

and to induce the former "to forfeit its right and its duty to exterminate every single Fascist soldier on the territory of the Union." "Vain efforts and futile dreams! Our Red Army is successively dealing with the German wedges into the front, and Hitler's political wedges are ridiculous."

Through the medium of the press and radio the Soviet Government has left Japan and the rest of the world in no doubt as to its judgment of Japan's conduct. "Traacherous attack," "Perfidious assault" and "Thorough preparation for aggression" were the terms employed by the *Pravda*, and there can be little doubt as to where the sympathies of the Soviet Union lie in this regard. At the same time official representatives, such as M. Lozovski and M. Litvinov, have intimated that Soviet-Japanese relations were regulated by the Soviet-Japanese Neutrality Pact. M. Litvinov none the less cheerfully calls the Japanese "our common enemy." Emphasis is generally laid on the fact that, after all, Germany is the principal enemy, and that in dealing its mighty blows at the latter on the eastern front the U.S.S.R. is fulfilling its duty in the best possible way. It may, however, be remarked, as was pointed out in *Summary* No. 80 when the pact was concluded, that the terms of the operative article of the pact leave the Kremlin free to act as suits it, since the U.S.S.R. only bound itself to observe neutrality should Japan "be the object of military action by one or more States." Everything depends, therefore, on the interpretation which it may suit the Kremlin to put on the term "military action." If it is held to mean "aggression," then obviously Japan is not protected by the pact, since she could hardly claim that she had been the object of aggression. But it must be admitted that the rulers of the Soviet Union have a great deal on their shoulders already in their task of driving the German invader out of their territories without prematurely adding to the burden. It is not possible, either, to estimate accurately the extent to which the Far Eastern Army has been drawn on for men or material for the defence of Moscow. The Soviet propaganda machine has now begun to write up the Libyan campaign in a sense favourable to us. An article broadcast from Kuibyshev on the 12th December stated that General Auchinleck had achieved important successes and described the fighting as severe.

SCANDINAVIA.

While recent arrivals from Norway continue to emphasise the unbreakable solidarity of the loyalist front, a rather less favourable picture of the situation in organised labour circles has lately been provided. The reign of terror inaugurated by the German authorities seems to have achieved some measure of success in these quarters. The removal of many of the best trade union leaders by arrest or otherwise has left the movement somewhat hesitant and divided. Some workers shrink from the policy of resigning from the Quisling-controlled organisations, fearing the permanent disintegration of their unions if members are now lost. There is also a tendency to argue that the agitation against the payment of subscriptions is futile, since these contributions will be deducted from wages by the employers. On the other hand, the Swedish paper, *Dagens Nyheter*, reports on the 10th December that thousands of Norwegian workmen are still refusing to pay, in spite of threats of German courts-martial.

The ban upon wireless listening seems also to have achieved a certain measure of success. Individual listeners are reported to be still fairly numerous, but increasingly cautious about spreading the information which they receive. In spite of the efforts of secret organisations to circulate the news, it seems that the population as a whole is very ill-informed, and is at the mercy of rumour, the volume of which grows continually. While many of these rumours are harmless and encouraging, it must be remembered that the circulation of reports obnoxious to the German authorities is now threatened with the severest punishment, including even the death penalty. There is therefore a danger that rumours deliberately put about by the Nazis themselves may come to predominate: there is some suspicion that a recent story that the Nygaardsvold Government had resigned may have originated in this way.

In these circumstances, there is an intensified demand for the provision of news in leaflet form from England, and considerable disappointment is being expressed at British inaction at a time when encouragement is felt to be particularly needed. The will to resist remains nevertheless extremely strong;

there are numerous cases of actual and suspected sabotage, and work carried on for the Germans is slowed down to the maximum extent, with the knowledge and the approval of the contractors. According to the Swedish paper *Social-Demokraten* for the 11th December, the presence of frequent Russian patrols in Finmark, the northern province of Norway, has been reported to Oslo by the chairman of the local commune. If this report is true, as seems quite likely, the people of Northern Norway may begin to look primarily to Russia for the encouragement which they desire. Since the start of Russo-German hostilities labour circles in Norway are reported to be showing an increased radicalism.

The recent successes of the Soviet forces have come as a shock to Finland: *Helsingin Sanomat*, which has hitherto shown particularly strong German sympathies, in expressing surprise and disappointment, observes that Finnish opinion had confidently expected the fall of Moscow before Christmas. The situation round Leningrad is now likely to be watched with particular anxiety, since a German retirement on this front would clearly affect the situation of the Finnish troops in the Ladoga region. The announcement, moreover, by Germany of her intention to stop offensive operations, immediately after Finland had been committed to continuance, can hardly fail to increase Finno-German tension.

On the 15th December the Swedish Court of Appeal rejected the plea of immunity raised by His Majesty's Government and the Norwegian Government in the case of the ships detained in Göteborg harbour (see *Weekly Summary* No. 108), and confirmed the order for the arrest of the ships.

There are indications of renewed German pressure on Sweden. Dr. Schuurle is understood to have delivered a fresh note requesting further facilities for the transit of troops through Swedish territory; the demand has, however, been refused. Public opinion in Sweden is certainly likely to support a firm attitude on the part of the Government. The reign of terror in Norway has aroused widespread indignation, and the barbarous treatment of political prisoners in that country has been exposed and denounced in the Swedish press. *Dagens Nyheter* claims that reports of torture and physical maltreatment are now supported by an irrefutable mass of evidence, and describes the situation as "utterly shameful." In Göteborg, recently, the arrest of a British sailor on a charge of drunkenness, and of a Norwegian who came to his rescue, led to a considerable riot, with shouts from the crowd of "Down with the Nazi police!" An incident at Haparanda when a German deserter into Sweden was handed back to the Finnish—and thus presumably to the German—authorities has also aroused outspoken criticism in the Swedish press.

The action of the United States in taking over the Swedish liner *Kungsholm*, with a promise of compensation, has been met by a protest from the Swedish Minister in Washington, but in Germany the reaction in the Swedish press is condemned as surprisingly feeble.

In Denmark there has been complete silence in the press on the subject of Count Reventlow's repudiation of the Danish Government, and the subject seems also to have been excluded from newspapers in Sweden. Contrasted with the immediate and vigorous reaction of the Danish Government to previous cases of the kind, this reticence seems rather significant, and suggests the existence of some difference of opinion in Danish official circles as to the treatment of the situation.

LOW COUNTRIES.

Seyss-Inquart on Sunday followed up the policy steadily pursued of imposing nazism on the Netherlands by formally banning all associations and movements of a political character. He did not deny that the Dutch Nazis are highly unpopular, a fact which is amply illustrated week by week by official statements of punishments inflicted for "insults" to them. There is thus proven the complete failure of the Germans to persuade Dutchmen to reconcile themselves, even under severe pressure, to government by men whom they denounce as paid traitors. Abuse continues also to be heaped on Roman Catholic clergy for their attitude to nazism. Thus *Volk en Vaderland* says that warnings uttered in the churches about the danger of Dutch youth being "led astray" really mean a warning to youth not to join the Mussert imitation of the Hitler-Youth organisations. It is probable that Seyss-Inquart is compelled to introduce a still