

Price 15c

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

1939



No. 9

The Meaning of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact

V. M. MOLOTOV

The Struggle for Peace

AN EDITORIAL ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

The 75th Anniversary of the First International

A New China Is Being Born

Triumph of the Alliance Between Workers and Peasants



9

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

1939

THE LAND OF SOCIALISM TODAY AND TOMORROW

REPORTS AND SPEECHES AT THE 18th CONGRESS OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION (BOLSHEVIKS)

By

Joseph Stalin
A. A. Zhdanov
L. Kaganovich
N. Shvernik

D. Z. Manuilsky
K. Voroshilov
Mikhail Kalinin
A. Mikoyan

V. M. Molotov
A. Andreyev
L. Beria
N. Krushchev

The full record of the great congress of the transition from socialism to communism in the U.S.S.R., together with the Resolutions, Amendments to the Rules of the C.P.S.U., etc.

Cloth, 488 pages

Price 75 cents

THE SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

SPEECHES AND REPORTS

By

Dimitroff
Ercoli
Pollitt
Browder
Varga

Thorez
Wang Ming
Marty
Cachin

Gottwald
Pieck
Okano
Kuusinen

and many others

Cloth, 600 pages

Price \$1.00

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

ORGAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

VOL. XVI

SEPTEMBER, 1939

No. 9

CONTENTS

The Meaning of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact	V. M. MOLOTOV	951
--	-------------------------	-----

Editorials

The Struggle for Peace		958
The Guarantee of a New Germany		969
Thaelmann, the Great Symbol		973
The Expulsion of the Spanish Youth from the Socialist Youth International		975
The Struggle of the Communist Party of France for the Peasants		979

Theory and Practice of the Labor Movement

The Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the First International	P. DENGEL	983
The Nature of German Fascism	F. LANG	993
A New China Is Being Born in the Struggle	W. LEITNER	1002
The Besteiro Trial	JESUS HERNANDEZ	1010

In the Soviet Union

Triumph of the Alliance Between Workers and Peasants	B. PONAMAROV	1015
--	------------------------	------

Book Reviews

Germany and Europe	KURT FUNK	1021
"Soviet Policy and Its Critics"	FRANZ SCHNEIDER	1026

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, INC., P. O. BOX 148, STATION D, NEW YORK CITY
Subscription price: one year \$1.75; six months 90 cents. Single copies 15 cents

WORLD ACCLAIM!

**THE HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY
OF THE SOVIET UNION**

364 Pages. Cloth \$1.00

Over 12,000,000 copies of this great history have been printed in 24 languages! In the United States alone, over 90,000 copies have been sold in the last six months.

Of this book, Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, said:

"This is no ordinary book to be skimmed through and then laid aside on a bookshelf. It is a scientific textbook to be studied and mastered, not a collection of dogmas to be memorized, not for mechanical quotation of extracts, but to understand the essence of the theory of Marxism-Leninism so that it can be **applied to the most varied** and different problems and situations, so that this theory can be enriched with the new experiences of the revolutionary working class movement also of our country."



WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

The Meaning of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact

BY V. M. MOLOTOV

The following is the full text of the speech of V. M. Molotov, Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, and People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, before the August 31, 1939, meeting of the fourth special session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.—Ed.

COMRADES: Since the third session of the Supreme Soviet the international situation has shown no change for the better. On the contrary, it has become even more tense. The steps taken by various governments to put an end to this state of tension have obviously proved inadequate. They met with no success. This is true of Europe.

Nor has there been any change for the better in East Asia. Japanese troops continue to occupy the principal cities and a considerable part of the territory of China. Nor is Japan refraining from hostile act against the U.S.S.R. Here, too, the situation has changed in the direction of further aggravation.

In view of this state of affairs, the conclusion of a pact of non-aggression between the U.S.S.R. and Germany is of tremendous positive value, eliminating the danger of war between Germany and the Soviet Union. In order more fully to define the significance of this pact, I must first dwell on the negotiations which have taken place in recent months in Moscow with representatives of Great Britain and France. As you know, Anglo-French-Soviet negotiations for conclusion of a pact of mutual assis-

tance against aggression in Europe began as far back as April.

True, the initial proposals of the British Government were, as you know, entirely unacceptable. They ignored the prime requisites for such negotiations—they ignored the principle of reciprocity and equality of obligations. In spite of this, the Soviet Government did not reject the negotiations and in turn put forward its own proposals. We were mindful of the fact that it was difficult for the Governments of Great Britain and France to make an abrupt change in their policy from an unfriendly attitude towards the Soviet Union which had existed quite recently to serious negotiations with the U.S.S.R. based on the condition of equality of obligation.

However, the subsequent negotiations were not justified by their results. The Anglo-French-Soviet negotiations lasted four months. They helped to elucidate a number of questions. At the same time they made it clear to the representatives of Great Britain and France that the Soviet Union has to be seriously reckoned with in international affairs. But these negotiations encountered insuperable obstacles. The trouble, of course, did not lie in individual "formulations" or in particular clauses in the draft of the pact. No, the trouble was much more serious.

The conclusion of a pact of mutual assistance against aggression would have been of value only if Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union has arrived at agreement as to definite military

measures against the attack of an aggressor. Accordingly, for a certain period not only political but also military negotiations were conducted in Moscow with representatives of the British and French armies. However, nothing came of the military negotiations.

They encountered the difficulty that Poland, which was to be jointly guaranteed by Great Britain, France and the U.S.S.R., rejected military assistance on the part of the Soviet Union. Attempts to overcome the objections of Poland met with no success. More, the negotiations showed that Great Britain was not anxious to overcome these objections of Poland, but on the contrary encouraged them. It is clear that, such being the attitude of the Polish Government and its principal ally towards military assistance on the part of the Soviet Union in the event of aggression, the Anglo-French-Soviet negotiations could not bear fruit. After this it became clear to us that the Anglo-French-Soviet negotiations were doomed to failure.

What have the negotiations with Great Britain and France shown? The Anglo-French-Soviet negotiations have shown that the position of Great Britain and France is marked by howling contradictions throughout. Judge for yourselves. On the one hand, Great Britain and France demanded that the U.S.S.R. should give military assistance to Poland in case of aggression. The U.S.S.R., as you know, was willing to meet this demand, provided that the U.S.S.R. itself received like assistance from Great Britain and France. On the other hand, precisely Great Britain and France brought Poland on the scene, who resolutely declined military assistance on the part of the U.S.S.R. Just try under such circumstances to reach an agreement regarding mutual assistance, when assistance on the part of the U.S.S.R. is declared beforehand to be unnecessary and intrusive.

Further, on the one hand, Great Britain and France offered to guarantee the Soviet Union military assistance against aggression in return for like assistance on the part of the U.S.S.R. On the other

hand, they hedged around their assistance with such reservations regarding indirect aggression as could convert this assistance into a myth and provide them with formal legal excuse to evade giving assistance and place the U.S.S.R. in a position of isolation in the face of the aggressor. Just try to distinguish between such a "pact of mutual assistance" and a pact of more or less camouflaged chicanery.

