk so much about the traffic and to be incessantly proclaiming our sins to the world’. The Jewish effort should concentrate on ‘anti-Semitism which is at the bottom of the traffic’. Bertha Pappenheim, a founder the German feminist movement, took particular exception to the idea that the Report of the Special Body of Experts was objective and fair. The informants on whom the experts relied used Yiddish jargon. The experts made little effort to analyse such language; they simply included it while taking care to minimise use of the word Jews. ‘Generally speaking it is unsectarian,’ Pappenheim observed, ‘but as soon as Jews are mentioned, the quality ceases’. As Cohen saw it, the problem was not so much deliberate or systematic distortion but selective inclusion (although even he found the anecdote about the Polish traffic victim and the rabbi’s wife to be ‘absurd’). Jewish organisations in various countries readily supplied the experts with information they had about trafficking, and because information of this quality was not available for non-Jewish groups, and because the experts did not make the effort required to assemble it, the result was a document with disproportionate attention on the Jewish activities.

In a 1929 article, Erich Fromm described the white slave traffic in German as a myth. Fromm formed part of group of social theorists, mostly Jews, associated with the Institute of Social Research at the University of Frankfurt. The Institute brought psychoanalysis and Marxist theory to a critique of Weimar culture. According to Fromm, the myth of the white slave trade derived from a ‘complex of fantasies creating sexual desire’ which concentrated resentments on Jews, who collectively represented the image of ‘the hated father’. Whether his explanation of Mädchenhandel had any merit, he managed to identify as least part of the appeal of the Jewish trafficker as an element of National Socialist propaganda. White slave trafficking invoked sexual fantasies and fears, and tying these to Jews gave the Nazi regime a powerful basis for myth-making.

After working for so many years to raise awareness of Jews involved in the traffic, Jews in Britain threw their campaign into reverse gear. A pamphlet released in 1937 by the Woburn Press in London entitled The White Slave Traffic carried the banner ANTI-SEMITIC LIES EXPOSED. The pamphlet declared that anti-Semites, in their efforts to propagate racial hatred, revived old allegations that had been refuted in the past. Among these was a statement that the white slave traffic was
controlled by Jews, financed and encouraged by Jews. The language avoided use of the word ‘race’ and used ‘faith’ instead. ‘This statement is a deliberate lie’, the author declared, ‘It was never denied that there were some Jews engaged in this dreadful traffic, but their numbers were never large in proportion to traffickers of other faiths. To-day, few Jews take part in this traffic, and the reduction in their numbers is the result of Jewish activity’. Jewish traffickers nearly always came from countries where Jews were persecuted, where the opportunities of Jews to earn a living had been curtailed, and while they were men of bad character, ‘in no way were they, even by the widest stretch of imagination, typical members even of those communities from which they came’. The victims of these men were also ‘nearly all girls of their own faith’.85

Further, the pamphlet distanced Jews from claims within the Report of the Special Body of Experts. In referring to the work of the Jewish Association, the author said that Buenos Aires had always been a ‘notorious centre of this traffic’ and in 1930, the Jewish Association had broken up a ‘notorious group of traffickers’. However, further investigations made in 1936 by the Argentine Police revealed that the largest proportion of women in the licensed houses were not foreigners, but Argentines, as was a large proportion of madams. ‘In other words, the general belief that the Argentine houses were filled with foreign girls imported by foreigners was shown to be untrue’. Out of 1,062 women only 38 were of Polish or Russian origin. The proportion of foreign women in Argentina had been a major finding of the Special Body of Experts in declaring the whole issue of international traffic to be more real than imaginary. The pamphlet went on to say that annual reports of the League of Nations Advisory Committee on Traffic in Women and Children, which had been published from 1922, seldom mentioned cases of Jews as traffickers among thousands of cases each year.86

Conclusions

The League of Nations commissioned a second study on the trafficking in women. Completed in 1933, this study moved beyond the focus of the first study—Europe, the Mediterranean and the Americas—into the Far East. The American Social Hygiene Association paid for the study and provided the services of Major Bascom Johnson who chaired the travelling commission.87 The 1933 study did expand the geographical scope of the League’s enquiry, but compared to that of 1927, amounted to far less significance. Even before it was over, the American Association
pressed Johnson to wrap up his tour as soon as possible because he was needed for more important work back at the New York office.

The 1927 study had political repercussions. Within the British Empire, these involved exchanges of blame between colony and capital. The report suggested the spill-over effect, that whatever problems occurred in Britain originated somewhere else. The music hall affair pointed to Malta, a tiny British colony, as the source of problems in London. The report also figured into the European politics, and particularly, the assault on Jews within Hitler’s Germany. The presentation of Jewish involvement in the traffic within the report appeared to endorse allegations of ‘Jewish trafficking’ by the National Socialists. In commissioning the social-scientific investigation of 1927 into the traffic, the League replaced the moral vocabulary of the Victorian era with the scientific language of health and hygiene. International anti-traffic campaigners claimed to have set aside the Victorian myth of the ‘white slave trade’, but they also helped create another: the myth of the ‘Jewish trafficker’.
In 1932, the ocean liner *MS Georges Philippar* caught fire and sank on a return voyage to France from China. The cause of the fire never rose beyond the level of speculation, and some suspected it had been deliberately set to murder a French journalist who was aboard. Before he died in the fire, Albert Londres achieved acclaim for enquiries into abuses in French colonies and other issues. As an investigator for the League of Nations, he tracked the routes of prostitutes being taken from Europe to South Africa. His account, *Le Chemin de Buenos Aires* (The Road to Buenos Aires), brought the narrative drama of a novel to documentary reporting, and stirred public reaction across the European capitals. Londres had boarded the ship at Shanghai, along with a portmanteau of material he had collected about the drug trade. He was about to expose those responsible for the international drug trade in the same way he had the white slave traffic.¹

Efforts to establish a system of international control of opium started before the Great War, and afterward, the League of Nations took up the matter with some urgency. The issue was important enough for the United States to abandon its policy of ignoring Geneva and American representatives joined the Advisory Committee on Opium. Great Britain and the United States pointed to China as the chief reason for the rising numbers of heroin addicts in the world and China and the United States blamed Britain for refusing to end opium monopolies in its colonies. After 1925 when American and Chinese delegates walked out of the proceedings, Britain managed to forge an international structure, the Central Opium Board, for regulating the drug trade worldwide. By 1936, however, the British chair of the board admitted the whole system had failed. Clandestine drug factories in the Mediterranean and Europe, supported by an inexhaustible supply from the Far
East, continued to increase the number of addicts. Meanwhile, in America, the US Congress created the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, and its director promptly blamed drug smuggling on Chinese ships and Britain’s colonies off the coast of Florida for the country’s drug problem.

The politics of the League of Nation’s drug policies reveal something very important about the significance of crime as an international issue. When in 1931, the Japanese Kwangtung Army attacked Chinese troops in Manchuria, China appealed to the League for help. The Assembly approved a resolution ordering the Japanese to leave, but the Japanese stayed in Manchuria and left the League. The League of Nations was content to watch. But following reports the Japanese purposely encouraged drug addiction amongst Chinese, and increased the flow of illicit supplies of opium out of China, representatives in Geneva declared it was time to act. The British delegate argued that Japanese involvement in the drug trade created a threat to ‘all countries’ throughout the world and advocated military force. The need to protect Chinese sovereignty had not been enough to motivate coordinated action, perhaps the need for crime prevention would be.

The league’s drug policy

The Great War changed social attitudes across Europe about regulation of drugs. There were whispers of drug use by soldiers on the front lines. Rumours circulated back home that before offensives, men had been made to drink wine, ether, or a mixture of wine and narcotics, in order to induce a state of ‘semi-drunkenness’ necessary to let loose their ‘brutal and anti-human instincts’. Afterward, in France, suspicion fell on Germany, said to be exporting cocaine as a means of enfeebling the French race. Regular shipments of le neige (snow) arrived in France by aeroplane, or express train, in the pockets of soldiers with the Army of Occupation in the Rhine.

In Britain, reports in 1916 of prostitutes selling drugs to soldiers triggered fear of widespread cocaine addiction. At the Home Office, Malcolm Delevingne worried that cocaine use in the army, and specifically by soldiers on leave in London, might infect the general public. He brought together representatives from the Home Office, Customs, Board of Trade, Colonial Office and Foreign Affairs Office to push for urgent police action. Prior to 1914, legislative control of drugs in Britain had been exercised by poisons and pharmacy laws. These laws concerned the sale of opium and cocaine; they provided no restrictions on possession or use of the drugs. Delevingne wanted to extend to drugs powers that had
been taken by the government for monitoring sales of war materials. The inter-departmental committee prompted a response from Parliament and Defence of the Realm Act Regulation 40B came into force in July 1916. The act contained extensive restrictions on the use of cocaine which made it an offence for anyone except medical professionals to possess, sell, or give it away. As things unfolded, the Select Committee on the Use of Cocaine in Dentistry in 1916 and 1917 found ‘no evidence of any kind’ to indicate the prevalence of a cocaine habit among military or civilian populations. At most, a few hundred Canadian soldiers had been involved out of the 2.5 million that passed through London.7

But concerns about drug addiction continued. In 1918, Billie Carleton, a popular young actress, was found dead in bed the morning after attending a Victory Ball at the Albert Hall, apparently from an overdose. The inquest and trial of a theatrical dress-designer who had supplied Carleton with drugs, spotlighted a wider problem. Carleton had circulated among party-goers who not only mixed cocktails, but sniffed cocaine and smoked opium. There were possible connections to army officers on leave and the American owner of a West End Club.8 Noel Coward dramatised the London drug scene in The Vortex, his first great success. The play centres on the character of Nicky Lancaster who returns to his family after some time in Paris. Nicky has a fiancée at his side, but also a small gold box, full of cocaine, in his pocket. His family notices his instability, irritability and cruelness, and one family friend, Helen Saville, realises why. She pleads with him to give up his illicit indulgence: ‘You’ve got to stop it; you haven’t gone very far yet, there’s still time—for God’s sake listen to reason’. Nicky resolves to turn himself around and seeks the support of his mother. Given the drug theme, the licensing committee was reluctant to approve exhibition, but Coward won his entertainment license by insisting the story was ‘little more than a moral tract’. The production began its original run in November 1924 with Coward himself in the role of Nicky.9

In France, the government enacted laws in 1916 and 1922 to combat the underground traffic in opium, morphine, heroin and chiefly cocaine. Harry J. Greenwall, correspondent for an English newspaper, reported that drugs poured into the country through ports of Cherbourg, Brest, Toulon and Marseilles. Cocaine had become ‘everybody’s secret’ in Montmartre; nine-tenths of the ‘women of easy virtue’ in the district took cocaine. The police formed a special brigade to stop the flow, and had recently contended with Chinese gangs.10 Georges du Parcq, press attaché at the Prefecture de Police, reported that crime amounted to an
organised business in Marseilles. The city had a ‘vicious Chinatown’ through which to import drugs and a large population of wealthy students in Paris eager to buy their wares. ‘Being Orientals they require opium and the main gateway to France, is of course, Marseilles’. The special squad of detectives made regular seizures of drugs from vessels trying to land in secret.11

The British government had been interested in the international control of opium from before the war and contributed to a series of conferences with other states.12 In 1909, Britain joined a gathering of 12 governments in Shanghai, including the six European powers and China, to consider the opium problem in the Far East. The conferees agreed to a set of recommendations for control of the international trade in dangerous drugs, but as these were never ratified, the convention amounted to advice about what should be done. The Shanghai conference did, however, lead to a second meeting in 1911 at the Hague, and this produced an agreement signed by 12 nations. The Hague International Opium Convention did not, owing to more than one complication, aim for the suppression of drug traffic. British delegates took the view that people in eastern countries chewed opium for relief from various symptoms of disease and traditions practised over centuries could not be abandoned overnight. Further, the governments of opium-producing countries derived significant financial benefit from its sale. There was the immediate question of compensation, not to mention the problem of building an alternative economy. So, rather than suppression, the convention pursued the idea of trimming off the excess of production over the amount for legitimate (medical and scientific) purposes. The six chapters dealt with restrictions on the production and sale of raw opium; the import and export of manufactured opium; regulation of medicinal opium and derivatives of the coca leaf; and identified laws to make it a criminal offence to possess opium and other drugs. The convention also spelt out measures to prevent smuggling into China.13

The United States favoured the creation of an ‘international commission’ to enforce the agreement but the other powers rejected this proposal. Sir William Collins, one of the British delegates, later recalled having been instructed not even to participate in a discussion of such an idea.14 As an alternative, the Hague participants agreed to entrust certain duties to the Dutch government. The Netherlands had been a major producer of narcotics and profited from the growing demand for opiates in Europe.15 To secure this arrangement, the participants returned to the Hague in 1913 and 1914. When war broke out, 32 states had
signed the Convention, in addition to the original 12, and 11 powers had ratified it. In Britain, a few weeks before the Armistice, the question was raised in the House of Commons as to what the British government proposed to do in regard to the Hague agreement. Lord Robert Cecil said the government intended to put into force some provisions of the convention without waiting for confirmation by all signatory powers.

At the Paris Peace Conference in February 1919, Cecil urged international cooperation to control the drug traffic. He inserted Article 295 into the Treaty of Versailles which provided that ratification would constitute ratification of the Hague International Opium Convention of 1912, as well as the Protocol adopted by the Third Opium Conference in 1914. In addition, supervision for the execution of its provisions was passed from the Dutch government to the League of Nations. At the first Assembly, it was agreed the Secretariat would collect further information to enable the League to carry out duties associated with the drug traffic. It was further decided that an Advisory Committee on Opium would be appointed by the Council. The Advisory Committee would be drawn from China, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Japan, the Netherlands, Portugal, Siam, Yugoslavia and the United States, although securing American cooperation would prove rather difficult. The Harding administration not only refused to endorse Cecil’s plan, but withheld its endorsement for transfer of supervision over previous agreements to the League. The United States insisted that it would continue to look to the Netherlands for activities under the agreement of 1912 and to regard the Dutch government as intermediary for communications with the League. The second and third Assemblies renewed pleas for American cooperation, and in December 1922, Secretary of State Hughes accepted an invitation from the Council to work with the Advisory Committee. Rupert Blue, assistant surgeon general of the Public Health Service, sat with the Advisory Committee during its fourth session in 1923. The Americans were pleased with the arrangement, and later that same year, sent a larger delegation, including Stephen G. Porter, chair of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. It was, in other words, the League’s efforts to control the opium traffic that induced the United States to formally acknowledge the League.17

At the fifth session of the Opium Advisory Committee, which met in the spring of 1923, Porter submitted the American interpretation of the Hague Convention. First, use of opium products for any use other than medical or scientific constituted abuse. Second, to prevent such abuse,
it was necessary to reduce production of raw opium so that there would be no surplus available. His declaration put the United States at odds with others members of the Advisory Committee, chiefly Britain, who sought to retain permission for smoking and eating opium by individuals. Britain wanted to avoid American criticism of its policy in India and wished to limit the participants in any negotiation to the other countries that were producing raw material or manufactured drugs. It was agreed that two conferences would be convened. At the first, governments in which smoking of opium was still legal, ‘the Opium bloc’, would work out its prohibition. The United States would not participate. At the second, producing and manufacturing countries would gather with the aim of reducing dangerous drugs manufactured for export.18 The resolution of the US Congress in 1924 authorising American participation in two international conferences constituted, said Quincy Wright, professor of international politics at the University of Chicago, an important step in the long history of mankind’s fight against narcotics. He believed previous negotiations had established general agreement that use of opium for other than medical and scientific purposes should be abolished. He also believed there was agreement that non-medical use of opium and narcotic drugs could only be suppressed by curtailing production. He stressed that drug control could not be effective unless it was international. Any of the poppy-growing countries could meet medical and scientific needs, and given the worldwide character of trade, production would need to be truncated everywhere else or the effort would be useless.19

