The last Nuremberg judgment, given eight weeks ago, discussed public attention once more on the principles and purposes of the war crimes trials. Despite occasional episodic dramatic moments, the Nuremberg trials have not proved particularly "good copy", partly because the average American likes to look toward a cheerful future rather than brood over disagreeable memories, and partly because the attention has been increasingly concentrated on the new tensions generated by the East-West split.

So few people will regret that the Nuremberg trials have ended, and many will find it easy to forget them entirely. Yet I venture to predict that as time goes on we will all hear more about Nuremberg rather than less, and that in a very real sense the conclusion of the trials marks the beginning, and not the end, of Nuremberg as a force in politics, law, and morals. For the Nuremberg trials, like all judicial trials, must be regarded more than an episode - they must be part of a process. Nuremberg was part of the process of enforcing law - law that long antedated the trials, and that will ensure later the future of law that binds not only Germans and Japanese, but all men. As the Nuremberg tribunal itself declared in its last judgment:

"We may not, in justice, apply to these defendants because they are German, standards of duty and responsibility which are not equally applicable to the officials of the Allied Powers and to those of all nations. Nor should Germans be convicted for acts or conduct which, if committed by Americans, British, French or Russians would not subject them to legal trial and conviction."

By undertaking to judge and punish Germans at Nuremberg, the United States and other participating governments are deeply committed to the standards and principles which were enforced there. And it is awareness of this fact which lies at the root of the controversy engendered by Nuremberg - controversies which, I believe, are largely based on misunderstanding, and which, often open with the remark that "Nuremberg has established a dangerous precedent."
As a rule, those anxieties spring from the notion that at Nuremberg the Nazi diplomats were punished for drafting notes, the generals for making military plans, and the businessmen for manufacturing war materials—things that were done by our own diplomats and generals and businessmen. But a glance at the Nuremberg records and judgments will at once dispel these illusory fears, and the only real problem is how to make people generally aware of the true facts.

Nuremberg defendant was accused or convicted merely because he held a high position or performed a particular function, but only upon a showing that he used or abused his position, authority, or skill in a criminal manner. American doctors do not perform stupid and murderous medical experiments on unwilling human guinea pigs; American businessmen do not engage in round-up operations of foreign civilians, deporting them thousands of miles, and setting them to forced labor under inhuman conditions; American generals and diplomats do not participate in the extermination of racial and religious minorities.

But it was these and other such acts that underlie the Nuremberg judgments, and the only precedent that Nuremberg has established is that there may be punished by internationally-constituted courts. It is a precedent that need alarm no American as long as our country respects the freedoms, and our government maintains the devotion to humanitarianism and the cause of peace. It is a precedent which will be welcomed by all who believe that peace and human dignity will find their surest guarantee in the establishment of a world order under the rule of law.

---

1 The April issue of "International Conciliation", published by the German Bundesamt für Internationale Frieden, contains a symposium article by General Taylor of all the Nuremberg trials, together with an analysis of the pertinent legal questions.