Further, on the one hand Great Britain and France stressed the importance and gravity of negotiations for a pact of mutual assistance and demanded that the U.S.S.R. should treat the matter most seriously and settle very rapidly all questions relating to the pact. On the other hand, they themselves displayed extreme dilatoriness and an absolutely light-minded attitude towards the negotiations, entrusting them to individuals of secondary importance who were not invested with adequate powers.

It is enough to mention that the British and French military missions came to Moscow without any definite powers and without the right to conclude any military convention.

More, the British military mission arrived in Moscow without any mandate at all (*general laughter*), and it was only on the demand of our military mission that on the very eve of the breakdown of the negotiations they presented written credentials. But even these credentials were of the vaguest kind, that is, credentials without proper weight. Just try to distinguish between this light-minded attitude towards the negotiations on the part of Great Britain and France and frivolous make-believe at negotiations designed to discredit the whole business of negotiations.

Such are the intrinsic contradictions in the attitude of Great Britain and France towards the negotiations with the U.S.S.R. which led to their breakdown.

What is the root of these contradictions in the position of Great Britain and France? In a few words, it can be put as follows: On the one hand, the British and French governments fear aggression, and for that reason they

would like to have a pact of mutual assistance with the Soviet Union provided it helped strengthen them, Great Britain and France.

But, on the other hand, the British and French governments are afraid that the conclusion of a real pact of mutual assistance with the U.S.S.R. may strengthen our country, the Soviet Union, which, it appears, does not answer their purpose. It must be admitted that these fears of theirs outweighed other considerations. Only in this way can we understand the position of Poland, who acts on the instructions of Great Britain and France.

I shall now pass to the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact.

The decision to conclude a non-aggression pact between the U.S.S.R. and Germany was adopted after military negotiations with France and Great Britain had reached an impasse owing to the insuperable differences I have mentioned. As the negotiations had shown that the conclusion of a pact of mutual assistance could not be expected, we could not but explore other possibilities of ensuring peace and eliminating the danger of war between Germany and the U.S.S.R. If the British and French governments refused to reckon with this, that is their affair. It is our duty to think of the interests of the Soviet people, the interests of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. (*Prolonged applause.*) All the more since we are firmly convinced that the interests of the U.S.S.R. coincide with the fundamental interests of the peoples of other countries. (*Applause.*) But that is only one side of the matter.

Another circumstance was required before the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact could come into existence. It was necessary that in her foreign policy Germany should make a turn towards good-neighborly relations with the Soviet Union.

Only when this second condition was fulfilled, only when it became clear to us that the German Government desired to change its foreign policy so as to secure an improvement of relations with the U.S.S.R. was the basis found for the

conclusion of a Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact. Everybody knows that during the last six years, ever since the National-Socialists [Nazis] came into power, political relations between Germany and the U.S.S.R. have been strained. Everybody also knows that despite the differences of outlook and political systems, the Soviet Government endeavored to maintain normal business and political relations with Germany. There is no need now to revert to individual incidents of these relations during recent years, which are well known to you.

I must, however, recall the explanation of our foreign policy given several months ago at the Eighteenth Party Congress. Speaking of our tasks in the realm of foreign policy, Stalin defined our attitude to other countries as follows:

"1. To continue the policy of peace and of strengthening business relations with all countries;

"2. To be cautious and not to allow our country to be drawn into conflicts by warmongers who are accustomed to have others pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them."*

As you see, Stalin declared in conclusion that the Soviet Union stands for strengthening business relations with all countries. But at the same time Stalin warned us against warmongers who are anxious in their own interests to involve our country in conflicts with other countries.

Exposing the hullabaloo raised in the British, French and American press about Germany's "plans" for the seizure of the Soviet Ukraine, Stalin said:

"It looks as if the object of this suspicious hullabaloo was to incense the Soviet Union against Germany, to poison the atmosphere and to provoke a conflict with Germany without any visible grounds."**

* Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, pp. 17-18, International Publishers, New York.

** *Ibid.*, p. 14.

As you see, Stalin hit the nail on the head when he exposed the machinations of the Western European politicians who were trying to set Germany and the Soviet Union at loggerheads.

It must be confessed that there were some short-sighted people even in our own country who, carried away by oversimplified anti-fascist propaganda, forgot about this provocative work of our enemies. Mindful of this, Stalin even then suggested the possibility of other, unhostile, good-neighborly relations between Germany and the U.S.S.R. It can now be seen that on the whole Germany correctly understood these statements of Stalin and drew practical conclusions from them. (*Laughter.*) The conclusion of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact shows that Stalin's historic prevision has been brilliantly confirmed. (*Loud applause.*)

In the spring of this year the German Government made a proposal to resume commercial and credit negotiations. Soon after, the negotiations were resumed. By making mutual concessions, we succeeded in reaching an agreement. As you know, this agreement was signed on August 19. This is not the first commercial and credit agreement concluded with Germany under her present government.

But this agreement differs favorably not only from the 1935 agreement but from all previous agreements, not to mention the fact that we had no economic agreement equally advantageous with Great Britain, France or any other country. The agreement is advantageous to us because its credit conditions (a seven-year credit) enables us to order a considerable additional quantity of such equipment as we need. By this agreement, the U.S.S.R. undertakes to sell to Germany a definite quantity of our surplus raw materials for her industry, which fully answers the interests of the U.S.S.R.

Why should we reject such an advantageous economic agreement? Surely not to please those who are generally averse to the Soviet Union having advantageous economic agreements with other coun-

tries? And it is clear that the commercial and credit agreement with Germany is fully in accord with the economic interests and defense needs of the Soviet Union. This agreement is fully in accord with the decision of the Eighteenth Congress of our Party, which approved Stalin's statement as to the need for "strengthening business relations with all countries."

When, however, the German government expressed the desire to improve political relations as well, the Soviet government had no grounds for refusing. This gave rise to the question of concluding a non-aggression pact.

Voices are now being heard testifying to the lack of understanding of the most simple reasons for the improvement of political relations between the Soviet Union and Germany which has begun. For example, people ask with an air of innocence how the Soviet Union could consent to improve political relations with a state of a fascist type. "Is that possible?" they ask. But they forget that this is not a question of our attitude towards the internal regime of another country but of the foreign relations between the two states. They forget that we hold the position of not interfering in the internal affairs of other countries and, correspondingly, of not tolerating interference in our own internal affairs. Furthermore, they forget the important principle of our foreign policy which was formulated by Stalin at the Eighteenth Party Congress as follows:

"We stand for peace and the strengthening of business relations with all countries. That is our position; and we adhere to this position as long as these countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union, and as long as they make no attempt to trespass on the interests of our country."*

The meaning of these words is quite clear: the Soviet Union strives to maintain friendly relations with all non-Soviet countries provided that these countries maintain a like attitude to-

* *Ibid.*, p. 17.

wards the Soviet Union. In our foreign policy towards non-Soviet countries, we have always been guided by Lenin's well-known principle of the peaceful co-existence of the Soviet state and of capitalist countries. A large number of examples might be cited to show how this principle has been carried out in practice. But I will confine myself to only a few.