The first conference fell short of Wright’s wish. All of the participants, with the exception of China and Japan, insisted it was impossible to suppress opium smoking in the Far East until China ended smuggling. China had sought to eradicate opium cultivation, and by 1917, nearly succeeded. But the collapse of the national government fostered the rise of political warlords and the warlords turned to poppy cultivation to raise revenue. The generals financed their armies by land taxes, which forced peasants to grow cash crops, of which opium was most profitable.20 The British Minister to Peking reported in 1921 that the governor of Kansu had convened a conference of officials, gentry and merchants at which he encouraged poppy cultivation to stave off financial panic and wide-scale mutiny.21 But the Chinese refused to shoulder responsibility. Dr Sao-Ko Alfred Sze, admitted that, as a consequence of ‘temporary disturbed political conditions’, there had been a ‘revival of poppy growing’ within Chinese territory. But he insisted that prohibition was possible. At one point, one of the Portuguese
delegates, Dr Rodrigo Rodrigues, defended his nation’s colonial takeover of Macao by suggesting it had rendered ‘services to humanity’. The Chinese people, in particular, should be grateful to Portugal for having freed them ‘from a state of piracy’. Sze retorted by offering to broker a loan to Portugal to end its opium monopoly and Rodrigues responded by saying his government ‘had no need of advice on the internal administration of its colonies from anyone’. By the middle of November, all that had been accomplished was a draft document outlining some minor reforms, such as eliminating opium sales to youth.22

Meanwhile, the second conference got underway. In contrast to the limited number of nations represented at the first conference, the second included more than 40. Four days into the gathering, Representative Porter, Reverend Brent and the other American representatives launched their proposals, which to the British point of view, amounted to an attempt to rewrite the Hague Convention. Essentially, Porter proposed to achieve the purpose of the second conference by methods of the first, in other words, to pursue prohibition of drug traffic by regulation of production. The British delegation declared the issue had already been settled; India expressed utter disagreement. Sir John Campbell of India joined Delevingne in opposition. Campbell alleged that Porter had previously agreed not to have proposed such a motion, a claim denied by Reverend Brent. In December, Delevingne announced that he had received an order to return to London and the second conference went into recess. At an inter-departmental meeting a few days before Christmas, the British delegation decided to sign the draft agreement from the first conference, propose an international commission to enquire into conditions in the Far Eastern territories, and pursue an active programme of propaganda. It was primarily the opinion of the public in Britain and the United States they wished to influence. There was a current of opinion in Britain, led by the Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade, which sympathised with the American view of prohibition.23

When the second conference reconvened in January 1925, Lord Cecil, the new head of the British delegation, opened with a lengthy speech about the American proposals. The second conference, he insisted, was ‘incompetent’ to discuss the first. The chair of the American delegation, Porter, insisted that the United States had met its obligations under the Hague Convention and had a right to insist other governments would meet their obligations. From this point, the proceedings degenerated into recriminatory rivalry. Cecil referred to the ‘terrible evil’ of drug addiction in America by stating that ‘consumption of opium per head is very much
greater in America than India’. Porter objected to the comparison. ‘If he can utter a greater slander against any people than that’ Porter thundered, ‘than I would like to know what it is’. As soon as it became clear the British had no intention of acquiescing, the American delegation retreated to the position that they could not sign any agreement short of outright prohibition. Under the circumstances, Porter declared, the Americans had no other option than to withdraw. In February 1925, the American delegation, along with the Chinese, walked out.

The duel between Cecil and Porter reflected two very different political styles. Cecil, son of the third Marquess of Salisbury, read law at Oxford before turning to politics. He joined the House of Commons before the war as a Conservative, and later served as Undersecretary and Assistant Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. He was, at the Paris Peace conference, the British representative in charge of negotiations for the League of Nations, and devoted the next 30 years of public life to the League. Porter, who was born in Ohio, practised law in Pittsburgh before being elected as a Republican to the US House of Representatives. He had a distinctive dislike for titles and made a point of referring to ‘Mr Cecil’ in correspondence. When, at an afternoon dinner party in Geneva during 1923, they met face-to-face for the first time, Cecil tried to establish a working friendship by joking about the American preference for informality. When asked by a member of the American contingent if he would like to meet ‘Representative Porter’, Cecil declared that he would be happy to refer to him as ‘Lord Stephen’. They also embodied very different national sensibilities and international pretensions. As an editorial in The Times explained the Americans were led by a man who had come to Geneva armed with ‘drastic proposals’ to curb the drug traffic. It was ‘an easy matter for the American congress, so far removed from those countries which derive a considerable part of their revenue from the production of opium, to pass resolutions for its suppression’. The opium habit was well-ingrained in India, China and Persia, and so long as this demand remained, the interests of producing countries had to be considered.

A letter to the New York Times praised Porter for ‘a magnificent piece of work toward releasing humanity from a terrible curse’. He had put the American case for prohibition to the world and made it clear to everyone that Britain was to blame for thwarting an international agreement along these lines. It was ‘amazing that a man of Lord Cecil’s prestige’ would condescend to defend such a morally-indefensible policy as opium monopolies.
The second conference salvaged some success, ironically, by reviving the American proposal at the Hague from before the war. Great Britain proposed the formation of a central opium authority: the amount of production and manufacture of drugs should be limited to medical purposes; the manufacturing countries should send to this central body an estimate of these requirements; and these estimates would form the basis of establishing total need worldwide. Considerable discussion took place around its’ jurisdiction. The French maintained that each government should decide its own needs and the board should trust these figures. They further opposed the plan of restricting manufacture of drugs and preferred a system of caps on the volume of trade. Japan sided with France. Such a board impinged on national sovereignty and denied the right of national governments to revise their estimates. The Dutch delegation proposed the central authority should simply be empowered to collect and publish statistics. Eventually, the conferees agreed a convention to limit trade to maximum levels (defined by ‘medical and scientific purposes’), to adopt surveillance measures at free ports, provide stiffer penalties for violation and to increase the number of drugs under international regulation (by including all those determined to be ‘habit forming’). The convention included a provision for the Central Opium Board, to be comprised of eight technical experts. The board was to receive quarterly import and export statistics, annual estimates of domestic consumption, and annual statistics of the amount of raw opium produced, amount manufactured, and number of illegal drug seizures.29

The American withdrawal had left Britain in role of leading the international effort, but had not caught everyone by surprise. ‘We as a nation rightly pride ourselves on taking the lead in good works’ remarked William Wilson at a meeting of the Medico-Legal Society in London, ‘I believe the Americans generally start things and then drop out themselves’. The first step toward international drug control had been taken by President Roosevelt, but the American government left Britain to carry the scheme forward. ‘It was an international problem, and it was forced upon us’.30

Addicts and empire

The League of Nations can be seen as an institutional agent in the transition from a world of formal empires to a world of nation states, and the effort to fashion League drug policy provides a good example of this. The pursuit of international drug cooperation meant for Britain,
as it did for the Netherlands, France, the United States and other powers with overseas possessions, confronting colonial drug policy. The impact of drug prohibition on colonial economics was substantial.\(^3\)

The American view of Britain’s drug policy found precise expression in a small book entitled *The Opium Monopoly*. It was written by Ellen La Motte, who had taken an interest in the opium trade during a tour of the Far East. Following a conversation with an English-speaking Hindu on a train, who complained about the British opium policy in India, she resolved to investigate the situation in each country she visited: Japan, China, Hong Kong, French Indo-China, Siam and Singapore. She learned that while the Japanese suppressed the trade, as did countries in Europe and the United States, British colonies encouraged it through their opium monopolies. In Hong Kong and Singapore, she entered government shops where opium could be freely purchased ‘just as one goes to a shop to buy cigarettes’. Not only did the British government authorise opium production, it lent money without interest to farmers willing to cultivate poppies. Each month, the government conducted auction sales where thousands of pounds of opium were sold for distribution throughout the world. She described Singapore as a city of wide streets, fine government buildings, magnificent quays and docks, all financed from opium sales. The government accrued license fees from divans where opium could be smoked, and where she witnessed profound shame and degradation. Americans knew so little about the situation because its diplomats agreed to shield a great friend. But the United States ought not turn away from Great Britain. It was ‘a blot upon the honor of a great nation’ La Motte declared, ‘to think that she deliberately runs her colonies on opium’.\(^3\)

Leonard A. Lyall explained the British view of the situation at a conference on Opium and Dangerous Drugs at the London School of Economics in 1929. In Singapore, a government monopoly had been established. Opium was sold only at government shops and opium smokers throughout the Straits Settlements had been registered. Comparing official figures for the past ten years, the amount of opium consumed had been reduced 15 per cent, but this did not include opium smuggled from China. Smuggling, Lyall stressed, was not as serious an obstacle to suppression than finding a replacement for lost revenue. If opium-smoking were prohibited, the government would lose a third of its income. Hong Kong confronted an even more difficult situation. A small island off the China coast meant that the authorities had far more trouble with smuggling from the mainland. And, while a government monopoly had been established, opium smokers had not been registered. Hong Kong derived some
10 per cent of its total revenue from opium. Lyall conceded the strength of the American position in international negotiation. In the Philippines, the American policy of entirely forbidding opium smoking and all traffic in opium, had not eliminated drug misuse from the islands. But even if, as a practical matter, it never succeeded, the American policy had much to recommend it. ‘The American government cannot be accused of growing rich by the degradation of its subjects; it cannot be accused of having one policy for the American and another policy for the Chinese, and most important of all’ Lyall continued, ‘American policy in a matter of right and wrong is not affected by financial considerations’.

China invoked colonial policy as a source of the drug menace, mainly as a means of deflecting criticism from its own policies. In international diplomatic forums, Chinese representatives complained about the role of European powers. Although European colonial powers had officially prohibited the import of opium, smugglers brought large quantities into the country from Japanese, British, French, Portuguese and Dutch possessions. The colonial system created new addicts among Chinese, produced a regular harvest of opium for smuggling, and forced Chinese authorities to follow suit. ‘Let it be remembered’, wrote R.Y. Lo, ‘that China does not manufacture any form of narcotics. All that is found on the market is imported from foreign countries’. He pointed out that with the exception of the American government’s prohibition policy in the Philippines, all the colonial powers in the Far East adhered to the system of government monopoly. ‘Being as bad as it is, practically making the Far Eastern world unfit for morally clean people to live in, why have not the so-called liberal governments of Great Britain, France, Netherlands, and Japan abandoned this morally indefensible business in opium?’

The Advisory Committee on Opium and Dangerous Drugs spotlighted Chinese opium production as the leading obstacle to effective control of illicit drug traffic throughout the world. In 1920, the British delegation suggested sending a commission of enquiry to inspect the situation. Although a world inspection tour did take place in 1929, the inspectors had to by-pass China. Chinese authorities declined to participate because they could not risk the possibility the enquiry would demonstrate the inability of the central government to restrain the warlords. In 1924, China’s representative at the first opium conference, Chao-hsin Chu, a professor of economics at the University of Peking, sounded a familiar argument. The great evil in the world was not eastern opium cultivation, but western consumption of cocaine, morphine and heroin. Within China itself, the smuggling of morphine created greater
difficulties than opium addiction. The Chinese government could not control drug traffic within its territory because many foreign powers enjoyed extra-territorial rights which put their nationals beyond the jurisdiction of law enforcement. Chinese commentators accused European powers of *duhua zhengei* (policy of poisoning), that is, selling opium to ethnic Chinese for revenue or an attempt to weaken the Chinese race.

The appearance of T.W. (Thomas Wentworth) Russell Pasha on the international stage not only gave Britain the ability to demonstrate its determination to eradicate drug addiction within its empire, but also provided a means of turning-the-table on critics of its imperialist practices. Born into a family from Bedfordshire and educated at Cambridge, Russell Pasha learned of ‘the jewel in the crown’ from a cousin in the Indian Civil Service. He became in 1911 assistant commandant of the police at Alexandria, and two years later, transferred to Cairo, where he became in 1917 head of the city police. Russell Pasha became El Miralai (roughly, lieutenant colonel), but in 1924, it appeared as if his career had come to an end. He had heard India’s new prime minister was refusing to renew contracts for Europeans employed as constables and head constables, and he requested of the Foreign Office advice about whether he could apply for early retirement. Then, in 1925, the government of Egypt enacted the first narcotics law, and he found the career path that would lead to international renown. Up to the end of the Great War, there had been no need for drug legislation in Egypt, and offences were considered mere contraventions. Prices were low, which led to the spread of addicts, but there was little the police could do as the maximum penalty for selling or possession was one Egyptian pound or less than a week’s imprisonment. The narcotics law strengthened police powers and Pasha made anti-drugs the centrepiece of his administration.

In 1929, the Egyptian Prime Minister, Mohammed Pasha Mahmoud, authorised formation of a special bureau to combat drug addiction throughout the country. Russell Pasha took charge of the Central Narcotics Intelligence Bureau with an annual budget of 10,000 Egyptian pounds. His first task was to check the import of drugs from Syria. His organisation of a camel-riding border patrol made newspapers across Britain. But fairly early on, Russell Pasha envisioned a wider strategy. Encouraged by special funds he received for his enquiries, he extended investigation not only across the whole of Egypt, but into the international network. He bought off one of the leading traffickers, who supplied information about routes and contacts, and sent his agents to gather proof of the big manufacturers
in Europe. He planned to trace the source of drugs imported into Egypt, to present these facts to the League of Nations, to prosecute drug traffickers in Egypt, and raise the retail price of drugs beyond the means of the fellahin. Russell Pasha had been aware of the League’s anti-narcotic work via Malcolm Delevingne with whom he maintained regular correspondence. He posted Delevingne confidential copies of seizure reports and sought his advice on handling international investigations. Delevigne, in turn, passed on these reports to allies within the Advisory Committee on Opium. Together, they would chart the worldwide drug trade extending from India and China to Europe and back to India and Egypt.  

That same year, Russell Pasha ‘hit on the simple but decisive expedient of publishing the report had had furnished to his own government’. He posted copies of the reports of the Egyptian Narcotics Bureau to newspapers across Britain. Complete with illustrations of techniques for drug smuggling, the British press regarded them as ‘textbooks for other countries’ and authentic accounts that read with the ‘fascination of a detective story’. The reports established his credentials as an expert in the international drug traffic within anti-drug circles in Britain and the League of Nations. In his report of 1930, he referred to the over-production of heroin at a French factory at Mulhouse and the manufacture of a derivative of morphine in Switzerland. The Mulhouse factory, Pasha said, exported in 1928 more than 10,000 pounds of heroin, more than twice the world requirements for medical and scientific purposes. Not only did this amount exceed the total exports allotted to France, but also the figures given in the official report. Russell Pasha claimed he had acquired his figures from his own agent’s examination of the firm’s accounts. At Zurich, a chemist had produced a drug not banned by Swiss law, but as harmful as heroin.

Egypt was not a member of the League of Nations, but Delevingne won for the Egyptian drug tsar the opportunity to appear before the Opium Advisory Committee. Russell Pasha gave his first address in Geneva following publication of the first annual report of his bureau in 1929. He reviewed his successes in Egypt and asked for their cooperation. ‘Gentlemen, I ask you: Is it fair that Europe should thus pour its tons of poison into my country? Europe is strict enough in its own countries to prevent their ruination by drugs…Egypt is fighting to save herself, but she cannot do it without your help’. He returned to Geneva in 1931. This time, he insisted on showing the Advisory Committee a film he had commissioned about the plight of Egyptian drug addicts. The film depicted distressed souls, in prison and hospital, in
various stages of ‘dope poisoning’. Pasha later joined the Advisory Committee and continued to make the most of his annual reports. In 1932 he announced a new campaign against the Bulgarian government. The European centre for the manufacture of heroin for the underground drug trade had relocated to Sofia. This Bulgarian factory, which opened in October 1931, produced large quantities of heroin which was smuggled out in false-bottomed trunks into Hamburg, for the American market, and to Marseilles, where they came to Egypt and the Far East. Russell Pasha’s bureau obtained details of the working of the factory, including photographs of laboratories and copies of the annual balance sheet showing quantities of raw material purchased and heroin manufactured for export. Bulgaria was a member of the League of Nations, but had been indifferent to compliance with agreed limitations.