We have, for instance, a non-aggression and neutrality treaty with fascist Italy ever since 1933. It has never occurred to anybody as yet to object to this treaty. And that is natural. Inasmuch as this pact meets the interests of the U.S.S.R., it is in accord with our principle of the peaceful coexistence of the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist countries. We have non-aggression pacts also with Poland and certain other countries whose semi-fascist system is known to all. These pacts have not given rise to any misgivings either. Perhaps it would not be superfluous to mention the fact that we have not even treaties of this kind with certain other non-fascist bourgeois-democratic countries, with Great Britain herself, for instance. But that is not our fault.

Since 1926, the political basis of our relations with Germany has been the treaty of neutrality which was already extended by the present German Government in 1933. This treaty of neutrality remains in force to this day. The Soviet Government considered it desirable even before this to take a further step towards improving political relations with Germany, but the circumstances have been such that this has become possible only now.

It is true that it is not a pact of mutual assistance that is in question, as in the case of the Anglo-French-Soviet negotiations, but only of a non-aggression pact. Nevertheless, conditions being what they are, it is difficult to overestimate the international importance of the Soviet-German pact. That is why we favored the visit of Von Ribbentrop, the German Minister for Foreign Affairs, to Moscow.

August 23, 1939, the day the Soviet-

German Non-Aggression Pact was signed, is to be regarded as a date of great historical importance. The Non-Aggression Pact between the U.S.S.R. and Germany marks a turning point in the history of Europe, and not only of Europe. Only yesterday the German fascists were pursuing a foreign policy hostile to us. Yes, only yesterday we were enemies in the sphere of foreign relations. Today, however, the situation has changed and we are enemies no longer.

The art of politics in the sphere of foreign relations does not consist in increasing the number of enemies for one's country. On the contrary, the art of politics in this sphere is to reduce the number of such enemies and to make the enemies of yesterday good neighbors, maintaining peaceable relations with one another. (*Applause.*)

History has shown that enmity and wars between our country and Germany have been to the detriment of our countries, not to their benefit. Russia and Germany suffered most of all countries in the war of 1914-1918. Therefore the interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union and Germany stand in need of peaceable relations. The Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact puts an end to enmity between Germany and the U.S.S.R. and this is in the interests of both countries. The fact that our outlooks and political systems differ must not and cannot be obstacles to the establishment of good political relations between both states, just as like differences are not impediments to good political relations which the U.S.S.R. maintains with other non-Soviet capitalist countries. Only enemies of Germany and the U.S.S.R. can strive to create and foment enmity between the peoples of these countries. We have always stood for amity between the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and Germany, for the growth and development of friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the German people. (*Loud and prolonged applause.*)

The importance of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact lies in the fact that the two largest states of Europe have agreed to put an end to

the enmity between them, to eliminate the menace of war and live at peace one with the other, making narrower thereby the zone of possible military conflicts in Europe. Even if military conflicts in Europe should prove unavoidable, the scope of hostilities will now be restricted. Only the instigators of a general European war can be displeased by this state of affairs, those who under the mask of pacifism would like to ignite a general conflagration in Europe.

The Soviet-German Pact has been the object of numerous attacks in the English, French and American press. Conspicuous in these efforts are certain "Socialist" newspapers, diligent servitors of "their" national capitalism, servitors of gentlemen who pay them decently. (*Laughter.*) It is clear that the real truth cannot be expected from gentry of this caliber. Attempts are being made to spread the fiction that the signing of the Soviet-German Pact disrupted the negotiations with England and France on a mutual assistance pact. This lie has already been nailed in the interview given by Voroshilov.

In reality, as you know, the very reverse is true. The Soviet Union signed the Non-Aggression Pact with Germany, for one thing, in view of the fact that the negotiations with France and England had run into insuperable differences and ended in failure through the fault of the ruling classes of England and France.

Further, they go so far as to blame us because the pact, if you please, contains no clause providing for its denunciation in case one of the signatories is drawn into war under conditions which might give someone an external pretext to qualify this particular country as an aggressor. But they forget for some reason that such a clause and such a reservation is not to be found either in the Polish-German Non-Aggression Pact signed in 1934 and annulled by Germany in 1939 against the wishes of Poland, or in the Anglo-German declaration on non-aggression signed only a few months ago. The question arises: Why cannot the U.S.S.R. allow itself the same privi-

lege as Poland and England allowed themselves long ago?

Finally, there are wiseacres who construe from the pact more than is written in it. (*Laughter.*) For this purpose, all kinds of conjectures and hints are mooted in order to cast doubt on the pact in one or another country. But all this merely speaks for the hopeless impotence of the enemies of the pact who are exposing themselves more and more as enemies of both the Soviet Union and Germany, striving to provoke war between these countries.

In all this, we find fresh corroboration of Stalin's warning that we must be particularly cautious with warmongers who are accustomed to have others pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them. We must be on guard against those who see an advantage to themselves in bad relations between the U.S.S.R. and Germany, in enmity between them, and who do not want peace and good neighborly relations between Germany and the Soviet Union.

We can understand why this policy is being pursued by out-and-out imperialists. But we cannot ignore such facts as the especial zeal with which some leaders of the Socialist Parties of Great Britain and France have recently distinguished themselves in this matter. And these gentlemen have really gone the whole hog, and no mistake. (*Laughter.*) These people positively demand that the U.S.S.R. get itself involved in war against Germany on the side of Great Britain. Have not these rabid warmongers taken leave of their senses? (*Laughter.*) Is it really difficult for these gentlemen to understand the purpose of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact, on the strength of which the U.S.S.R. is not obliged to involve itself in war either on the side of Great Britain against Germany or on the side of Germany against Great Britain? Is it really difficult to understand that the U.S.S.R. is pursuing and will continue to pursue its own independent policy, based on the interests of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and only their interests? (*Prolonged applause.*)

If these gentlemen have such an uncontrollable desire to fight, let them do their own fighting without the Soviet Union. We would see what fighting stuff they are made of.

In our eyes, in the eyes of the entire Soviet people, these are just as much enemies of peace as all other instigators of war in Europe. Only those who desire a grand new slaughter, a new holocaust of nations, only they want to set the Soviet Union and Germany at loggerheads, they are the only people who want to destroy the incipient restoration of good-neighborly relations between the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and Germany.

The Soviet Union signed a pact with Germany, fully assured that peace between the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and Germany is in the interests of all peoples, in the interests of universal peace. Every sincere supporter of peace will realize the truth of this. This pact corresponds to the fundamental interests of the working people of the Soviet Union and cannot weaken our vigilance in defense of these interests. This pact is backed by firm confidence in our real forces, in their complete preparedness to meet any aggression against the U.S.S.R. (*Loud applause.*)

This pact, like the unsuccessful Anglo-French-Soviet negotiations, proves that no important questions of international relations, and questions of Eastern Europe even less, can be settled without the active participation of the Soviet Union, that any attempts to shut out the Soviet Union and decide such questions behind its back are doomed to failure.

The Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact spells a new turn in the development of Europe, a turn towards improvement of relations between the two larg-

est states of Europe. This pact not only eliminates the menace of war with Germany, narrows down the zone of possible hostilities in Europe, and serves thereby the cause of universal peace: it must open to us new possibilities of increasing our strength, of further consolidation of our position, of further growth of the influence of the Soviet Union on international developments.

There is no need to dwell here on the separate clauses of the pact. The Council of People's Commissars has reason to hope that the pact will meet with your approval as a document of cardinal importance to the U.S.S.R. (*Applause.*)

The Council of People's Commissars submits the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact to the Supreme Soviet and proposes that it be ratified. (*Loud and prolonged applause. All rise.*)

* * *

On the conclusion of Molotov's statement, the joint sitting of the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., on a motion of Deputy Shcherbakov, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Having heard the statement of Comrade V. M. Molotov, the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, and People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs, on the ratification of the Non-Aggression Pact between the U.S.S.R. and Germany, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. resolves:

"1. To approve the foreign policy of the government.

"2. To ratify the Non-Aggression Pact between the U.S.S.R. and Germany, concluded in Moscow, August 23, 1939."

The Struggle for Peace

The following article on the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact was written on August 27, 1939, prior to the speech of V. M. Molotov Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, and People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., before the August 31, 1939 meeting of the fourth special session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

For a complete analysis of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact, read the full report of V. M. Molotov, which appears on page 951 of this issue—Ed.

A NON-AGGRESSION pact has been concluded between the Soviet Union and Germany.

The conclusion of this pact is a huge success for the consistent and undeviating peace policy of the Soviet Union. The full magnitude of this success may be judged from the fact that for years German fascism designated the "crusade against Bolshevism" as its special mission, that it directed the spearhead of its alliances against the Soviet Union under the banner of the so-called "anti-Comintern pact," that two years ago it was still dreaming of conquering the Ukraine, that the entire world was expecting a military attack by Germany against the land of socialism.

In the face of all these threats the Soviet Union has remained calm. Calmly and firmly, it has continued its gigantic labor of construction and introduced the gradual transition from socialism to communism.

At Lake Khasan, the Red Army drove the Japanese militarists out of the Soviet Union with a devastating blow, and at

the borders of the Mongolian People's Republic, it drove home the meaning of a violation of the borders of the Soviet Union and its allies to all aggressors. It left no doubt that it is ready to live in peace with all countries as long as they do not undertake a direct or indirect attack against it, but that it is determined and able to turn back any aggressor with bloody heads.

In face of this clear and powerful policy of the Soviet Union, that tendency in Hitler Germany that considers it inadvisable to begin a war with the Soviet Union at the present time gains the upper hand. Step by step, Hitler Germany modified its aggressiveness against the Soviet Union, until finally it passed from its plans of aggression to a non-aggression pact.

In concluding the pact, the Soviet Union has remained absolutely loyal to the line of its peace policy. As far back as February, 1934, in his report to the Seventeenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.), Comrade Stalin, in view of the aggressive temper of German fascism, stated that it was not the Soviet Union but Germany that had changed the orientation of its foreign policy. Comrade Stalin said more than five years ago:

"We never had any orientation towards Germany nor have we any orientation towards Poland and France. Our orientation in the past and our orientation at the present time is towards the U.S.S.R. and towards the U.S.S.R. alone. And if the interests of the U.S.S.R. demand rapprochement with this or that country which is not interested in disturbing peace, we shall take this step without hesitation.

"No, that is not the point. The point is that the policy of Germany has changed. The point is that even before the present German politicians came into power, and particularly after they came into power, a fight between two political lines broke out in Germany, between the old policy which found expression in the well-known treaties between the U.S.S.R. and Germany and the 'new' policy which in the main recalls the policy of the ex-Kaiser of Germany who at one time occupied the Ukraine, undertook a march against Leningrad and transformed the Baltic countries into a *place d'armes* for this march; and this 'new' policy is obviously gaining the upper hand over the old policy."*

When fascist aggression developed with increasing violence, the Soviet Union tried to frustrate the aggressors' plans of conquest by a system of collective security, and to safeguard peace together with all non-aggressive states. But it became steadily clearer that the imperialist bourgeois governing circles of England and France had no intention of resolutely putting a stop to fascist aggression, but, on the contrary, were pursuing the plan of arriving at an agreement with the fascist aggressors, at the expense of others, and directing the aggression against the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union joined the League of Nations in order to put even this little brake upon fascist aggression. When Italian fascism invaded Ethiopia, the Soviet Union considered it correct to compel the aggressor to halt the war by means of unanimous application of sanctions. But the French, and soon after the English, bourgeoisie preferred to leave Ethiopia to the aggressor, which, in its lying terminology, it described as "localizing" peace. By this capitulation to the aggressor, France and England practically destroyed the

League of Nations and aroused a desire on the part of the small nations to buy themselves off by a short-sighted policy of so-called "neutrality."

The Soviet Union concluded a pact of mutual assistance with France and a similar pact, dependent upon aid being given by France, with Czechoslovakia, in order to establish by this means a peace front in Europe superior to the aggressor. The reactionary British bourgeoisie, under the leadership of Chamberlain, attempted to frustrate this pact in order to maintain the "balance" in Europe, that is, in order to make it possible for the aggressor to enrich himself at the expense of others. The reactionary French bourgeoisie at first attempted to torpedo the ratification of the pact, and, later on, after ratification took place, pushed the pact into the background and sabotaged it to the best of its ability. The representatives of the reactionary French bourgeoisie deliberately spread the nonsensical conception that the Soviet Union needs the help of France, although, in concluding the pact, the Soviet Union was guided only by the desire to erect a strong barrier against the increasing danger to world peace.

True to its principles, the Soviet Union supported the Spanish Republic which was invaded by the fascist aggressors, and Comrade Stalin sent to Comrade Diaz the now famous telegram in which he emphasized that the liberation of Spain is "the cause of all progressive and advanced humanity." But the reactionary British and French bourgeoisie engineered the miserable farce of so-called "non-intervention" and actually supported the fascist aggressors against the Spanish fighters for freedom, who were simultaneously defending the peace of Europe. The reactionary British and French bourgeoisie carried their treachery so far that they plotted the putsch of Casado and Beistero against the People's Front and in that way brought about the collapse of the Spanish Re-

* Joseph Stalin, "Report of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., to the Seventeenth Congress," in *Socialism Victorious*, pp. 20-21. International Publishers, New York.

public and the rapid increase of aggression in the rest of Europe.

This policy of the reactionary British and French bourgeoisie, which also permitted German fascism to take possession of Austria, reached its pinnacle in the Munich conspiracy. The Czechoslovak Republic, cold-bloodedly selected by the reactionary British bourgeoisie as the sacrificial victim, and miserably betrayed by its French allies, was thrown into the maw of German imperialism. The Soviet Union declared its readiness to defend Czechoslovakia, but the reactionary British and French bourgeoisie, and even the reactionary Czech bourgeoisie, refused Soviet aid, because the betrayal of the European peace front was directed precisely against the Soviet Union. According to Chamberlain's plan, Germany was to march to war against the Soviet Union through the breach of the shattered peace front, which he himself had opened up. This plan was not new, and Munich was no astonishing turning point, but only a logical consequence of the policy of Chamberlain and Bonnet, the policy which always pursued the aim of isolating the Soviet Union and diverting fascist aggression against the land of socialism, bringing about war between Germany and the Soviet Union.

Comrade Stalin characterized this cynical and deluded policy in his report to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.) in the following words:

"The policy of non-intervention reveals an eagerness, a desire, not to hinder the aggressors in their nefarious work, not to hinder Japan, say, from embroiling herself in a war with China, or, better still, with the Soviet Union; not to hinder Germany, say, from enmeshing herself in European affairs, from embroiling herself in a war with the Soviet Union; to allow all the belligerents to sink deeply into the mire of war, to encourage them surreptitiously in this; to allow them to weaken and exhaust one another; and then, when they have become weak enough, to appear on the scene with fresh strength, to appear, of course, 'in the interests of peace,' and

to dictate conditions to the enfeebled belligerents.

"Cheap and easy!

"... Or take Germany, for instance. They let her have Austria, despite the undertaking to defend her independence; they let her have the Sudeten region; they abandoned Czechoslovakia to her fate, thereby violating all their obligations; and then they began to lie vociferously in the press about 'the weakness of the Russian army,' 'the demoralization of the Russian air force,' and 'riots' in the Soviet Union, egging the Germans on to march further east, promising them easy pickings, and prompting them 'Just start war on the Bolsheviks, and everything will be all right.'"*

Comrade Stalin referred to the hullabaloo raised by the reactionary press in England, France and the United States that Germany intends to march against the Soviet Ukraine, and added:

"It looks as if the object of this suspicious hullabaloo was to incense the Soviet Union against Germany, to poison the atmosphere and to provoke a conflict with Germany without any visible grounds.

"... Even more characteristic is the fact that certain European and American politicians and newspaper writers, having lost patience waiting for 'the march on the Soviet Ukraine,' are themselves beginning to disclose what is really behind the policy of non-intervention. They are saying quite openly, putting it down in black on white, that the Germans have cruelly 'disappointed' them, for instead of marching farther east, against the Soviet Union, they have turned to the west, you see, and are demanding colonies. One might think that the districts of Czechoslovakia were yielded to Germany as the price of an undertaking to launch war on the Soviet Union, but that now the Germans are refusing to meet their bills and sending them to Hades."**

From this situation which he so masterfully characterized, Comrade Stalin

* Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, pp. 13-14, International Publishers, New York.

** *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

drew clear, unequivocal conclusions and stated:

"The tasks of the Party in the sphere of foreign policy are:

"1. To continue the policy of peace and of strengthening business relations with all countries;

"2. To be cautious and not allow our country to be drawn into conflicts by warmongers who are accustomed to have others pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them;

"3. To strengthen the might of our Red Army and Red Navy to the utmost;

"4. To strengthen the international bonds of friendship with the working people of all countries, who are interested in peace and friendship among nations."*

That was, is and remains the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. Whoever has ears must have heard that; whoever has a mind must have understood it; but evidently the ears and minds of certain reactionary politicians were not in the best shape. To be sure, the illusions, not only of broad masses of people but also of influential circles of the bourgeoisie, were dispelled soon after Munich; to be sure, even the most obtuse were soon able to recognize that peace had not been saved, that aggression was increasing and that it was being directed not against the Soviet Union, but against England and France—but Chamberlain and his clique did not want to revise their anti-Soviet political plans.

Under pressure of a growing popular opposition and in view of the increasing menace to England and France by aggressive German and Italian imperialism, Chamberlain, it is true, was compelled to undertake negotiations with the Soviet Union concerning the establishment of a peace front—but it could not be concealed that the negotiations were nothing but a large-scale maneuver. While the Soviet Union sought guarantees for real security of peace, the imperialist British politicians obviously wanted to utilize the negotiations merely as a means of pres-

sure in order to secure a new Munich. The reactionary British politicians graciously wanted to permit the Soviet Union to go to war for Poland without being ready to acknowledge the Soviet Union as an equal partner and to include the Baltic states in the system of security. The ruling circles of Poland graciously wanted to permit the Soviet Union to support Poland with war material, but would not allow a single Red Army fighter to step on Polish soil. The tone-setting bourgeoisie of the jeopardized states graciously wanted to permit the Soviet Union to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them, without preventing fascist aggression on the Baltic coast.

While the British government, represented by negotiators without authority, dragged out and prolonged the discussions in Moscow, haggling like a shopkeeper over the Soviet Union's clear and obvious conditions which served solely to maintain peace, and while they misled public opinion concerning the status of the negotiations, it was at the same time preparing a new Munich by dispatching "experts" who were as like the fatal Runciman as peas in a pod; by mysterious "missions" like that of the League of Nations Commissioner Burckhardt who ran back and forth between Hitler and Halifax; by manifold "feelers" behind the scenes, by mysterious reports concerning the possibility of a conference with the exclusion of the Soviet Union.

On June 29, Comrade Zhdanov published an article in the newspaper *Pravda* in which he said:

"The fact of the impermissible delay and endless procrastinations in the negotiations with the U.S.S.R. permit one to doubt the sincerity and real intentions of Britain and France, and forces us to raise the question as to what actually lies at the basis of such a policy, whether serious strivings to establish a peace front, or a desire to take advantage of the fact of the negotiations as well as of the protracted character of the negotiations themselves for other aims, which

* *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

have nothing in common with the questions of creating a front of peace-loving powers."*

After pointing to a number of facts which characterized the double game of the reactionary British and French politicians, Comrade Zhdanov declared:

"All this goes to show that the British and French do not want a pact with the U.S.S.R. based on the principle of equality and reciprocity, although they daily aver that they also favor 'equality' in the form of a pact, however, in which the U.S.S.R. would play the role of a laborer who carries the whole burden of obligations on his shoulders.

"But not a single country with self-respect will agree to such a pact if it does not want to become a puppet in the hands of people who are accustomed to have others pull their chestnuts out of the fire.

"All the more reason why the U.S.S.R., whose might, power and high merits are known to the whole world, cannot agree to such a pact.

"I think that the British and French do not want a real pact, which is acceptable to the U.S.S.R., but only to *talk* about a pact in order, speculating on the public opinion of their countries regarding purported non-compliance of the U.S.S.R., to make things easier for themselves to strike a bargain with the aggressor.