Russell Pasha gave Britain a hedge against assaults on its character. But La Motte’s little book had done more than impugn the mighty British imperial lion: not only was the colonial system of drug monopoly unworthy of a great empire, it was a threat to the well-being of the United States. ‘The welfare our own country is at stake’ La Motte preached. Given the over-production of opium to supply addicts in the Far East could not be controlled, the menace of opium threatened America. This argument meant that Americans could argue against British policy from a superior moral position, but also claim to being victimised by it as well. L.L. Stanley, a doctor working in California’s prison at San Quentin, argued along these lines in 1921. The production of British opium directly affected the welfare of American society, he insisted, because every cruise ship and freighter coming to San Francisco from the Far East contained large quantities of smuggled opium. The drugs either made it into the United States directly, or to Mexico or Canada, and then into the country. Stanley reckoned the first thing to do was to shame the British Empire before its international colleagues. The fact of Britain’s involvement in opium production was deplorable, and no enlightened nation should allow the situation to exist. ‘The problem is a world problem’ Stanley stressed; ‘It is not for a few social workers, a few physicians, a few municipalities, a few states, and a few governments, but it is for all the world, for its influence touches all’.

Drugs and foreign policy

In the United States, the rhetorical strategies deployed by this first generation of anti-drug traffic crusaders presented drugs as a monstrous, powerful, expanding evil that would destroy civilisation itself. Captain
Richmond P. Hobson, president of the International Narcotic Education Association, delivered a series of talks on the NBC radio network about the menace of narcotic addition threatening all continents. ‘The whole human race...’ Hobson announced from NBC’s New York studio in 1928, ‘is now in the midst of a life and death struggle’. On the issue of addiction to cocaine and heroin ‘hangs the perpetuation of civilization, the destiny of the world and the future of the human race’.48

American officials in the decades between the wars expressed a morbid fear of narcotics. In 1930, the Bureau of Narcotics was established with the Treasury Department, and the assistant commissioner of Prohibition, Harry J. Anslinger, was chosen to head it. The legislation creating the bureau had been sponsored by Stephen G. Porter. While he remained opposed to accommodation with the League of Nations, he was determined to improve domestic law enforcement and enhance the independent international role of the United States in drug-related matters. Anslinger went beyond even what Porter had in mind for a national agency. He maintained a deeply personal war on narcotics that expressed itself in the image of the ‘G-Man’—the federal law enforcement agent dedicated to the war on crime. He was known to carry a small leather book containing thousands of names of people suspected of involvement in the narcotics traffic.49 He persuaded the U.S. Congress to adopt stricter control legislation and by amplifying the dangers presented by narcotics trafficking abroad. By suggesting the drug problem was foreign, both in terms of use and well as source, Anslinger tapped nationalistic undercurrents within American society, and built a fiefdom with the federal bureaucracy of which he remained head until 1962.50

Anslinger attended meetings in Geneva of the Advisory Committee on Opium and professed American support for international cooperation. But, like Porter, he demanded Britain conform to American strategies. Within months of becoming head of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, Anslinger complained to Delevingne about the import of illicit drugs into Florida from Britain’s Caribbean colonies. ‘It has been established beyond a reasonable doubt’, Anslinger wrote, ‘that large quantities of narcotics are being smuggled into the United States from the Bahamas’. He advised the British government to send a member of the secret service to Nassau to get a handle on the situation.51 Delevingne turned up no evidence of drug smuggling from the Bahamas and dismissed the suggestion of a British anti-drug agent. He was, however, sensitive to reports in American newspapers of British indifference to the drug traffic. In October 1930, the New York Times carried a story
with the headline British West Indies sees traffic go unchecked by officials. The story, an Anslinger plant, pointed to British possessions as a clearinghouse for widespread narcotics traffic in the Caribbean. Delevingne insisted that Honduras was not one of the channels through which smuggled drugs reached the United States. During 1933, France and Germany allowed to be exported into Honduras consignments of morphine amounted to 76 kilos when the supervisory body under the Hague convention had determined its national needs to be under 1 kilo. Delevingne marvelled at how competent anti-drug authorities in Paris and Berlin could have approved such transactions.

Britain harboured its own suspicions of American capacity for effective suppression of drug traffic. In 1936, H.L. Dowbiggin, former inspector-general of police in Ceylon, toured police forces across North America and learned of American anti-drug system, or rather, the lack of system. The United States had no coordinated structure of uniform policing but 1,799 different police forces. There were at least three different law enforcement bodies dealing with illegal drug transactions in each city: the federal narcotics squad, the state police and the city authorities. In Los Angeles, the police confronted a variety of drugs including morphine, cocaine, opium and drug they called ‘marawana’. The Los Angeles Police Department said the principle drug traffickers were Japanese. In Detroit, marijuana was also a problem. The city had opened a narcotics hospital and drug addicts were sent to it by court order. The police there told him it was giving them a great deal of trouble.

By 1935, Delevingne conceded that, despite more that two decades of international anti-drug efforts, ‘the illicit traffic continues to flourish’. The trade was too lucrative to be given up. Many traffickers, individuals and gangs, had been thwarted, but others escaped through the mesh of enforcement efforts. The problem was clandestine factories, sources of supply completely outside international oversight. Although there were rumours of clandestine manufacture in Europe, no evidence had as yet emerged. In recent years, Turkey and Bulgaria, had been identified as sources. Now, it appeared that China represented the leading source. Clandestine morphine factories had been reported in Chungking, one of the most westerly provinces, near the great opium producing region of Szechuan. Major W.H. Coles, HM chief inspector under Dangerous Drugs act and British representative on the Opium Advisory Committee, recounted in 1938 the success of the League of Nations’ anti-trafficking campaign. ‘Formerly supplies from licensed factories fed the illicit traffic, but it can now be said that practically no drugs which are licitly manufactured ever escape into the illicit traffic’. Addiction
remained a problem, never-the-less, in Europe and the Far East. "Where, it will be asked do all these addicts obtain supplies of drugs to maintain their addiction? The answer is from the illicit traffic which is supplied from clandestine factories."

For any number of police commissioners, prison wardens, politicians and other anti-drug campaigners, there was no choice but to pursue international cooperation in suppressing the drug traffic. Advocates for the League of Nations seized on this sentiment and decided that drug control furnished a prime opportunity to demonstrate the value of this institution. "The success of these Conventions' declared the Advisory Committee on Opium, 'is all the more valuable at a time when the political horizon of the League of Nations is temporarily hidden under a cloud'. The public was not sufficiently aware of the value of the work of the League in the control of traffic in opium and dangerous drugs. 'By the devotion and industry of its experts and officials, backed by the good-will and co-operation of governments, the problem has been at least partially solved'. The Convention of 1931 had pioneered new territory, that of a 'planned economy on a worldwide scale'. It represented the first attempt by concerted actions of government to regulate a branch of industry throughout the world from the point at which raw materials enter the factory to the point finished goods reach the consumer. The conventions drawn up by the League had introduced a system of collaboration for suppression of narcotic drugs that could, and should, serve as a model for those called on in the future to deal with other problems.

But even the Advisory Committee felt obliged to acknowledge the 'darker side of the picture'. There was still an illicit traffic fed by underground manufacture and the problem of addiction in China had been aggravated by Japan. The Japanese had taken over Chinese territory and although they claimed to be en route to suppression of the opium trade, outside observers described conditions leading in the opposite direction. Chinese delegates to the Advisory Committee complained about drug trafficking. Japanese nationals had been revealed as the primary actors in major drug trafficking cases yet Japanese consuls in various ports protested against searches by Chinese police. It was an 'open secret' in China that Japanese traffickers operated with the tacit approval of their government.

At the nineteenth session in November 1934, the representative from China charged that Japanese operatives, protected by Japanese military, operated a monopoly that brought opium into the port city of Tianjin. Distribution in the port city centred on three hotels in the Japanese concession. Whenever Chinese police attempted to intervene, Japanese military authorities intervened on behalf of Japanese nationals. The Japanese
representative on the Opium Committee denied his government tolerated
the traffic. Heated exchanges between Chinese and Japanese representa-
tives on the Committee took place throughout the 1930s until Japan
withdrew from the League of Nations in 1938.59

The conjoining of the opium issue and Japanese aggression increased
the moral base for anti-Japanese feeling in Washington DC and favour-
able feeling in the United States and Britain toward Chiang Kai-shek.
Conservative MP Irene Mary Bewick Ward, who attended the seventh
Assembly of the League of Nations as an alternate, urged international
intervention. She described the ‘terrible situation’ in Manchuria, when
during a seven-month period, 1,793 corpses of addicts had to be cleared
from the streets of Harbin. ‘Experience had shown that when any one
point of the globe became a centre for illicit traffic...all countries were
in danger of being flooded by illicit drugs from the region in question’.
In other words, the need to deal with drugs traffic presented due cause
for political efforts to stop the Japanese the world was unwilling to
stop on behalf of the Chinese sovereignty. The Canadian delegation
agreed. The situation in the Far East had become worse during the past
year. During the past few years, it had been a source of considerable
anxiety to the United States and Canada. It was true that the Japanese
had dealt effectively with preventive measures, such as smuggling
aboard Japanese vessels through North American ports. But the situ-
ation was grave in those parts of China occupied by Japanese forces.
Japanese ships carried opium into China for manufacture of heroin
bound for the Canada and the United States.60

Delevingne did what he could to raise the stakes as well. He invoked
the nightmare of ‘reverse colonisation’ to justify continuing efforts.
Once, the British government had cultivated opium in India and forced
it on the people of China. Now, the ghosts of those Chinese addicts
threatened the residents of London, Manchester, Birmingham and
other British cities. In a 1935 address to the Society for the Study of
Inebriety, he declared that China was in a position to reverse its nine-
teenth role vis-à-vis Britain: ‘The tables will indeed be turned with a
vengeance if the Far East, which has been one of the chief victims
of the illicit traffic from the West, should now, armed with the know-
ledge that the West has taught it, become a menace to the West itself’.61

The drug traffickers

There was, however, a growing suspicion that the whole international
architecture for control of opium and dangerous drugs had collapsed.
Not only had the conventions, resolutions and speeches proved unable to stop the drug traffic, they may have succeeded only in encouraging the traffickers. Leonard Lyall, the British chair of the League’s Central Opium Board, ignited a furore in 1936 when he characterised the international anti-drug regime based in Geneva as a failure. At the 21st session of the Advisory Committee on Opium, he declared: ‘The present system of fighting the illicit drug traffic had broken down entirely’. He had reached this conclusion based on the disparity between the fraction of drug seizures in the United States and Canada compared to the vast populations of addicts in these countries—120,000 in America and 8,000 in Canada. Smuggling could not be stopped without measures that would ‘choke legitimate trade’, and to achieve even limited success, police were forced to rely on deals with criminals or their own spies.62

T.W. Russell Pasha took exception. He sided with the Advisory Committee who could not accept Lyall’s ‘unjust interpretation’ of the situation, an interpretation that must have been based on ‘inadequate statistical information’. Lyall had not merely disparaged the work of the League of Nations, but anti-narcotics efforts throughout the world. Two months later, in his speech to the Advisory Committee, Russell Pasha disavowed the comments of his colleague. He could not allow the moment to pass, he said, without declaring that Egypt ‘firmly declines to associate herself’ with the much-publicised opinion ‘that the present methods of fighting the drug traffic have completely broken down’.63 He must have hoped that no one would remember his own speech the previous year when he had himself sounded a note of defeatism. The drug traffickers had ‘big finance’, he said then, to carry on their activities while governments allowed ‘restricted budgets’ for their response. In Egypt, the budget he enjoyed for secret service work had been much reduced. He wished for ‘a few thousand pounds’ from ‘one of the world’s millionaires’ to finance his investigations. ‘I have had thirty-two years service in the Egyptian Government, and Government service like most things cannot go on forever.’64

Paul Wolff, a Berlin physician, suggested the drug traffic was decreasing, but not as a result of anything the League of Nations had done. Although many ‘strongholds of the drug traffic’ remained to be breached, addiction appeared to be in decline. Occasional cases of large-scale smuggling reported in the press gave the impression of a faltering attack, but from the standpoint of a practising physician, it was possible to say that addiction was less of a problem than it had been a few years earlier. Drug addiction no longer jeopardised Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and France. Cocaine abuse had spread rapidly in eastern and
central Europe, but there was a cause for optimism. The lesser value of cocaine to the medical profession meant that the cocaine traffic could be reduced to complete eradication. In contrast, the problem of opium was complicated by the medical need for morphine and demand would continue so long as there was illness. There was also the economic aspect of poppy cultivation in Asia. ‘These difficulties have yet remained unsolved in spite of all the efforts of the League of Nations’. The solution was for the international community to follow the German example. In 1931, the government introduced a system of stringent restrictions on the medical profession. As a result, there had ‘undoubtedly been a decrease in the number of these illegal dealers and I know from my own experience that it is now difficult to obtain cocaine through these channels in the night resorts of Berlin’.65

In 1929, Philip Noel-Baker, British delegate to the Assembly of the League of Nations, warned against an ‘overdose of optimism’ with regard to anti-drug efforts. During the Paris Peace Conference, Noel-Baker had been principal assistant to Lord Robert Cecil on the committee which drafted the Covenant. During the early 1920s, Noel-Baker served as a member of the Secretariat and principal assistant to Sir Eric Drummond, the first secretary-general. While the League had put into place machinery for taking on the problem of opium, the traffic in narcotic drugs was comparably more difficult. The profits were tremendous. It was the most suitable of commodities for illicit traffic, for smuggling from one country to another, for distribution without notice of police. ‘It has been proved by the League that the smuggling and distribution is carried on by a great international gang who have a stupendous capital behind them’.66 The identity of this ‘great international gang’ is not clear from Noel-Baker’s remarks, but he may have been referring to the smuggling ring at Vienna in the report of Egypt’s narcotics bureau of that year. After the war, Jews had arrived in Vienna from Galicia, Ukraine and territories under Austrian authority. The drug trade offered them, according to Baron Henry D’Erlanger’s summary of Russell Pasha’s account, a ‘glorious opportunity’ for making money without capital, for using their knowledge of several languages and for exercising their skills in dodging the law. Russell Pasha’s agents broke up smuggling ring, made up of Jews from Poland, who had established themselves in the Viennese underworld. The names of members of the gang in the report of the Central Narcotics Intelligence Bureau ‘read somewhat like the cast at one of the offerings of the Yiddish theatre’.67

During the 1920s, the Home Office received regularly reports about drug trafficking to North America. In 1923, the high commissioner for
Canada forwarded a list of persons suspected of illicit importation of drugs from Europe. The list included that of Laurent De’leglise of Montreal, ‘one of the largest international traffickers of narcotics in America’. Known under several aliases, De’leglise had made $250,000 in the drug trade. He had been arrested and fined in Canada, and had been in trouble in Ottawa on a bribery charge. There were additional items in his Canadian file from Austria and Switzerland, Rome and New York City. The report detailed his illicit career. In 1919, De’leglise had approached W.H. Williams of the Cunard Line with a view to smuggling narcotics. De’leglise had been the brains of a smuggling ring drawing on accomplices with the Cunard Line. He involved a number of people, both in distributing the drugs ‘retail’ and in smuggling the drugs into the country, but kept them from knowing one another. De’leglise travelled to Europe, chiefly England, where he purchased a large stock of morphine and some cocaine, and placed it into storage. Whenever he had a buyer, he telegraphed England to send an amount by one of more of his operatives on Cunard. He relied on three different chief stewards who regularly carried between 500 and 1,000 ounces. On arrival in Montreal, Williams received the drugs and deposited them at the De’leglise flat. De’leglise had bribed the harbour police to allow his shipments to pass, and kept Williams happy with cigarettes.68

In addition the likes of De’leglise, there were the Chinese. C.H.L Sharman, chief of the narcotics division at the Canadian Department of Health, believed the illicit opium traffic along the Pacific Coast was controlled entirely by Chinese operatives. ‘The Oriental, in the very large majority of cases, also handles morphine and cocaine, so that he is in a position to cater to the addiction both of the Occidental and of those of his own race’. One drug warlord, Lim Gim, who was uncovered by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in Vancouver, operated a syndicate with direct links to suppliers in Hong Kong and mainland China. Using coded letters and telegrams, his operation had cornered the opium traffic in the United States and Canada. Even when exposed as a ‘wholesaler as distinct from an ordinary peddler of dope’, the judge declared that he was obliged to apply a lenient sentence owing to a petition for leniency ‘signed by people I cannot ignore’.69 Canada’s Federal Department of Customs reported on their efforts to thwart ‘Chinese methods’ for drug smuggling through Vancouver. Every ship from the Far East carried at least one ‘opium man’, a wealthy, intelligent Chinese disguised by occupying some menial capacity. He worked with ‘carriers’ to bring the drugs ashore. These carriers used devices, such as hidden pockets in several lawyers of clothes, or ‘fishing’ vessels offshore waiting to make a catch through
portholes of lower decks of liners. Other Chinese ashore concealed drugs in hollowed-out slabs of wood carefully placed on a pile to appear as if they had been casually tossed onto the pile. Canadian authorities routinely used aeroplanes to accompany ships from the Orient. Despite the success of this technology, heavy penalties and frequent convictions, Vancouver remained a distribution point for western Canada as well as the United States.\textsuperscript{70} In Ottawa, James McBrien of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police had confirmed this to H.L. Dowbiggen. Ottawa operated a central government narcotics bureau under the Department of National Health aimed at arresting the flow of dangerous drugs from Japan and China.\textsuperscript{71}

Reports from the Liverpool police in the 1920s pointed to China as the major source of drugs in Britain. The Chinese had operated opium importing businesses while the trade had been legal and continued after it had been made illegal under the Dangerous Drugs Act.\textsuperscript{72} Press reports linked the opium traffic with Chinese dope rings and secret murder societies. The leaders of these networks travelled first-class between Liverpool, Cardiff and London, and while the police were winning, Chinese in dark suits and gold-rimmed eyeglasses continued to enjoy harems of wives and fat bank accounts.\textsuperscript{73} M.D. Perrins collated this information and sent it to Delevingne. An employee at the Home Office, Perrins became one of the leading British authorities on the international illicit drug trade.\textsuperscript{74} He said the evidence lead to several conclusions. The first thing to be understood was that ‘wherever there are Chinese there is opium traffic’. The Chinese maintained a clandestine network working through boarding-house keepers and steamship companies. While police in Cardiff and Liverpool maintained close watch over Chinese residents, the Chinese were still able to open up new channels for import of cocaine, morphine, and heroin. They maintained regular routes between British ports and those of Hamburg, Rotterdam, New York, Philadelphia and Hong Kong. ‘The drug problem in this country’, Perrins stressed, ‘is now largely a Chinese problem’. Most of this traffic was ‘passing through’ Britain. The amount supplied for consumption in the UK was negligible compared to that on the way to Canada and Australia. Suppression this activity was complicated by the fact that the Chinese suppliers in Britain were otherwise law-abiding citizens. In order to deal effectively with the traffic, Perrins recommended improved coordination of police activity in London, Liverpool and Cardiff, and specifically, that they should seek to identify Chinese residents in a position to supply opium. He also recommended British consuls abroad make enquiries of Chinese suspected of trafficking drugs through Rotterdam,
and that the Home Office obtain reports from authorities in Canada, the United States on Chinese suspected of ferrying drugs across the Atlantic.\textsuperscript{75}

The collective impression from the various networks of drug traffickers pointed to a containment system that leaked considerably. Nathan Raw, physician and Conservative MP for Liverpool, worried that international efforts had not stamped out the drug traffic but only driven it underground. In an address to the Medico-Legal Society, he declared: ‘What prohibition is to the United States the drug traffic is to Great Britain and the rest of the world—a medium for making much money by those daring enough to engage it’. Year by year the League of Nations had made it more difficult to traffic in drugs, yet instead of blotting out the illicit trade, this effort only made drugs more expensive for addicts and the profits greater for traffickers. He referred to the case of Brilliant Chang, said to have masterminded drug smuggling into England. He had been deported several years previously in connection with several cases, but another large operator or two took his place. A few minutes later, in the discussion following Raw’s talk, a member of the audience assured him even Brilliant Chang was still trading. ‘One does like to mention oneself’ commented F.D. Levy, a crown court prosecutor, ‘but I \textit{did} prosecute that man at the Old Bailey’. Chang received 18 months imprisonment and was deported back to China. But he returned to England sometime later disguised as a Japanese.\textsuperscript{76} This argument would be repeated. A Canadian observer suggested in 1933, the situation had improved. Addiction to narcotics had not increased in Canada during the previous five years. But this good news came with a warning, ‘As the restrictions against the manufacture and sale of narcotics are tightened up in Europe it is altogether likely that the illicit traffic in these drugs will acquire the impetus in oriental countries which will reach a target in Canada’.\textsuperscript{77}

Other observers came to the opposition conclusion: it was clear the only way to achieve effective suppression of drugs was international cooperation. The Americans, as Hugh F. Spender argued, needed to set aside their differences and join Britain in fashioning a meaningful system to control supply. Spender, one-time editor of the \textit{Daily News}, made a living as a regular contributor to various journals. As there were only about twenty drug factories in the world, it was absurd for anyone to claim it was impossible to control their output. The American delegation, who had walked out of the conference at which the Central Opium Board was created, declared it to be of little use. But with adequate ratification, it might succeed in making enquiries of countries
manufacturing oversupplies of drugs. The publicity thrown on the traffic by the Advisory Committee on Opium had ‘at least had the effect of making every country shrink from appearing to connive at the traffic’. The Americans had success with a central board to regulate manufacture within the United States, although dangerous drugs from other countries had been smuggled in. But Britain could not make effective at the international level the Central Opium Board at Geneva owing to powerful economic interests. He urged American support for the British effort.78

In 1931, the International Conference for the Limitation of the Manufacture of Narcotic Drugs met at Geneva. The conference drew delegates from 54 states. The participants dealt with the special problem of limitation of manufacture and considered the means to supplement the regime of international control as established by previous conventions. They also sought to establish a method for estimating of the total quantity of drugs required for medical and scientific purposes derived from the data received by the Central Control Board. In addition to supplying annual estimates of need, each country agreed to maintain a special administration for complying with international regulations. The convention, signed by 37 states by 1933, represented the first international agreement regulating all stages of an industrial product, from production to distribution. The convention extended from cultivation of raw material, to manufacture of drugs for legitimate needs, to the illicit traffic.79

Five years later, the Advisory Committee on Opium and Dangerous Drugs reported that certain additional narcotics should be brought under international control, and proposed a conference to drawn up a draft convention. The conference, held at Geneva in June 1936, concluded an agreement to strengthen penalties for offences against conventions of 1912, 1925 and 1931. It provided that any action contrary to these conventions must be punished by imprisonment. Under a section concerning extradition crimes, the convention provided for the establishment of a central office for coordination of work related to suppression of illegal drug traffic and for communication with similar organisations on the part of national governments.80 There were, in addition to Egypt, more than 40 nations with specialised police antidrug organisations. The representative from Spain urged the formation of an interchange among officials of these national administrations.81

The Advisory Committee reported that many drugs which had gone into the illicit traffic had been abandoned because of the efficacy of the police and the marked rise in price in several countries. Further, many
illicit drugs seized by the authorities had been adulterated, further evidence that international control was working. The problem, the League decided, was clandestine drug factories. The League had achieved effective control over legitimate manufacture of narcotic drugs, and this had driven traffickers to obtain supplies from clandestine sources. Between 1929 and 1936, more than 50 clandestine factories had been discovered. The conference recommended creation of a specialised police force, to enforce provision of the convention, echoing the view of the Assembly two years earlier which had resolved that governments could detect secret factories only by means of specialised police services.82

The most devoted League advocates, like those within the League of Nations Union, never lost hope. Less than a year before the start of war in 1939, the Union audited the success of the League in dealing with the international traffic in dangerous drugs. The review explained British policy over the years and trumpeted Russell Pasha’s activities in Egypt—his break-up of an international ring based in Vienna and his Camel Corps protecting Egypt’s frontier with Palestine. Success over the years had been achieved; the manufacture of drugs was limited to modern industrial countries vulnerable to public opinion. But this had changed. ‘Seizures of illicit drugs, still large and frequent, showed that smuggling went on, and, to supply it, clandestine manufacture’. The same people who carried on the illicit traffic of legally-manufactured drugs now carried on a roaring trade in drugs derived from illicit production. At first, illicit production centred in Turkey. Then, Turkey joined the League of Nations and illegal manufacture moved to Bulgaria. The ring was closing in, but there were gaps. Smuggling to Canada and the United States came via several routes, including the Suez Canal. ‘The League work on dangerous drugs shows how a problem of immense complexity can, gradually, be solved by the combination of expert planning, government action and public pressure’.83

Conclusions

Although drug control comprised a small part of the ambitions for the League of Nations, it took on increasing significance as the League faltered. Within the Advisory Committee on Opium and Dangerous Drugs, the participants elevated ‘drug trafficking’ to the status of a ‘world problem’. But in choosing the illicit trade in drugs to demonstrate the League’s success, the leaguers took on a world of trouble. To achieve a coordinated response to drug supply, use and misuse, even on paper, confronted American unilateralism, Chinese defensiveness
and British reluctance. The Americans remained convinced of their moral superiority, the Chinese wished to avoid embarrassment and the British Empire needed an alternative source of income. After a decade of speeches, conventions, resolutions and ratifications, a number of observers decided that drug addiction had become an even bigger problem than before. Even the triumphs of Britain’s Russell Pasha were in jeopardy. When he revealed, in 1930, the over-production of heroin at the Mulhouse factory in France, he hoped to shock the European powers into action. As it turned out, the French claimed to have known about the site five years earlier. Alfred Morain of the Prefecture de Police took credit for the discovery on behalf of a special agent he had despatched to Mulhouse.84
6
Political Murder and Terrorism

As far as Georges du Parcq saw it, the establishment of the League of Nations brought to Switzerland crooks from all over the world. Press attaché at the Préfecture de Police in Paris, du Parcq spent six months in Geneva in 1926. The concentration of diplomats attracted spies of all nationalities who positioned themselves throughout the city in the hope of overhearing some piece of information they could sell to unscrupulous governments. There were also ‘fanatical anarchists’ about, many of them linked to Bolsheviks. The OGPU, the Russian replacement for the Tsar’s secret police, set themselves up in one of the better hotels. The Geneva police told du Parcq how they had foiled several assassination attempts, including a plan to murder a high-placed British delegate. A woman travelling on a Spanish passport had been stopped at the border two days earlier. Not only did she confess to her role in the plot, she surrendered the names of her co-conspirators.¹

Whether or not du Parcq exaggerated the threat in Geneva, he was right about the risk of assassination in general terms. If there was a crime wave in the interwar period, it was a wave of political crime. Assassinations of political leaders, police and prominent citizens took place across the continent of Europe, in North and South America, and in British territories from Egypt to India. While obtaining a precise figure is difficult, owing to the difficulty of distinguishing political murder from non-political murder, the average number of political murders per year in the decade after the Great War may have reached a figure on the order of five times that of the decades before the war.²

At the time, many observers tried their hand at formulating a universal definition of political crime. Given the range of contexts in which such crimes took place, this was not an easy task. Definitions tended to reach a breaking point before reaching across all the victims, offenders and
circumstances that seemed relevant. Never-the-less, the journalists, lawyers, professors and others who tried to formulate an understanding managed to present thoughtful, and in many ways, satisfying theories. Definitions tried to account for political motivation and moral considerations, ordinary crimes with political motives, the politicisation of criminal law and special offences of revolutionary character. One group of lawyers, gathered in Brussels for the International Conference for the Unification of Criminal Law in 1931, became the first to arrive at an international definition for ‘an act of terrorism’. In the late 1930s, the League of Nations convened a Special Body of Experts on the Suppression of Terrorism. The documents they produced inserted this definition of terrorism into an international treaty and in so doing inaugurated a key aspect of the twentieth-century understanding of political violence.

Germany and political crime

The murder of Walter Rathenau in Berlin in 1922 focused the German public on the crisis of political crime, at least for a moment. Rathenau had headed AEG, the German electric company, before accepting a post as minister of reconstruction in the Weimar government. He became head of the Foreign Ministry and took on the task of negotiating the terms of Versailles with Britain, France, the United States and the Soviet Union. Rathenau attracted the anger of extreme nationalists, and refused to take on a bodyguard even when warned about death threats.

On 24 June, Rathenau left his villa in Grunewald, riding in a slow-moving, open car. At the corner of the Wallotstrasse, his chauffeur was overtaken by a car which forced him to stop. A second car, a big six-seater carrying two men in new leather jackets, pulled alongside. The first pointed an automatic pistol at Rathenau’s face and held down the trigger. When he finished, the second stood up to toss a hand grenade in Rathenau’s direction. Everyone knew who was responsible. The day before, Karl Helfferich, the former imperial vice-chancellor, had denounced Rathenau in the Reichstag. Helfferich spoke of Rathenau as the Jew responsible for the shame of reparations brought on Germany and the destruction of the middle classes. News of the murder spread throughout the city, and when Helffrich appeared in the Reichstag that afternoon, members shouted ‘Murderer! Murderer! Out with the murderers!’ Processions to mark the funeral took place in cities throughout Germany. Hundreds of thousands marched, four deep, under mourning banners, the red of Socialism and the black-and-gold of the Republic. The plot had developed several months earlier. In April, a student and a former naval-officer met at the
Steglitzer Ratskeller with other members of a murder society formed out of the Ehrhardt Brigade. They decided to shoot Rathenau on the road from a car they had procured for a previous murder. Captain Hermann Ehrhardt founded the ‘Organisation Consul’ in Bavaria with the aim of provoking a revolution to Germany to destroy the Weimar government. The Consul targeted politicians for assassination and delivered punishment to members accused of cooperating with the Weimar authorities.4

The assassination of Rathenau followed a pattern that had become horribly familiar in Weimar Germany. Emil Julius Gumbel, a lecturer in statistics at the University of Heidelberg, published several books and dozens of articles on political violence. A thin volume entitled *Zwei Jahre Mord* (Two Years of Murder), appeared in 1921, followed by *Vier Jahre politischer Mord* (Four Years of Political Murder) in 1922, an expanded and revised edition. In his first book, Gumbel documented all incidents of murder with a political motive between November 1918 and December 1920. He recounted the murders of Wilhelm Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, and many less well-known citizens. The later edition concluded with the murder of Rathenau. Between January 1919 and June 1922, 376 political murders had taken place. Judicial officials of the Länder neglected to prosecute those responsible, except when it came to those committed by the Left. In only four of 22 murders by the Left, those responsible had not been punished, while justice failed victims in some 326 cases out of 354 perpetrated by the Right.5 Police organisations and tribunals did not function, and in some cases, connived with the murderers. In the Reichstag session of 1921, SDP deputy Gustav Radbruch held up a copy of *Zwie Jahre Mord* and challenged the Minister of Justice Eugen Schiffer to investigate the cases. Later, when Radbruch became minister of justice, he made an investigation, but could not publish his report owing to political pressure within the ministry and the Reichstag.6

In Britain, *The Saturday Review* compared the ‘murder gangs’ to those in Ireland with the observation that ‘in Germany, as in Ireland, the gunman has been busy’. Though the actual murderers might never be discovered, those really responsible were fanatical monarchists and militarists who executed Rathenau for political views. Rathenau displayed determination to preserve the democratic form of government, and fulfil as far as possible Germany’s obligations under the Treaty of Versailles. The article explained that Germany held the key position in Europe. The support for Rathenau expressed at his funeral offered reason to hope the threat to the republic by means of a *putsch* had subsided.
But so long as the monarchists and militarists remained active (and they were entrenched in Bavaria), ‘there is sure to be further trouble’. The Berlin correspondent for The Times insisted the ‘German anarchists’ responsible for the violence were ‘quite unique’. They were not fighting for freedom, against injustice and oppression, because the authorities had not dealt with them unjustly. Rather, they were fighting for reinstatement of monarchy and empire, for return of Germany and military dominance of Europe. They were activated by race hatred against foreigners: French, Poles, English and most of all, Jews. They maintained a superstitious belief in ‘Aryan stock’ coupled with extreme nationalism. An essay in Fortnightly Review emphasised that although the actual number would never be known, it was clear the murders of so-called Schädlinge (social pests), had been mostly carried out by the Right. The author referred to the ‘murder clubs’ as the perpetrators of ‘highly-organised murders’.