"The next few days should prove whether such is the case or not."**

That was very clear, very serious language—but the reactionary British and French politicians pretended that they had no ear for the warnings of a responsible and conscientious Soviet statesman. They continued to drag out and prolong the negotiations, to hold off the Soviet Union and to drag their own peoples around by the nose. Meanwhile, the war tension, the war danger, grew sharper from day to day. True, England

had assumed a guarantee for Poland, but this guarantee hung in the air as long as the British government found a hundred excuses for not signing the pact with the Soviet Union.

The French and British military missions in Moscow had no authority to agree even to the most obvious prerequisites for a front of resistance against the aggressor. While in France and England the bourgeois press created the impression that the Soviet Union was ready to go to war for other countries "with or without a pact," the French and British military missions refused to give the Soviet government the practical possibility of establishing an unbroken front of resistance together with all the jeopardized states and thereby to curb the aggressor, to put a stop to his aggression.

In an interview with *Izvestia*, Comrade Voroshilov revealed the underhanded game of the English and French governments to the world in the following words:

"The Soviet military mission considered that the U.S.S.R., having no common frontier with the aggressor, can render assistance to France, Great Britain and Poland only if its troops will be allowed to pass through Polish territory, because there is no other way for Soviet troops to establish contact with the aggressor's troops. . . .

"Despite the perfectly obvious correctness of this position, the French and British military mission disagreed with this position of the Soviet mission, while the Polish government openly declared that it did not need and would not accept the military assistance of the U.S.S.R. This made military collaboration of the U.S.S.R. with these countries impossible.

"This forms the basis for the differences. Here negotiations were broken off. . . .

" . . . The military negotiations with Great Britain and France were broken off not because the U.S.S.R. concluded a non-aggression pact with Germany, but on the contrary, the U.S.S.R. concluded a non-aggression pact with Germany, among other reasons, as a result of the

* *Daily Worker*, New York, June 30, 1939 [Ed.].

** *Ibid.*

fact that military negotiations with France and Great Britain reached a deadlock in view of insuperable differences."*

The innermost nature of these unbridgeable differences of opinion consisted of the fact that England and France were not ready to recognize the Soviet Union as a partner with equal rights; that, on the contrary, they merely attempted to utilize the Soviet Union for their insidious purposes in order to come to a surreptitious agreement with Hitler and then to let him loose against the land of socialism. When it was perfectly clear that the English and the French governments had no intention whatsoever of establishing, together with the Soviet Union, a common front of resistance against the aggressor for the defense of peace; that, on the contrary, they were pursuing their old objective of inciting Germany and the Soviet Union against one another and, by means of a new Munich, directing the aggression against the land of socialism—the Soviet Union thwarted these insidious plans and, in the interest of the nations menaced by war and in its own interest, concluded the non-aggression pact with Germany.**

Through this pact the Soviet Union has shown all peoples that it is possible to prevent aggression, to check it, when it is opposed resolutely and unequivocally, when it is made clear to the aggressor that every attack will meet with powerful resistance. Fascism directs its blow against those whom it expects to capitulate and restrains its attacks against those who manifest imperturbable firmness. It is always possible to check aggression if it is met firmly. The non-aggression pact of the Soviet Union with Germany is therefore an important contribution towards curbing the aggressor, towards restricting aggression,

* *Sunday Worker*, New York, August 27, 1939 [Ed.].

** See speech by V. M. Molotov on pp. 951-954 of this issue.—Ed.

and can acquire an even greater importance if all forces that desire peace are securely united, and can bring about the adoption in their countries of a policy of cooperation with the Soviet Union to insure peace.

But the non-aggression pact between the Soviet Union and Germany has still other immediate effects. With this pact, the Soviet Union, at one blow, split the war bloc of states which had joined together under the banner of the so-called "anti-Comintern pact." It isolated the Japanese militarist clique and thereby rendered an invaluable service to the liberation struggle of the Chinese people.

With this pact, the Soviet Union smashed the plan of the reactionary bourgeoisie, represented by Chamberlain, to bring about a war between Germany and the Soviet Union and frustrated the new Munich which had already been prepared.

With this pact, the Soviet Union opened the eyes of the German people to the power of the Soviet state and its love of peace and showed them that socialism towers above the clouds of anti-Communist lies like an unassailable mountain.

With this pact, the Soviet Union has equipped the international working class and all honest friends of peace with a strong weapon in the struggle against the bankrupt policy of the reactionary bourgeoisie.

II.

The great success of the Soviet Union, whose policy compelled the aggressor to desist from his plan of attacking the land of socialism, has infuriated all the reactionary circles in England, France and other countries who had still hoped to direct fascist aggression against the Soviet Union by means of a new Munich. The howl of these people against the Soviet Union is the best proof that they regarded the socialist state purely as an instrument for pulling their chestnuts out of the fire for them, as a tool that is used temporarily only to be discarded at

the first opportunity. To their own detriment, they overlooked the fact that the Soviet Union is a great power of the first magnitude, a *socialist* great power which is always ready to employ its might for the maintenance of peace and is never ready to lend assistance for any kind of imperialist interests.

The policy of the reactionary bourgeoisie in England as well as in France has suffered a number of most serious defeats in recent years. The policy of Chamberlain and Bonnet has done serious damage not only to the peoples but also to the bourgeoisie: These politicians, blinded by their anti-Communism, have not only sacrificed Ethiopia, Spain, Austria and Czechoslovakia, they have not only shattered the prestige of France and England, they have not only increased the aggressiveness of the fascist states, but for all this they have gained only the scorn and the growing claims of the aggressive powers. In view of these facts, he whose wrath in England and France is not directed against the bankrupt "Munichers," but against the Soviet Union, only demonstrates thereby that he, too, did not pursue an honest peace policy but rather had suspicious mental reservations.

To a great extent, this is also true of the reactionary leaders of the Second International who join with particular anger in the howl of the reactionary bourgeoisie against the Soviet Union. These people have the mournful courage to accuse the Soviet Union of "betraying the anti-fascist front." It is well to remind these people that they were the ones who, for years, had prevented the consummation of an anti-fascist front, that they considered their main task that of maintaining a split in the working class, that they subordinated everything, literally everything, to their hatred for the Communists and to incitement against the Soviet Union.

For many years the Communists have been working patiently and tirelessly to bring about an anti-fascist front in all countries and internationally, the back-

bone of which can only be the united working class determined to struggle. The reactionary leaders of the Second International have done everything from first to last to thwart these efforts and to carry through a program whose guiding principle was summarized by the traitor Besteiro, in the words: "I hate communism immeasurably more than fascism."

During every decisive phase of fascist aggression, the Communist International appealed to the Second International and proposed the establishment of international unity of action against war and fascism. The reactionary leaders of the Second International categorically rejected all of these proposals.