Gumbel proposed that murder clubs, in the sense of organisations formed solely for the purpose of assassination, did not exist. There were Geheimbündler, secret, paramilitary organisations, which condoned political assassination as a secondary aim or means to an end. As he explained, murder had become a tool of movements with monarchist, imperialist and anti-Jewish ambitions. These ambitions were not openly acknowledged, but disguised in the form of scientific, cultural or other political demands. The movements overlapped, so that various organisations shared objectives, as well as attitudes toward killing. Further, the membership was drawn from the same people. Cataloguing the organisations was pointless because the same person might be affiliated with as many as ten organisations. The Geheimbündler engaged in murder in the belief that by eliminating those with opposing ideas it was possible to eliminate their ideas, and as a strategy for fortifying their organisation, that is, by killing members thought capable of betraying them. The organisations appeared for a brief moment, before dissolving into other associations, and then reforming for assassination. They overlapped with hiking clubs, study groups, sports organisations, rifle clubs, veterans’ groups, as well as organisations devoted to promoting monarchist and imperialist ideals. This allowed the organisations to avoid any specific ban or attempt to dissolve them and make it possible for leadership to deny culpability for murders.

Most Germans, Gumbel said, remained indifferent to the killing. Despite the demand at Rathenau’s funeral for political change, organisations like the Organisation Consul continued to experience leniency. The perpetrators risked little because they could rely on well-placed networks of like-minded individuals who provided shelter, protection and assistance.
Individuals within police authorities furnished assassins with papers for travelling abroad; court proceedings ended with acquittal, or fines for murder convictions. ‘The indifference with which one greets political murders and the victims of turbulent street demonstrations today in Germany is explained by the fact that the war has numbed us to the value of human life’. The ‘brutalisation of the war’ also explained why so many murders had been committed by officers and soldiers. This method of killing had become common under conditions which rendered the life of individuals unimportant; when orders, spoken and unspoken, disallowed taking of prisoners. ‘I am not optimistic enough to believe,’ Gumbel concluded, ‘that my work will cause even one of the murderers to be punished or that political murders will cease.’

Gumbel continued his research, and subsequently produced a book on the *Schwarze Reichswehr* (Black Army), and in 1931 on political crimes and fascist murders. These efforts aroused the anger of extremist organisations and gangs of murderers who, working through sympathisers at the universities, aimed to silence him. Student riots prevented his promotion to associate professor, and in 1932, the nationalists forced him out of the university.

The Weimar government did make some effort to tackle the problem of political murder. In 1928, Germany sought the extradition from Guatemala of Richard Eckerman for the murder of Fritz Beyer. The charges specified that Eckerman had been a leader of the Black Army, a club of former German officers formed to protect Germany from attack by its neighbours and suppress Bolshevism within Germany. When Beyer attempted to join the club, the members decided he was a spy, and Eckerman was alleged to have given the order for him to be executed and buried. When the events came to light a year later, four the men who took part were tried and imprisoned. But Eckerman escaped to Guatemala. The case reached the Supreme Court of Justice in Guatemala where Eckerman’s counsel insisted that because the case alleged a political crime, he was protected by a clause in the constitution prohibiting extradition for political crimes and common crimes linked to political crimes. The court accepted that Eckerman took part in a patriotic society, but ruled that extradition should be granted. The justices explained that ‘universal law’ recognised sedition, treason and rebellion as political crimes ‘but it cannot be admitted that ordering a man killed with treachery...without form of trial or authority to do it, constitutes a political crime’.

In seeking extradition, the Weimar government had overcome the primary legal barrier to international agreement about political crime.
There had been an attempt, in the decades before the Great War, to reach an international treaty concerning anarchist outrages. Following attacks by anarchists in capital cities of Europe, many countries passed laws to suppress this form of violence. Representatives from European states, including Britain, convened at Rome in 1898 for the International Defence Against Anarchists Conference. The conferees did not produce an international agreement, in part because of the ‘political crimes’ exception in extradition agreements. Extradition agreements made a specific exception for political crimes to allow states to avoid interfering in the politics of another state. Most states were happy to decline to extradite offenders wanted for political crimes in order to minimise friction between governments. The Rome conference attempted to sidestep this problem by shifting violence into the category of ‘social crime’. Specifically, the conferees adopted a definition of social crime proposed by the International Law Institute at its meeting in Geneva in 1892. The Geneva group resolved that ‘criminal acts directed against the basis of social organisation, and not solely against a given state or a given form of government’ would not be considered political crimes insofar as the application of the rule on extradition.\textsuperscript{14}

Following Hitler’s assumption of power in 1933, it became impossible to allow extradition on the theory of social crimes. On 27 February 1933, fire nearly destroyed the main assembly hall of the Reichstag in Berlin and the police found Marinus van der Lubbe, a Dutch communist, at the scene. Göring arrived while the building was still ablaze and announced the fire a communist plot. Within hours, president Paul von Hindenburg signed an emergency decree ‘for the protection of people and the state’ that ended civil liberties, including freedom of speech, press, association and privacy. Six months later, a group of international communists led by Willi Münzenberg, produced \textit{The Brown Book of the Reichstag Fire and Hitler Terror} (published in Paris). The book became the lens through which international observers saw Nazism. The \textit{Brown Book} charged that although van der Lube claimed to have acted alone, the ‘true arsonists’ were Goebbels, who planned the conspiracy, and Göring, who directed his SA accomplices to the Reichstag through a secret passageway from his presidential residence. Münzenberg insisted the fire could only be a political crime, and since only the National Socialists could benefit, it must have been ‘premeditated, supported and perpetrated by leading National Socialist functionaries’. The book became a worldwide bestseller. It was translated into 24 languages and appeared in more than 50 editions.\textsuperscript{15}
The National Socialist government had expanded the meaning of political crime and commentators feared it would use such measures to attack persons while abroad. Lawrence Preuss, professor of political science at the University of Michigan, commented on the international dimensions of the German situation. In nearly every state, there had taken place a marked increase in political crime since the end of the Great War. The problem of political crime had become ‘one of international concern’ because subversive and treasonable activities were often conducted with complicity of foreign governments. Any attempt on the part of threatened states to assert extraterritorial jurisdiction over political crime, especially if committed by aliens, would be certain to generate international friction. Further, the disordered conditions which allow for political crime tend to prevent international cooperation in prevention and suppression. All of the general social causes which could be identified in the development of political crime could be seen in Germany, where the post-war order contended with attacks by communists on the left and nationalists and monarchists at the opposite stream. The response of the government was to repress actions deemed to endanger national security with severity, but overlook actions viewed as strengthening state security. In practice, the German law on political crime had been limited to Germans, although as a matter of law, could be applied equally to aliens. So far, the government chose to avoid the international complications which might result from application of the law to foreign nationals. But there could be no assurance the National Socialist government would not choose to enforce against foreigners its legal machinery on political crime.16

Few were better placed to argue against extradition to Hitler’s Germany for political offences than Hermann Mannheim. Before emigrating from Germany to Britain in 1934, Mannheim had been a judge of the court of appeal and professor of criminal law at the University of Berlin. He had been dismissed from his post by the ‘Aryan clause’ of the German Civil Service law introduced October 1933. He arrived in London in 1934, and with the help of the Academic Assistance Council, acquired a post at the London School of Economics. In a 1935 article, Mannheim said that traditionally, extradition agreements between nations excluded political crimes, as while states were obliged to assist in bringing justice to common law offences, they wanted to avoid taking sides in domestic political disputes or conflicts between nations. But, several political murders involving assassinations by members of one state in another country had led some to call for relaxing the political crimes exception. Following the murder of the King of
Yugoslavia and the France’s Foreign Minister in Marseilles in 1934, the French floated a proposal for relaxing the political crimes exception in international extradition agreements. Several countries announced their willingness to remove assassination from the list of non-extraditable crimes. Mannheim urged a more conservation approach. He suggested that it was unwise to alter legal principles in response to recent political events that would in the future set dangerous precedents. He opposed a loose interpretation of political crimes which would have the effect of overturning safeguards set up by domestic law for the protection of nationals and foreigners on their soil.17

The murder of Sir Henry Wilson

Britain took its understanding of political crime less from the German situation than acts closer to home. One political commentator, J.R. Fisher, lamented that despite self-government in most counties of Ireland, things were as bad as ever. During the nineteenth century, the police force had contended with shootings, house-breakings, cardings, cattle-maimings and other offences. But violent crimes took place with distressing frequency. By January 1920, there had been 20 murders, 27 cases of ‘firing-at’, 41 cases of firing into dwellings, 70 incendiary fires, and numerous raids for arms. Armed bands of assassins assembled in high roads in populated areas to carry out attacks with revolvers and bombs. ‘Politics of some distorted and demented kind may of course be suggested’ as the cause, Fisher suggested, and went on to propose that anarchists and murder-clubs were in the background. But he concluded the main cause was lawlessness in the aftermath of the rebellion and the unwillingness of the Irish government to enforce the rule of law.18

W.G. Carlton Hall offered a legal analysis of the issue, motivated, he said, by his experiences as an officer of the Territorial Force in Ireland. ‘Political crime’ was a common expression but difficult to define in precise terms. There were two categories. ‘Indirectly political crimes’ referenced acts that were illegal per se and had as their motive the accomplishment of some public purpose, while ‘directly political crimes’ owed their illegality to the tendency to injure the sovereign or machinery of government. The distinction was less a characteristic of the acts as the law toward them. In a particular case, the difference resulted from the discretion of the prosecutor in the charging document.19

In 1922, Irish issues spilled over into England, leading the government to reveal its hand concerning how it would deal with political criminals. In June, Herbert Asquith announced in the House of Commons that
Sir Henry Wilson had been shot dead outside his London home. He led the Imperial General Staff during the final year of the Great War, proclaimed passionate support for Ulster’s resistance to Home Rule. Throughout 1920 and 1921, he opposed Lloyd George’s efforts to secure an Anglo-Irish Treaty. On his retirement in 1922, he became a Unionist MP for Ulster and advisor to Sir James Craig, the new governor of Northern Ireland. When Craig received the news in Belfast, he announced that Wilson had ‘laid down his life for Ulster’. The murder proved beyond all doubt there was a wide conspiracy against those who defended Ulster. A month before, Craig surmised that much of the trouble between Catholics and Protestants originated in the work of Bolsheviks. He said that he could show, with reference to a map, a connection between Moscow and Ireland. It could also be a movement on the part of elements in the south and west of Ireland to make government impossible, in order to be able to say the British could not govern, and ought to clear out. As far as the murder of Wilson was concerned, he was convinced it was probably the work of the most extreme section of the Irish Republican Army.

In the House of Commons on the following morning, John Gretton, who had been a colonel in the Territorial Army, pressed the government for assurance that appropriate steps had been taken to protect the lives of British subjects in Ireland and England. Questions from other members followed. Was it true that Scotland Yard had been instructed to relax security measures? Would the Prime Minister revisit his decision to sack Basil Thomson, who had carried out such a splendid job of tracking down Sinn Fein gunmen and Irish Republicans? Did the government have any plans for increased supervision of passengers between Ireland and England? Would the police now carry firearms? Austen Chamberlain, Leader of the House of Commons, demurred saying he had no further information on the assassination and asked the members to defer discussion until the following Monday when the government would have more by the way of answers. John Frederick Peel Rawlinson, MP for Cambridge University, thought the wait would only increase public anxiety. ‘We ought to thrash out the case of national and imperial importance’ in the House immediately to avoid days of speculation in the press. Chamberlain explained the Prime Minister—Lloyd George—was at the very moment in conference with the Cabinet to deal with the matters at issue.

At that conference, Lloyd George and Edward Shortt met with the Colonial Secretary, Winston Churchill, and others, to chart a response. They decided that Churchill would give a speech in the House of Commons, less about this particular outrage than about the government’s
efforts to suppress ‘the root of the trouble’: the IRA. They discussed the utility of establishing a passport system for travel from Ireland, before deciding the two men, Joseph O’Sullivan and Reginald Dunn, had been from London, and such a system would not have succeeded. They also discussed ‘speeding up the trial’. Any delay would lead to evaporation of the public sense of outrage and allow the prisoners to become heroes within a ‘dangerous section of the population’. The perpetrators should be ‘kept in the position of an ordinary blood-thirsty murderer’. They also agreed to ‘avoid anything which…the Irish extremists would wish to represent as a great political trial’. The longer the proceedings carried on, the greater the ‘risk of bloodshed in Ireland’.23

In the House of Commons, Martin Archer-Shee criticised Shortt for failing to provide proper police protection. At every port where passengers arrived from Ireland, the police should search them for firearms. One Irish passenger had arrived, Archer-Shee had been told, with ‘two pistols in his belt just like a Mexican bravo’ and no search was made.24 When Shortt took the floor in his defence, he began with the declaration that Basil Thomson, former police commissioner, had said that if Irish negotiations did not break down, police protection could be reduced. When pressed on the matter of early warning, Shortt explained that the Home Office received thousands of anonymous documents containing threats against public officials, but that no specific warning had come from the head of police in Ulster with information about a plot to kill Henry Wilson. While it was obvious Wilson’s life was in danger in Ireland, it was far from clear he was in danger in England. Further, ‘there is no further doubt that these two young men had not been from Ireland’. Both were from London, both had served in the army and both had lived with their parents until the day of their crime. ‘There was no evidence whatever that they had ever been in Ireland at all during their lives’. When an MP suggested ‘they both had Irish names’, Shortt replied, ‘There are plenty of people with Irish names, many of whom have never been to Ireland’. He denied the government allowed gunmen from Ireland free access to England: did anyone really believe IRA assassins arrived with revolvers in their waistbands, like Mexican bandits?25 It was not, Shortt continued, his place to say whether the two criminals arrested were members of the IRA. ‘It is for the Courts to decide’.26

At the trial, the judge refused to allow O’Sullivan and Dunn to read a statement. The statement the judge refused to be aired in court declared they had acted on their own, without advice or assistance from Ireland.
While in the British army, they had learned to take human life to defend the principles of self-determination and freedom for small nations. They had come back from France to find their own country had been divided, with a government in Belfast that committed outrages against the Irish people. They had targeted Henry Wilson because he had been responsible for ‘the Orange Terror'; Wilson had organised ‘a body of men known as the Ulster special constables, who are the principal agents of his campaign of terrorism’. This campaign, they declared, had been responsible for 500 deaths during the previous few months.27

George Bernard Shaw blasted the British government for the ‘scandalous travesty of judicial procedure’ by which O’Sullivan and Dunn were sentenced to hang. The trial judge ‘lost his head so completely' that he denied the prisoners their right to plead not guilty and offer justification for their actions. The appeals court had compounded the injustice by upholding the decision not to allow the accused to speak. The accused did not intend to deny their actions, but rather, to explain their actions by way of arguing they were justified. To rule out such a defence, because it might have been successful, amounted to denying the men any defence whatever. Shaw supposed that if a man, a ‘fanatical English Unionist’, were to shoot De Valera or Collins, a fair trial would allow him the opportunity to appeal to a British jury on grounds of patriotism, and nobody in Ireland or America believed that an English judge would silence him. It would have been better, Shaw concluded, for the accused to have been killed by the spectators rather than carry out the spectacle of proceedings indifferent to English law. 28 Army colonel C.E. Calwell was among those who persisted in his belief in a connection to Ireland. At the trial, the assassins offered no defence beyond declaring they had been justified: they held Wilson responsible for massacre of the Irish. The fact that Lady Wilson received a number of threatening letters afterward, and needed police protection for two years, ‘goes far to prove that the murder was not merely the act of two unbalanced fanatics, but was the outcome of an organised conspiracy of murder’.29

One of the more interesting discourses to be seen in the years after the murder tried to distil universal principles at stake. One group of commentators drew on Christian concepts to unravel the legal dilemma of political crime. In 1924, a group of ministers, magistrates, JPs, and barristers and others organised the commission on the treatment of crime within the Conference on Christian Politics, Economics and Citizenship. The commission sought to formulate a Christian view on the nature, causes and treatment of crime. They proposed that unless crime
was understood from an ethical standpoint, rather than a purely legal point of view, it was impossible to understand the real nature of crime. They urged a series of reforms to be taken that reflected an ethical understanding of criminal behaviour and efforts to remove social evils, such as unemployment, bad housing and drink. To make their point, they underlined the reality of political crime. There were historical examples of legal crimes that were not ethical crimes at all, because they originated from virtue, such as ‘crime committed from political motives’. They commission offered, as an example, that of a ‘seditious speech’, not assassination of a political leader. But, they insisted the reality of political crime ‘suggests itself to reasonable men’s minds and is implicit in our ordinary conversation about crime’. It followed that political offenders should not be imprisoned alongside real criminals, because the law ought not be entitled to ‘invade the realm of conscience’.30

Another group of commentators turned to science. Maurice Hamblin Smith, medical officer at HM Prison Birmingham and lecturer in criminology at the University of Birmingham, explained political murder in the vocabulary of Freud’s psychoanalysis. Although the injustice of life occurred to most people to a greater or lesser degree, this feeling became repressed in some, leading to an issue of consciousness that manifested itself in various ways. ‘Many of the peculiar offences committed by fanatical political adherents probably arise from this cause’. The apparent inequality of natural circumstances, and the unhappy lot of others, could arouse ‘a violent sense of indignation’. Once repressed, this might ‘show itself in criminal acts of various kinds’. As an example of this complex, Hamblin suggested ‘we all know the paranoiac who delivers wild, impersonal harangues, who preaches anarchy and the like’. Many of these persons were used by political agitators. Although, Hamblin Smith suggested the boundary line between ‘paranoiac’ and ‘enthusiastic politician’ was at times every hard to delineate.31

The Wall Street bomb mystery

‘We Americans are beginning to hear much of political crime in our domestic affairs’, Robert Ferrari, who practised law in New York City and lectured in criminology at Columbia University, commented in March 1920, ‘Formerly, we heard of it only in international matters, and America was the asylum for political refugees. We now have political crime in our midst’. All of the countries of Europe, including the British Isles, drew a line between ordinary crime and political crime. The definition, derived from the work of Italian criminologist Enrico
Ferri, regarded the political criminal as a pseudo-criminal. Ordinary criminals were anti-social and anti-human in their assault on the bases of human life, but the political criminal attacked the political and governmental order. Ferrari argued for including an understanding of political crimes in American jurisprudence that included industrial or ‘class war’ crimes. While the social and industrial order was not the same as the political order, those who sought to change it by verbal means, through speech or other press offences, should fall under the consideration of political crime. Ferrari praised a recent decision by Justice Learned Hand concerning a forged passport to Ireland. Hand explored the motivation for the act, and determined that because it was political, the forger should receive a more lenient response.32

The ‘political criminals’ Ferrari had in mind were those targeted by the authorities for being labour agitators and political radicals. Between 1905 and 1917, the Industrial Workers of the World—nicknamed the Wobblies—organised a series of strikes to force capitalists to capitulate to a new society. Some Wobblies, the syndicalists, wanted to win control of labour unions, and others, the anarchists, distrusted all authority. The leading figure, William D. ‘Big Bill’ Haywood, a metal miner, gave emotive orations about a future society in which there would be no battle between capitalist and worker. If the public thought about IWW agitation, they regarded it as a nuisance, but America’s declaration of war on Germany transformed the Wobblies, into a subversive threat. The Wobblies, along with the Bolsheviks, radicals, trade unionists and anarchists, collectively referred to as ‘the Reds’, overlapped with foreign criminals and political agitators. President Wilson ordered an investigation, and in September 1917, federal agents raided IWW halls across the country. The Deportation Act (1918) led to further sweeps in November 1919 and January 1920.33 Wilson’s Attorney General, A. Mitchell Palmer chose J. Edgar Hoover to head the Radical Division (known as the General Intelligence Division from 1920) of the Justice Department. Hoover took charge of investigations concerning leading anarchists, Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman. While the sweeps would become known as the ‘Palmer raids’, Hoover planned and executed the department’s January 1920 raids on communists in 33 cities which led to the arrests of more than 3,000 people.34

In April 1919, 30 identical packages arrived at the addresses of prominent individuals across the United States. The targets included mayors, governors, local police officials, prominent business leaders, federal judges and authorities, including Palmer. The packages had been postmarked in New York with a return address of Gimbel Brothers Department Store.
The words ‘novelty’ and ‘sample’ were stamped with red letters. The *New York Times* described the attempt as ‘the most widespread assassination conspiracy in the history of the country’. In June 1919, ten bombs exploded in cities along the eastern seaboard and the Midwest: Boston; New York; Patterson, New Jersey; Philadelphia; Pittsburgh; Cleveland; and Washington, DC. Aside from one device left at Our Lady of Victory Catholic Church in Philadelphia, the bombs had been placed at the residences of state and federal officials and judges who had been involved in trials involving anarchists and radicals. Near the scene of the blasts in New York City and Washington DC, witnesses found a pink circular entitled *Plain Words* authored by ‘The Anarchist Fighters’. The pamphlet warned ‘the powers’ in America: ‘We have talked of liberty, we have aspired to a better world, and you gaoled us, you clubbed us, you deported us, you murdered us...we accept your challenge and mean to stick to our war duties. We mean to speak through the voice of dynamite, through the mouth of guns. We are not many, though perhaps more than you dream of’. One explosion wrecked the front of Mitchell Palmer’s house. About a hundred yards from where the front steps had been, police found part of a human backbone; fingers were recovered from a nearby tree and parts of a human skull on the road. The trouser pocket of the deceased contained blood-stained copies of the Anarchist circular.

The single most deadly event occurred on 16 September 1920 when a massive explosion took place on Wall Street at the corner of Broad Street. The *New York Times* reported 30 people killed, 300 injured. The explosion had taken place in front of the US Assay Office, directly across the street from the J.P. Morgan building. A mixture of human bodies, and carcasses of horses, lay in the street, the buildings spattered in blood. Within hours, the authorities had concluded the explosion was due to an infernal machine left on a horse-drawn cart. Some reports suggested an automobile had collided with a wagon-load of dynamite, or that the wagon had ignited spontaneously. But investigators noted heavy bits of cast iron window weights strewn about in the debris. Rust on their fractured ends indicated they had not been broken by the blast, but arranged on the wagon to magnify the destructive power of the concussion. The bomb had been detonated at noon, presumably the busiest moment. Richard Enright, commissioner of the New York Police, said his department was pursuing the theory the explosion was the work of ‘bomb plotters’. Rumours circulated about anarchists having placed a time bomb in a wagon; there was speculation the blast ‘signalled the long-threatened Red outrages’. In the coming months,
frequent press reports appeared linking the crime to well-known leftists radicals and trade unionists. The press anticipated a series of arrests starting with Big Bill Haywood.

The day after the explosion, Attorney General Palmer arrived in New York City, along with William Flynn, chief of the Bureau of Investigation. Flynn had been appointed as head of the Bureau in 1919, the day after the attack on Palmer’s house. Palmer promoted Flynn as ‘the greatest anarchist expert in the United States’ and the man capable of taking on ‘the biggest job in the business of crime detection today’. The Chicago Tribune gave Flynn a national reputation as the ‘U.S. Official Who Will Lead Fight against Terrorists’. In a legal sense, this was a requirement for a federal investigation. Without the suggestion of a conspiracy against the United States government, the only justification for the involvement of federal law enforcement (and Palmer’s interest) would have been damage to the Sub-Treasury building (being federal property). Palmer and Flynn tried to sound objective. ‘At the present time,’ Palmer said, ‘I believe this to be the result of a criminal conspiracy. I hope that further developments will tend to prove that it was an accident. I sincerely hope so, but present indications point to the contrary’. When pressed, Palmer acknowledged he had no reason to believe those responsible had planned to attack other targets, and no extra guards had been stationed around federal buildings either in New York or Washington, DC.

William Burns, head of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency, seized the moment. He walked to the scene from his office in the Woolworth Building north of the financial district to proclaim the bomb had been planted by Red radicals. ‘There is not the slightest doubt that it was a bomb which caused the explosion’ he told the New York Times. The day after the explosion, Burns called a press conference at his home to announce that he had been hired by ‘a group of ex-servicemen’ to run down the perpetrators. They had pointed out that this outrage had not been directed toward a particular individual or group of people, but at organised government. He agreed with their assessment: ‘the Reds’ had frequently denounced the government and proclaimed their intention ‘of bringing about a revolution by terrorism’. Burns viewed the Wall Street bomb with reference to the Los Angeles Times bombing. In 1910, he happened to be in Los Angeles when an explosion tore apart the premises of the Los Angeles Times. The dynamite blasts he had been hired to investigate in the city destroyed bridges, plants and other non-union construction projects. He managed to combine both investigations into a single success, by linking
two brothers with the Los Angeles Times explosion. He obtained a confession, claimed the reward, and acquired a national reputation for his detective agency. During the weeks following the Wall Street bombing, Burns made frequent press announcements, usually about the Reds. He wanted to find union involvement, as in the Los Angeles case, but failed to turn up any evidence of a conspiracy.\textsuperscript{41}

Meanwhile, William J. Flynn pursued a different explanation: the bomb had been planted by the same group of criminals as had earlier attacked the home of the attorney general. ‘The idea that Thursday’s outrage was part of an international plot does not gain serious currency here’ said The Times correspondent from New York City, ‘It is believed to have been the work of a small band of murderous Anarchists who neither represent nor have much influence with the known organizations or the extreme “Radicals”’.\textsuperscript{42} Federal agents were said to have found, minutes before the explosion, circulars from the ‘The Anarchist Fighters’ in a mailbox near the site. This radical leaflet warned of further attacks: ‘Remember we will not tolerate any longer. Free the political prisoners or it will be sure death for all of you’. Three days after the blast, Flynn revealed his suspicion that ‘the plot was conceived and consummated by the same group of Italian terrorists who planned and executed the June 2, 1919 outrages…’.\textsuperscript{43} The motive, he surmised, had been revenge for the prosecution of Sacco and Vanzetti. Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti had been executed in 1927, convicted and executed, many said, primarily because they were Italians and anarchists. Despite his initial statement to the press, Flynn had, within hours of the blast, begun tracking down Galleanisti.

Luigi Galleani, who had grown up in the Piedmont region of Italy, participated in the workers movement in France before arriving in the United States. Galleani and his disciples comprised a distinct current of anarchist-communists known as the \textit{anti-organizzatori}, a term derived from their passionate aversion to organisation. His newspaper, \textit{Cronaca Sovversiva}, ‘the anarchist weekly of revolutionary propaganda’, earned attention from the Bureau of Investigation as ‘the most rabid, seditious and anarchist sheet ever produced in this country’.\textsuperscript{44} He repeatedly called for acts of violence against tyrants, oppressors, and enemies of the people, with pistols, knives, and dynamite, and issued a booklet, \textit{La Salute} that contained step-by-step instructions for using nitroglycerine, gunpowder and blasting gelatine. Beginning in 1914, Galleani’s associates pursued acts of terror. They took part in attacks on churches and courthouses in New York City, including a plot to blow up St Patrick’s cathedral, and attempted to bomb a police station in Milwaukee, among
other sites, before 1918. Federal law enforcement authorities targeted the Galleanisti in the Palmer raids but Galleani himself managed to avoid direct links to crimes. He was, never-the-less, deported in June 1919 for statements made in opposition to the war. The Sedition Act (1918) penalised anyone who discouraged recruitment into the armed forces, obstructed the sale of bonds, or published material disloyal to the government.\(^{45}\) Using money from American colleagues, Galleani resumed his publishing activities in Milan and was said to be responsible for the bomb explosion at Genoa several days earlier.\(^{46}\)

Working from the *Cronaca* subscription lists by city, Flynn’s investigators looked for Galleanisti along the east coast. While Flynn admitted to the papers he had turned up ‘no direct evidence’ linking Galleani’s followers with the Wall Street blast, he predicted his efforts would produce a string of arrests.\(^{47}\) He also told the press his suspicion that terrorist networks in Italy extended back to the United States. He said he ‘learned from sources too impressive and reliable to be disbelieved that it was Galleani who not only sowed the seed that grew into the attack on Wall Street but he plotted the thing and forwarded his suggestions to America’.\(^{48}\) In London, observers doubted any connection between Genoa and New York. According to *The Times*, there was no evidence to suggest the Genoa explosion was tied in any way to that of Wall Street. Scotland Yard surmised it was may have been the work of anarchists, or simply madmen, with little purpose behind it.\(^{49}\) Behind the scenes, however, there was evidence of international links among Italian anarchists. MI5 (the Security Service) had been tracking Emidio Recchioni, an Italian immigrant who ran from 1921 a crusade against Mussolini from a delicatessen shop in Soho. MI5 believed Recchioni would stop at nothing to achieve his goal, not least because he tried to purchase an aeroplane for an unspecified Italian mission. Recchioni gave money and weapons to Angelo Sbardellotto, an Italian anarchist who offered to travel to Rome and kill *Il Duce*. After several failed attempts, Sbardellotto was arrested in Rome, where he was found with two bombs and revolver, and confessed his connection with Recchioni. MI5 kept this information to themselves, however, as Recchioni had a friendship with the British Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald.\(^{50}\)

Flynn never managed to identify the driver of the death wagon on that September day. However strongly he believed the culprit would be found in Italy, the Bureau of Investigation had few agents who could speak Italian. He despatched S.J. Clement to Italy to infiltrate the ‘Galleani group of anarchists’. Clement, who worked for the US Secret Service as an undercover agent, had burrowed into the Galleani group
before the war and learnt the name of the man who had blown himself up at Palmer’s front door. But although he worked in Italy from December 1920 until March 1921, he failed to turn up anything to substantiate Flynn’s theory of an international network. Galleani had arrived back in Italy in July 1919. He maintained ties with American anarchists and using money collected from them, revived the *Chronica Sovversiva* in Turin. Weeks after the bomb on Wall Street, anarchists clashed with police in Bologna and detonated a bomb in Milan. The liberal government arrested some 80 anarchists, including Galleani, and closed down the *Chronica Sovversiva*. The anarchists also faced brutal assaults from Mussolini’s Blackshirts. In March 1921, a bomb in Milan at the Teatro Diana killed 21 people and injured 172. Not only did Mussolini endorse the government’s heavy-handed tactics, but he also turned the Blackshirts loose on the anarchists. After October 1922, when Mussolini became prime minister, he displayed a determination to destroy the anarchists by force. His ‘Rocco laws’ suspended anti-nationalist parties and newspapers critical of his regime; cancelled passports; established a special tribunal for defence of the state; and re-instated the death penalty. Galleani wound up imprisoned with other political prisoners on the island of Lipari. Flynn tried to put the best face on the Bureau’s efforts, but following the election of Warren Harding in 1921, he lost his job to Burns who replaced him as director of the Bureau.