In Spain, the anti-fascist united front and people's front arose in the struggle against fascist aggression. From the very beginning, the Communists were the active core and the firm cement of this front against fascist aggression. The reactionary Social-Democratic leaders sabotaged this anti-fascist front with every means at their disposal, not only in Spain but also internationally. In Spain itself, Caballero and Prieto prevented the necessary consolidation of the anti-fascist front and caused the greatest difficulties to their own party comrades, Negrin and Del Vayo; and finally, Besteiro and Casado, with the complete approval of the reactionary leaders of the Second International, organized the traitorous putsch against the anti-fascist front. Outside of Spain, the reactionary leaders of the Second International supported the scandalous "non-intervention" policy, frustrated united international actions of the working class on behalf of the Spanish Republic, protected the fascist agents of the P.O.U.M., and finally, to crown this activity, expelled the heroic Spanish youth from the Socialist Youth International because it was not prepared to surrender the unity which it had consolidated through struggle and blood.

In France, the united front of the working class and the anti-fascist people's front, whose untiring champions

were and are the Communists, were realized in the defense against threatening fascism. The reactionary leaders of the Second International have regarded this as an "error" from the very beginning and opposed this "experiment." The reactionary forces have more and more gained the upper hand in the Socialist Party of France and have helped an "anti-Communism" to break out which has thrived to such an extent that Socialists may belong to Trotskyite and semi-Trotskyite organizations but not to organizations such as the Friends of the Soviet Union in which there are also Communists. The policy of the "pause," the policy of "non-intervention," the unconditional support of Munich—all these were blows against the united front, all these were stages along the road to that "anti-Communism" which more and more thrusts aside the policy of proletarian unity of action.

In England, the reactionary leaders of the Labor Party launched a furious struggle right from the beginning against the unification of the working class, against the formation of a broad anti-fascist peace front. They refused to admit the Communist Party into the Labor Party. They angrily declined to bring about the overthrow of Chamberlain through a mighty popular movement. They have expelled adherents of such a policy from their ranks. Internationally, they have always thrown their weight into the balance whenever it was a question of throttling the endeavors of the working class for unity.

Shall we recall the fact that the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders systematically prevented international trade union unity, the admission of the Soviet trade unions into the International Federation of Trade Unions? Shall we point out that the reactionary leaders of the Second International countenanced the betrayal of Munich? Shall we emphasize again that even those reactionary Social-Democratic leaders who are face to face with a fascist regime, like the members of the leadership of German Social-

Democracy, not only reject the anti-fascist united front but today are even openly offering their services to the reactionary bourgeoisie in the struggle against the Communists and against the Soviet Union? Shall we illustrate by hundreds and hundreds of examples the monstrous incitement developed everywhere against the Soviet Union, against the Communists by the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders in tow of the reactionary bourgeoisie and side by side with the Trotskyite scoundrels?

Enough examples! Every honest worker, every sincere anti-fascist can easily convince himself that it was the reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy who systematically prevented the establishment of a firm anti-fascist front of the workers, a front which would always attract to itself the masses of people and be a decisive factor in political events.

If the reactionary leaders of the Second International set up a big howl today against the Soviet Union and against the Communists, one can only reply: It is your fault that such an anti-fascist front for which the Communists have worked tirelessly has never materialized.

It is your fault that the working class has been split until now, that it could not unite its forces in order to wrest the leadership from the reactionary bourgeoisie and erect an insurmountable barrier to fascist aggression by means of a consistent international anti-fascist peace policy in closest alliance with the great state in which the workers rule, the Soviet Union.

It is your fault that the international working class could not play the decisive role to which it is politically entitled and which it can always possess if it does not drag in the wake of the bourgeoisie but carries through its own policy as an independent force. Your howling only proves that you also figured that the Soviet Union could be maneuvered into a war in order to attack it from the rear at the right moment. The Soviet Union has thwarted all these plans and that is

why you joined the howl of the reactionary bourgeoisie instead of arousing the working class at the eleventh hour against the bankrupt reactionary policy of the ruling circles!

Today, even more than yesterday, the working class has the task of uniting all forces against the reactionary politicians who sabotaged the establishment of a mighty peace front because they continued to hope that ultimately they would still be able to direct the aggression against the land of socialism by means of a new Munich. The non-aggression pact between Germany and the Soviet Union in no way precludes such a peace front but, on the contrary, can contribute towards placing the greatest emphasis on such a peace front.

The prerequisite for this is that the Social-Democratic workers, their organizations and parties stop allowing themselves to be dragged after the bankrupt policy of the reactionary bourgeoisie, that they resolutely bring about a political turn; that they throw their weight in the balance in order to realize a genuine peace front side by side with the only consistent peace power, the Socialist Soviet Union. It is high time that the working class become conscious of its full power and responsibility; that it no longer leave the political reins in the hands of the reactionary bourgeoisie; that, through its unity, it forces the adoption of a new political course and brings about the turn of all non-aggressive states to a sincere and unqualified peace policy; that, in closest fraternal alliance with the great victorious working class of the Soviet Union, it inspire the labor movement in all countries with an irresistible confidence in victory.

A serious responsibility rests upon the working class of the capitalist countries. If every class-conscious worker feels responsible for the unity of his class as an indispensable prerequisite of a consistent peace policy and really *fights* for the unity of his class, the reactionary bourgeoisie will soon be unable to maintain its bankrupt policy.

III.

The more clearly and completely the working class realizes the outstanding significance of victorious socialism in the Soviet Union, the stronger will it be.

The reactionary bourgeoisie understands full well that nothing so jeopardizes its fateful rule over the peoples as the radiance of the socialist victories in the Soviet Union; that nothing is so well suited to enhance the consciousness of power of the working class as victorious socialism advancing towards communism in the Soviet Union. For that very reason, it endeavors to prevent this radiation, to obscure the victories of socialism behind a dense cloud of lies and slander; for that very reason, it does everything in its power to set it back, to maneuver it into difficult situations, to drag it into bellicose entanglements. And for that very reason, the working class of the capitalist countries must recognize that every success of the Soviet Union, every victory of socialism in the Soviet Union, is its own success, its own victory.

Doubly valid today are the words of Comrade Dimitroff who, on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the great October Revolution, described a person's attitude toward the Soviet Union as the surest criterion by which we could distinguish the genuine adherents of the cause of the working class from all open and concealed enemies. Comrade Dimitroff, at that time in November, 1937, stated:

"The *touchstone* in checking the sincerity and honesty of every individual active in the working class movement, of every working class party and organization of the working people, and of every democrat in the capitalist countries, is their *attitude* toward the great land of socialism. You cannot carry on a real struggle against fascism if you do not render all possible assistance in strengthening the *most important buttress* of this struggle, the Soviet Union. You cannot carry on a serious struggle against the fascist instigators of a new world blood bath, if you do not render

undivided support to the U.S.S.R., a *most important factor* in the maintenance of international peace. You cannot carry on a real struggle for socialism in your own country, if you do not oppose the enemies of the Soviet state, where this socialism is being fulfilled by the heroic efforts of the working people. You cannot be a *real friend* of the U.S.S.R., if you do not condemn its enemies—the Trotsky-Bukharinite agents of fascism.