Success eluded Burns as well, although shortly after his appointment at the Bureau, he claimed to have solved the mystery. The bomber, he said, was a Polish anarchist under orders of the Reds. ‘The motive was to terrorize the people of this country by a demonstration of what they call mass action’. The bomb plotters were not after J.P. Morgan but ‘the most prominent spot in the whole world simply to make a big demonstration’. He despatched agents to Europe to hunt for Wall Street conspirators. ‘The radical wave, like the crime wave, reached its apex in the United States as a result of the war’ he explained. Although the Soviet government continued to spread money for propaganda purposes, and stirred up radicals in America, he was confident the case would be cleared up and it would signal the end of the radical movement in the United States. In December 1921, Burns’s agents stopped Wold Linderfeld in Warsaw. In a lengthy and detailed statement, Linderfeld admitted to having carried out the bombing based on instructions from the Third International. The story contained information known to investigators from other sources and confirmed Burns’s theory about the crime having been orchestrated by Moscow. But Linderfeld later retracted his confession and resisted extradition. When Burns finally got the chance to
interrogate him, at Ellis Island, the international detective realised his chief suspect had merely repeated information overheard in European anarchist circles.\textsuperscript{56}

**Murder in Marseilles**

The murders in Marseilles in the autumn of 1934 put terrorism on the League of Nations’ agenda. On 9 October, King Alexander of Yugoslavia arrived in Marseilles, en route to Paris on a mission to improve relations with France. Louis Barthou, French foreign minister, joined him in an open car on a parade route. As car neared the Place de la Prefecture, a man stepped forward, jumped onto the running board, and fired several shots. The King, hit twice, died where he sat. Barthou, who had been struck in the stomach and arm, was rushed to the hospital but died several hours later. General Georges of the French Supreme War Council was the only official to survive. The king’s chauffer fired at the man, who fell back into the crowd and returned fire. The assassin then attempted to kill himself, but gendarmes pulled the pistol from his mouth. After a silence, the crowd burst in between police, and attacked the assassin as he lay on the floor. The police later identified him as Petieus Kalemen, a Croat who had entered France two weeks earlier on a Yugoslavian passport.\textsuperscript{57}

Two years earlier, another assassination had taken place in France. On 6 May 1932, a man rushed up to French President Paul Doumer while browsing the books at an exhibition of First World War veteran writers, and shot him five times. A well-known author and the director of the municipal police were wounded as they wrestled the gun from the man. The police managed to take the man into custody, rescuing him from an angry crowd at the scene that attempted to lynch him on the spot. During the next few days, the French press revealed the identity of the assassin and speculated on his motives. Pavel Gorgulov, a medical doctor and poet, had left a village in southern Russia for Paris in 1930. Some newspapers suggested he was a tool of Soviet agents seeking to destabilise France; others referred to him as a fascist or lunatic. Gorgulov himself suggested he had nothing against Doumer as a person but had targeted him as a symbol of the French nation. During the previous two years, he had developed a hatred for the French whom he condemned for negotiating with the Bolsheviks who had destroyed his homeland. Killing Doumer, he hoped, would provoke the French Republic into war with the Soviet Union. Within two weeks of the murder, the Council of Ministers promulgated stricter
control over the foreign-born population. Radio Normandie, a commercial station only recently on the air, criticised the government for inviting such trouble by indiscriminately welcoming foreigners, which had resulted in an ‘international underworld’ resident on French soil.58

Despite a lengthy trial, monitored closely by the press and public, Gorgulov’s crime did not have major political repercussions. The 75-year old Doumer, who presided over a coalition government, had been a relatively modest force in French politics. The French public mourned the loss of ‘the father of the nation’, but Gorgulov’s ravings in court seemed to confirm he was more of a self-destructive madman than an agent of a foreign power. Alfred Morain, Prefecture de Police, explained a spate of political murders on French soil with reference to a theory of psychological disposition. In *The Underworld of Paris: Secrets of the Sûreté* (1928), he reviewed several killings that took place in the 1920s, including that of M. Bonservizi, a leading Italian fascist in France; Ataman Simon Petlirua, president of the Ukranian directorate; and Marius Plateau, secretary-general of the Ligue d’Action Française. He rested his analysis on Cesare Lombroso’s theory of political crime, in which the founder of scientific criminology distinguished between violent acts leading to revolutions and acts leading to revolts. Morain explained that what distinguished a political crime from an ordinary crime was the motivation, but went on to suggest the real cause of political crimes could be found in ‘a state of social unrest’. Nihilists, anarchists, and socialists planted fanatical ideas, and when amplified by the crowd, induced those with a ‘highly strung nature’ to act on their passions. Political criminals could be characterised as persons ‘sensitive to suggestion, fanatical, low intelligence, vanity....’59

But the murders in Marseilles referenced a complicated set of political affairs that portended wider troubles. ‘One cannot but be struck by the remarkable resemblance of the present accusation,’ American lawyer Arthur Kuhn commented in 1935, ‘to that brought against Serbia after the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife at Sarajevo on June 28, 1914’.60 Investigations carried out in France indicated the crime may have been committed as part of a plot against the government of Yugoslavia in order to further separatist ambitions of Croatia in relation to certain districts of Yugoslav territory. These districts had been part of Hungary within the Hapsburg monarchy. Whether the assassins acted alone, or on behalf of interests in Hungary, became a point of controversy. In the months following the crime, what funds the terrorists had at their disposal was not clear, although they may have received funds from Croatian and Bulgarian
immigrants in the United States. The assassins appeared to have a considerable organisation that extended across several countries and had enough money to pay for travel and explosives. They also commanded an elaborate office for the production of forged passports. Three days later, two men alleged to belong to the same ‘terrorist organisation as the assassin’ were arrested at a hotel in Haute-Savouie. They were taken to Annemasse, near the Swiss frontier, where they were questioned in the presence of Yugoslavia’s permanent delegate to the League of Nations. The police suspected their passports, like that of the assassin, had been forged.

Immediately after the funeral, diplomats from Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey met in Belgrade to consider the political aftermath of the assassination. Their statement on the circumstances of the murders expressed support for cooperation and rapprochement, but never-the-less made specific demands on other states. They determined the murder had been committed under the influence of ‘forces beyond the frontiers’, by ‘terrorists’ seeking to injure certain countries in international relationships. The Marseilles tragedy revealed the threat of ‘international anarchy’. The diplomats urged all states to join in recovering the guilty persons and in taking immediate measures to prevent the recurrence of such acts. Specifically, the Yugoslav authorities claimed the crime had been committed by men who had been trained in special camps in Hungary. They accused Hungary of assisting Yugoslav exiles in acquiring firearms and ammunition, of issuing false passports and of instructing them in the techniques of professional terrorism. A Czechoslovakian diplomat claimed that Hungary allowed a school of terrorists at Janka Puszta, only a few miles from the Yugoslav border. Political tensions between Hungary and Yugoslavia intensified, and in November 1934, Yugoslavia asked the League of Nations to intervene. The documents sent to Brussels accused Hungary of complicity in the crime and indicated the situation between the two nations ‘threatened to disturb the peace and good relations between nations’. Hungary requested League action as well; the government refused to be saddled with the ‘odious crime of Marseilles’.

Terrorism had been a topic of discussion at a series of International Conferences for the Unification of Criminal Law held in the early 1930s. There were several reasons, not least of which, the increasingly international character of society. Professor V.V. Pella, an advocate for unification of criminal law across Europe, explained that criminal law was changing in nations as a result of international developments. ‘Criminal law should, by itself become international, adapt itself to the growth in
crime incident to the unceasing transformation and internationalisation of contemporary social life’. In fact, it was at the conference in Brussels in 1931 that yielded the first definition of ‘an act of terrorism’. The conferees resolved: ‘the intentional use of means capable of producing a common danger that represents an act of terrorism on the part of anyone making use of crimes against life, liberty or physical integrity of persons or directed against private or state property with the purpose of expressing or executing political or social ideas will be punished’. Discussion continued in Paris the following year and in Madrid in 1934. There was continuing disagreement whether the definition should be based on political or social objectives, or the effects of specific violent acts. The Paris conference declared a terrorist to be someone ‘who within the scope of undermining social order, employs any means whatsoever to terrorize the population’ without reference to political objectives. The Madrid gathering decided ‘terrorism’ amounted to ‘anarchy’ and avoided any reference to political aims or motives as well.

After two months of negotiation, the Council of the League of Nations produced a resolution which observed ‘the rules of international law concerning the repression of terrorist activity are not at present sufficiently precise to guarantee efficiently international cooperation’. On the suggestion on Anthony Eden, the UK rapporteur, the Council established a Committee of Experts on the Repression of Terrorism ‘with a view to drawing up a preliminary draft of an international convention to assure the repression of conspiracies and crimes committed with a political and terrorist purpose’. The Committee of Experts would be composed of ten members, one from each of the governments of Belgium, France, Great Britain, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Rumania, Soviet Union, Spain and Switzerland. In Britain, the question was taken up at an Inter-Departmental Conference (including representatives of the Foreign Office, Home Office, Scottish Office, India Office and Colonial Office). It was agreed to send Sir John Fischer Williams to the Committee of Experts which met a Geneva in April 1935. The French government circulated an outline of a draft, in which the signatories would agree to suppress attempts on the lives of heads of state, MPs, judges and officials; attempts on public buildings, railways, ships and aircraft; and possession of arms, ammunition or explosives with a view to committing such acts. The French draft suggested improvement of means for detecting forged passports and for communicating information about attempted terrorist acts. It also included provision for relaxing the exception in extradition treaties of persons charged with political offences, specifically, to provide extradition of persons charged with assassination.
In London, the Cabinet discussed the implications of the murder for international relations. There was no reason, the ministers concluded, to expect any of Yugoslavia’s neighbours to seize the present opportunity to intervene, although if it appeared Yugoslavia would break-up, Mussolini would likely send the Italian fleet to the Dalmatian coast. In the weeks after the event, the Cabinet spent as much time discussing complaints received from other governments about exhibition of newsreel footage of the murders in Marseilles than the potential for wider conflict. Nevertheless, the Home Office would take a favourable view of the League of Nation’s project, at least at the point when it got underway. Under existing law, it was already a crime to conspire in the United Kingdom to commit murder abroad. This law could be extended to some other offences, provided the legislation distinguished a ‘genuinely terrorist act’ from attempts to change foreign governments by coup d'état. In certain circumstances, public opinion might be opposed to regarding insurrectionary activities as crimes. The delegate to the Committee of Experts should seek to limit the definition of ‘terrorist’ to activities ‘sporadic in their effect and to exclude mass movements of an insurrectionary character’. The Extradition Act (1870) prohibited extradition of any person for ‘an offence of a political character’. While British courts would be reluctant to regard assassination as an offence of a political character, there might be some circumstances when courts would be reluctant to extradite a person for political violence short of murder. The Home Office welcomed tighter controls over forged passports: making possession of a false passport a criminal offence would be desirable.

The Committee of Experts on the Repression of Terrorism, comprised of representatives from 11 states, met in three sessions between April 1935 and April 1937. By the third session, Britain had some reservations about what had become a more extensive document. Williams thought the prevailing definition of terrorism, which surrendered British wording to that advanced by the French, was ‘not of great importance’. Actes de terrorisme included acts directed against a State, not in private vengeance or hostility; acts intended to create a state of terror or panic; and stipulated further such acts were criminal in the sense of ‘being highly immoral’. The most important article in the convention, as far as his replacement, Leslie Brass, was concerned, had to with Article 9. The word ‘political’ did not appear, despite the efforts of several members of the committee to include it. The omission was beneficial because many continental jurists regarded political motive alone as enough to characterise a political crime, and had the word appeared, it likely would have been enough to exclude most acts of terrorism from extradition.
In November 1937, an international diplomatic conference met to adopt a convention based on the final draft submitted by the Committee, additional guidance submitted by governments and various external proposals for combating terrorism. By this time, the British government had decided not to sign. While the government had ‘the greatest sympathy’ with the objective of the conference, any convention the British delegation would sign would require ‘drastic curtailment’ of the present draft. The draft convention would require significant changes in domestic criminal law, and the government saw no practical need for pursuing such changes. The government was not prepared to argue for restriction of free expression in public, nor for amending existing law pertaining to firearms. The British delegates were told to extricate the British government from the convention without discouraging other countries. They should adopt the stance of observers rather than active participants.72

The Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism was signed at Geneva on 16 November 1937 by representatives of 20 states. The signatories agreed to regard as criminal offences ‘acts of terrorism’ committed on the territory of one country and directed against another. The murders in Marseilles served as an example of terrorism ‘of an international character’. Further, the signatories agreed to regard as criminal any conspiracy or assistance given in one state for acts of terrorism directed against another state and committed abroad. The convention contained provisions for extradition in case of such offences, for tightening municipal law regarding passports, firearms and explosives, and for greater cooperation amongst police. Under Article 15, each signatory undertook to establish a service in cooperation with its own police authorities for corresponding with other states and collating information related to terrorist offences. The Netherlands, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Spain, Belgium and France all supported the convention. Great Britain abstained. The British government announced that while it had considerable sympathy for the aims of the convention, there would have been considerable difficulty in framing domestic criminal law to harmonise with continental codes. It would be too difficult to persuade Parliament to change Britain’s methods.73 The Belgian representative asserted that an international convention on terrorism was necessary even though nations claimed their domestic laws provided adequate punishment for acts of terrorism. He pointed out that the traffic in women and counterfeit currency were also covered by national law, it was desirable to supplement these measures by international organisation because of the inadequacy of un-coordinated actions. Terrorism assumed an even greater international character than the traffic in women and
counterfeiting of currency. Existing international responses to terrorist outrages were not enough due to insufficient international police cooperation and the lack of facility for exchange of information about suspects.\textsuperscript{74}

The British delegation felt that more could be accomplished by informal cooperation among police in various states than a treaty spelling out punishment of terrorists. In their confidential report of the Diplomatic Conference to the Home Office, Williams and Brass explained that Articles 15 and 16 related to centralisation of information about terrorist offences and the establishment of communication between police forces of the different countries. They took the view that the cooperation of the United Kingdom in such a system would require no domestic legislation, and to some extent, already took place. International police cooperation, they concluded, ‘would seem in and by itself to be a more effective method of combating the activities of terrorists than the enactment by a not very large number of States of provision tending to make it slightly more likely that the authors of terrorist attempts, should they themselves survive, would have received legal punishment for their crimes’.\textsuperscript{75} Normal Kendal at Scotland Yard was less enthusiastic. The centralisation and circulation of information anticipated by Articles 14, 15 and 16 would likely mean ‘a substantial increase in work’ for the Special Branch. Germany, Italy and some of the Balkan states like Yugoslavia would likely present ‘a very large number of requests’ under Article 16, and should the convention be agreed, Britain would ‘a have to do a great deal more work for other countries that we shall be able to ask them to do for us.’ On the positive side, Kendal suggested the convention would make it easier to ‘get rid of an odd undesirable alien’ or two.\textsuperscript{76}

\section*{Conclusions}

The motivation and tactics of the wave-like surge of political violence in the interwar period took place in different contexts. But in each country, there were individuals who struggled to make sense of it. Investigators looked for international networks, professors sought comprehensive definitions and politicians pursued binding agreements. The step taken toward an international agreement, following the murders in Marseilles, reflected the desire for a comprehensive understanding. The French took the initiative within the League of Nations to construct an international agreement concerning terrorism and developed considerable support for a common legal definition. Britain preferred
to rely on informal police cooperation across borders—the same position taken at the International Defence Against Anarchists conference at Rome some four decades earlier. But it was not the lack of British support that sabotaged international agreement.

As a consequence of the violence of their methods, anarchists tended to general condemnation. And, under political conditions envisioned by the League of Nations, it was conceivable that each state would share an interest in punishing attacks on any one member regardless of where the attack had occurred. But given the strong trend toward nationalism, there was no discernable trend in this direction, and the problem of what constituted a political offence for purposes of extradition remained. Governments found it impossible to draw the line between political and non-extraditable and common and extraditable.77
Conclusion

Crime presented a significant international issue in the 1920s and 1930s. Experts warned of a new generation of criminals and novel forms of criminality, although not all of what they were concerned about was new to the decades between the wars.

Technology was thought to have empowered criminal activities stretching from country to country and continent to continent. ‘Motor bandits’ made the most of the new motorways for burglary and theft. Traffickers in drugs and women used cars, even aeroplanes, to ferry their illicit merchandise across borders. But such concerns were not unique to the interwar era. Most of the transportation and communications technologies of these decades had appeared in the late nineteenth century and concerns about them followed a habit of thought as old as the technologies themselves. Similarly, interwar suspicions about migration of ‘alien criminals’ and intrigues of ‘international Jewry’ continued a trend from before the Great War. Concern with alien criminality after the war contributed to the maintenance of wartime restrictions on foreigners. The passport, introduced as a temporary measure, became a fixture of modern life. Governments discovered how easy it was to track their citizens, and as Clifford Rosenberg points out, institutionalised a significant dimension of modern state surveillance.¹ Yet the threat of cross-border deviance and immigrant criminality dated from the 1880s. The Parliamentary debate in Britain after the Armistice specifically referenced the debate leading up to the Aliens Act in 1905.

What was new was the sense that four years of world war had changed everything. Beginning with anxieties about a ‘worldwide crime wave’ occurring in the wake of the conflict, there was a keen awareness of how global firestorms sparked local troubles. Police and prison authorities predicted a surplus of criminality as a consequence of brutalisa-
tion, ‘shell shock’ and deprivation. They offered compelling reasons, but the wave effect did not register in crime statistics. Millions had been savaged in one way or another by the war and the vast majority of soldiers and civilians did not turn to crime. Concern about a post-war crime wave did establish a model for detecting the side-effects of future global events. A number of politicians thought they could see a crime wave resulting from the economic crisis of the 1930s. The Home Secretary, Herbert Samuels, convinced himself there was evidence of correspondence between unemployment rates and crime rates, in Britain and ‘everywhere else’ affected by the slump. But academics did not agree, nor did statistics elsewhere in the world. The economic depression of 1929–33 created hardship for millions, but no worldwide crime wave.

Americanisation as an explanation for British crime patterns was also new. Intellectuals in Germany and France frowned on American economic, political and cultural influence, and in Britain, this had a lot to do with suspicions that prohibition-era crime in US cities spilled over the Atlantic. References to gangsters became a means of social criticism; editorialists insisted that British cities had become as crime-ridden as Chicago. Government authorities also made use of gangsterism as a form of explanation; the investigator into the 1932 riot at Dartmoor blamed the rising ‘gangster class’ as the underlying cause. Some said it was a Hollywood illusion. British cinema-goers took American crime films too seriously. But others found cause for concern in the message imparted to youth. George Orwell mourned the death of a taxi driver, killed by a boy who imagined himself a Chicago gangster and his girlfriend who wished for nothing more than to be his moll.

The most important new development, by far, was the League of Nations. The League collected concerns about transnational crime and organised them into an international public agenda. Crime comprised a trivial part of the dream for the League of Nations when first put to paper in 1919. But, the advisory committees that had been formed by the Assembly around trafficking in women and dangerous drugs enjoyed enormous success in shaping the League’s agenda, in large part because crime prevention appealed to a universal audience. League enthusiasts saw in the international campaigns for suppression of the white slave trade and for the regulation of narcotics the means of marshalling wide political support. Early on, advocates pointed to the League’s ‘non-political activities’ as comprising its most important work. Some, including Ishbel Hamilton-Gordon of the International Council of Women, went so far as to declare that if the effort to make Geneva the
capital of the world had achieved nothing else, success in the arena of human trafficking had made the whole enterprise worthwhile.

The case for preserving the League combined a series of arguments about crime, that when taken together, became a lore of international crime prevention. These arguments expressed the view that criminals took advantage of technologies for overcoming time and space. The activities of cross-border criminals had become so intertwined, and vulnerabilities of potential victims so inter-connected, that only wide-scale, unprecedented responses would do. To reduce drug addiction in Egypt, Russell Pasha insisted, required not merely a national drug enforcement organisation, or even the coordination of national drug bureaus, but a form of international government capable of managing a single system for regulating drug manufacture throughout the world. To end the drug trafficking required a commitment from every government to root out clandestine factories. Or, as a British MP explained in 1936: when any single point on the planet became a harbour for the illicit drug traffic, all countries were in danger of being flooded by drug addiction. Protecting Chinese sovereignty was not enough to justify military intervention, perhaps the need to prevent the Japanese from turning China into a centre for the drug traffic would be. Yet, as Virginia Berridge points out from her analyses of drug control, the problem would not have existed on this scale had it not been for the solution. The very existence of international drug control encouraged excess production, illegal manufacture and underground trading.2

Looking back, it would be hard to overestimate the importance of the League of Nations in identifying, promoting and shaping our understanding of crime as an international issue. It is impossible to theorise about the problem of international crime today without borrowing at least some of the conceptual vocabulary introduced in Geneva. The technical committees of the League presided over the conversion of the ‘white slave trade’ to ‘traffic in women’, ‘opium evil’ to ‘traffic in narcotics’ and ‘anarchist outrage’ to ‘acts of terrorism’. The advisory committees on opium, traffic in women, and repression of terrorism formed the centre of ideas and policy. In identifying problems of concern, they invented a specialist jargon, collated existing information, co-ordinated multi-national action, and drew-in international charities. The language of ‘trafficking’ is significant, because in adopting the concept for general use, the League brought three very different issues to the same level of significance as threats to the world’s wellbeing. The League was able to locate crime within a wider set of collective anxieties
about the future of the world. It established a narrative of traffickers and terrorists that would guide international efforts for decades to come.

Never-the-less, the League would have had nothing to say if it were not for the voluntary associations that pushed the diplomats into the politics of international crime. These organisations added traffic in women and drugs to the League’s constitution, and using this foothold, carried these issues higher up the League’s hierarchy of priorities. Rachel Crowdy and other women’s advocates utilised the framework of the League to reduce victimisation of fallen sisters and advance women’s equality. While some anti-trafficking voices within the League oversold traffic in women as an international problem, it did harm a significant number of women, and raising the issue enabled women to break into positions of political leadership in international affairs. Stephanie Limoncelli, Jessica Pliley and others have assessed the role of women in relation to the League.3

Other organisations, too, craved affiliation with the League of Nations and the legitimacy it brought to their cause. For years, Johann Schober pursued an official relationship on behalf of the International Criminal Police Commission. The police won places on advisory committees, and could boast of cooperation on measures to suppress counterfeit currency, but they did not entirely succeed in plans for merged operations. Considering this experience, alongside that of other groups, raises a significant question about the relationship between voluntary organisations and the League. While the various charities, professional associations and international organisations were busy trying to work the levers of League politics to their advantage, they were also being leveraged by the League for its purposes. The Jewish Association for Protection of Girls and Women appreciated their position as ‘assessor’ to the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Women. Claude Montefiore had failed to win Jews in synagogues across Britain to the cause, but he did achieve a voice within the League. It was too easy. Montefiore had no trouble finding political support for recognition of ‘Jewish trafficking’ as a problem and he appears to have realised in 1933 that his efforts were of more value to the National Socialists than Jewish women. On the other hand, international organisations outside the League framework appeared more vulnerable to co-optation. The International Criminal Police Commission fell to Nazi handlers. The International Bureau for the Suppression of Traffic in Women and International Penal and Penitentiary Commission were seriously compromised.

Mathieu Deflem provides a useful way of understanding crime in the interwar period when he writes of the ‘myth of international crime’. Referring to threat of international crime as an illusion does not mean
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that nothing like cross-border crime actually took place. There was some reality to it. Police, international charity workers and government analysts identified crimes and criminals that operated on an inter-continental scale, and they were in the best position to know. Technology facilitated some crimes, and trends occurred with response to particular offences. Evidence of international crime exists in various forms. In the reports of drug traffickers sent to the Home Office, in the case files of human trafficking organisations, in the investigations of E.J. Gumbel into the circumstances surrounding political murders in Weimar Germany. The language of myth includes the idea that concerns about international crime contained an element of truth, but were inflated, embroidered, or distorted into grander illusions. This appears to be the sense in which Deflem uses the word with reference to international police cooperation. Some degree of cross-border crimes did occur, but European police forces turned such cases into a wider threat.

Distilling fact from fiction is difficult because police, charities and international organisations blended facts from cases when urgent calls for action. They realised that the nature and extent of actual criminal activity mattered less than perceptions of it because documentary evidence was not prerequisite for international policy. The proof of cross-border crimes in the case files and card indexes would not, by itself, have led to the formation of agencies within the League of Nations or had motivated the response of national governments to League initiatives. Rather, individuals and organisations had to recognise such information as constituting a problem of global importance and present the threat in a way that would appeal to constituencies across national borders. News stories about victimisation in faraway places failed to inspire coordinated action. Internationalists had to find ways of bringing such threats closer to home. There had to be danger of worldwide proportion to get all the political constituencies involved working in the same direction and to overcome resistance to international campaigns.

In looking at human trafficking and drug trafficking as international issues we see the myth-making aspects of internationalisation of problems. What Deflem argues for the International Criminal Police Commission can also be said of the League of Nations. The threat of international crime served as a ‘professional’ or ‘organisational’ myth for the League; it furnished a rationale for its activities and a justification for its existence. Trafficking in women and drugs provided a compelling argument for coordinated action by national governments. The Special Body of Experts on Traffic in Women made the ‘international underworld’ the basis of their investigation. They projected the image of criminal networks extend-
ing not only from person to person, but from city to city and continent to continent. They did not regard the idea of an international underworld as an element of the white slave trade myth to be falsified, but as a conceptual tool for auditing the reality of the commercial sex trade in cities everywhere. Similarly, the reports of drug advisors, including Philip Noel-Baker, perceived something solid behind the facade of a 'great international gang' supported by 'big finance'. Hazy, blurred images furnished better political arguments than statistics and documents.

At the same time, the idea of myth can mean something more, or other than, advancing falsity over truth. In addition to distortions of the truth, or outright lies people are made to believe are true, there are statements known to be false but which we accept as true because this offers advantages. Hans Vaihinger proposed that consciously-false ideas collectively provide 'an instrument for finding our way about more easily in this world'. The 'world of the “unreal” is just as important', Vaihinger taught, 'as the world of the so-called real or actual (in the ordinary sense of the word); indeed it is far more important for ethics and aesthetics'. His book, *The Philosophy of “As If”* (1924), contains many examples of assumptions known to be false as the basis of investigation in chemistry, physics, mathematics, ethics and aesthetics. He pointed to use of the statistical average, for example, as a way of describing populations; the imaginary figure at the centre of calculation. The Belgian astronomer L.A.J. Quetelet proposed the *homme moyen*, the typical or average man, as the embodiment of this abstraction.

The political leaders, social critics and opinion-makers who wanted to understand the social impact of global processes and events introduced a number of false constructs. The phrase 'act of terrorism' within the League's response to the murders in Marseilles is an example of as-if thinking ('juridical fictions' comprise a whole category of constructs in Vaihinger's system). The wave of political murders committed in the decades after the war encompassed a variety of objectives, circumstances and outcomes. Political authorities knew that individuals and groups planned such murders in response to grievances, imagined or occurring, within particular contexts. They also knew that a coordinated multi-national response provided valuable political cover for interventions directed against enemies of the state. By universalising the threat of terrorism, and promoting the idea of the typical terrorist, it was possible to mitigate escalation into wider conflicts. If terrorist attacks of the interwar period would have resulted from a single international network, or even a single rationale, it would have been possible to reach a shared understanding. But despite common features,
terrorism and political murder reflected the designs of different groups and multiple rationales. The reality of political crime in Germany meant that any definition in international agreement would need to have been based on a fictional conception of universality.

Lord Cecil proposed something not so very far away from ‘as-if thinking’ in his speech concerning Article 23 in deliberation about the Constitution. To achieve peace, he said, it was necessary to do more than prohibit war. Nations could not will a functioning international government into being through speech-making about shared ideals. Rather, they had to rehearse the mechanisms for responding to major conflicts by routinely solving relatively small conflicts. The Constitution should include machinery for taking on traffic in women and drugs in order to get national governments into ‘the habit of cooperating’. Even if there was no international underworld to worry about, it was useful to believe there was, because it was a small price to pay for putting the machinery in working order that would in turn prevent the real threat of fascist government and war of aggression.

Overall, it would be difficult to conclude that the idea of international crime prevention in the 1920s and 1930s offered a basis for extending human rights or promoting peace. The significance of crime as an international issue must be seen in its capacity for justification of war and mass murder and the most resonant illusions about crime in the interwar period invoked the language of scientific truth. In Germany, the National Socialists pedalled their fantasies of ‘international Jewry’ and ‘Jewish criminality’, fortified by the vocabulary of criminal anthropology. Through the voices of Salvatore Ottolenghi, in forums like the international police congress, the Italians’ body-based theories of criminality found their way into the criminal-biological programme of Hitler’s Germany. Nazi rhetoric placed Jewish men at the centre of the international criminality, and turned Jewish women into their accomplices, drawing on pseudo-scientific texts such as Erich Wulffen’s 1923 handbook Das Weib als Sexualverbrecherin (Woman as a Sexual Criminal). The interwar capacity for scientific delusion was, it is important to understand, much broader than this, as can be seen in the career of Alexis Carrel.

A celebrity scientist of the interwar period, Carrel received wide acclaim for his pioneering methods for suturing blood vessels and a Nobel prize in medicine for his organ transplant techniques. In the 1930s, he teamed up with Charles Lindbergh to build the first profusion pump that permitted survival of organs outside the body. In Man, the Unknown (1939) Carrel offered his thoughts on the ‘crisis of civilisation’. The book
became a bestseller owing to Carrel’s association with Lindbergh (and
the coinciding of its’ release with the trial of Bruno Hauptmann, con-
victed for the kidnap and murder of the Lindberghs’ baby).\textsuperscript{11} Modernity,
Carrel said, made living impossible. The only way out was to ‘rely exclusively
upon scientific concepts’ and to develop a ‘science of man’. He pro-
moted a programme of ‘voluntary eugenics’. Public health, he insisted,
interfered with natural selection and allowed inferior individuals to pro-
create. He proposed sequestering of gifted children, advocated the train-
ing of women in childrearing (rather than professions), and criticised
short-sightedness that led to declining birth rates. In the final chapter,
his eugenics scheme became less voluntary. To deal with ‘the problem of
the great number of defectives and criminals’ he recommended that
particular categories ‘should be humanely and economically disposed
of in small euthanasic institutions supplied with proper gases’.\textsuperscript{12}
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