“The *historical dividing line* between the forces of fascism, war and capitalism, on the one hand, and the forces of peace, democracy and socialism, on the other hand, is in fact becoming the *attitude* toward the Soviet Union, and not the formal attitude toward Soviet power and socialism in general, but the *attitude* to the Soviet Union, which has been carrying on a real existence for twenty years already, with its untiring struggle against enemies, with its dictatorship of the working class and the Stalin Constitution, with the leading role of the Party of Lenin and Stalin.”*

The peace policy of the Soviet Union is directed towards the protection of the peace of *all peoples*, the preservation of all humanity from the horrors of a new world war. But the peoples, and, above all, the workers, must recognize that for all of them it is of particular importance to insure the Soviet Union itself against bellicose entanglements. Every year of peace which the Soviet Union gains is a year of further tremendous successes for the peaceful labor of socialist construction.**

During the past few weeks, the agricultural exposition in Moscow has shown once more what fullness of life, what advance in wealth and culture, what unparalleled human development socialism means. With graphic distinctness, it becomes clear to every visitor at this ex-

position how socialism is working to overtake the most advanced capitalist countries and ultimately to surpass them.

On the other hand, in the capitalist countries, a new economic crisis is spreading, capitalism is proving incapable of maintaining even the present living standards which already signifies hunger, poverty and unemployment for millions upon millions of people.

But what does this mean?

This means that in a few years, the attractive power of victorious socialism will be irresistible, that the millions of proletarians, proletarian-peasants and city middle classes in the capitalist countries will not only confront capitalism, full of indignation and disgust, but that they will also draw from the victorious, fully-developed socialism, which is growing more and more comprehensively into communism in the Soviet Union, the immediate knowledge that socialism is the fulfillment of their deepest wishes. They will derive the unchallengeable determination to realize socialism in their country also. Nothing can impart greater strength to the masses, nothing can influence the immediate development more strongly and happily than the peaceful competition between socialism and capitalism, than the increasingly tangible, increasingly more effective superiority of socialism over capitalism.

One can therefore understand that the reactionary bourgeoisie is doing everything in its power to thwart such a development or at least to prolong it, to drag the Soviet Union into a war; and it makes a desperate attempt to correct, perhaps by force of arms, the game which capitalism has lost. It is clear that this desperate attempt will also be unable to save capitalism, that the superiority of socialism will be proved in a war also, that revolution will emerge from a war also. But how many victims such a war would exact! How much more painful, how much more protracted would be the building up of socialism in a world devastated and brutalized by a world war; what incalculable advantage it will mean

* Georgi Dimitroff, *The United Front*, pp. 279-280. International Publishers, New York.

** See speech by V. M. Molotov on page 957 of this issue—*The Editors*.

for the workers, for the toilers of all countries, if in the course of a number of peaceful years, the Soviet Union succeeds in imparting such a superiority to socialism that any attack against the land of socialism becomes an insane adventure and immediately calls forth the revolutionary resistance of the masses in the capitalist countries themselves!

The non-aggression pact between the Soviet Union and Germany must also be evaluated in the light of these perspectives. This non-aggression pact not only represents an immediate strengthening of the chances for peace, a splitting of the war bloc which joined hands under the banner of the so-called "anti-Comintern" pact, a blow against the new Munich which the reactionary bourgeoisie prepared, a frustration of the plan to unleash war between Germany and the Soviet Union, a powerful aid to the liberation struggle of the Chinese people and a weapon against the bankrupt reactionary politicians—provided the working class will grasp this weapon. It is also a certain guarantee that socialism victorious on one-sixth of the earth will have a period of peace ahead, in which its power of attraction will become irresistible, in which it imbues the workers of all countries with the utmost fighting determination and confidence in victory, in which it supplies the libera-

tion struggle of all peoples with a unique support and renders them incomparable help.

It depends upon the working class of the capitalist world now to draw militant conclusions from the retreat of the fascist aggressor before the firmness, the resoluteness and consistency of the socialist peace power. The working class will be able to defend peace successfully if it closes its ranks in order to offer unyielding resistance to fascism and reaction. It will be able to produce a political change and replace the bankrupt reactionary politicians by governments that really defend the interests of the people and peace, if it overcomes any "anti-Communism" whatsoever in its ranks and does not permit the agents of the bourgeoisie to bring their incitement against the Communists and against the land of socialism into the labor movement. It will be able to win millions of new adherents to socialism if it whole-heartedly allies itself with its strongest center of power, with victorious socialism in the Soviet Union, if it forms a single front with the powerful working class of the Soviet Union and energetically supports the consistent peace policy of the Soviet Union in the interest of the toilers of all countries and of the peace of all peoples.

August 27, 1939.

The Guarantee of a New Germany

“Revolutionary Germany had to break with its whole past, especially in relation to its neighbors. Simultaneously with its own freedom, it had to proclaim the freedom of the nations previously oppressed by it.” (*Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, June 18, 1848.)

IN THESE unequivocal words, Marx and Engels, the founders of Scientific Socialism and the most consistent contemporary critics of the bourgeois revolutionary movements in nineteenth century Germany, outlined one of the most urgent tasks of the German people.

They spoke the unadorned truth in order to help the German people take the path of a new development:

“The French have been able to secure recognition for themselves even when they came as enemies. The Germans are recognized nowhere and nowhere find any sympathy. Even where they appear as magnanimous apostles of freedom, they are met with bitter derision.

“And this is right. A nation which all through its past had allowed itself to be used as an instrument of oppression against all other nations, such a nation must first show that it is really revolutionary. It must show it other than by a couple of half-baked revolutions which have no other result than to allow the old indecisiveness, weaknesses and disunity to continue existing in other forms. . . .”

Marx and Engels knew that the German nation would be able to prove what it must prove. For they knew the force that was growing up in order to produce this proof. They wrote in the *Deutsche Brüsseler Zeitung* on Feb. 20, 1848:

“For that reason, the Germans, above all other nations, must first be thoroughly compromised, they must become the laughing stock of all Europe even more than they are already, they must be *forced* to make a revolution. But when that happens they will arise; but it will not be the cowardly German bourgeois, it will be the German workers; they will arise and put an end to the entire squalid, muddled official German economy and reestablish German honor by a radical revolution.”

It is necessary to recall these words today for two reasons:

1. The liberation of Germany from a regime oppressing the German people and other peoples, from a regime whose existence has become a menace to human culture in general and the security of the nations of Europe, is becoming more and more a cardinal question on the solution of which depends the progressive development of a large part of humanity.

2. Discussions have arisen in other countries—especially in France which is menaced by German aggression—and among German emigres on the question of whether there are forces and what forces there are in Germany that may be considered revolutionary factors against the worst regime of violence known to history, and what prospect there is for these forces to reconstruct Germany after its liberation and to include it in a peaceful Europe. If this discussion is carried through consistently it may give rise to a strong impetus to the solution of the cardinal question.

The damage wrought by German fas-

cism also includes the dishonoring of the German name throughout the world. In view of the atrocities which the Hitler regime has perpetrated in its own country and in the countries which have come under its domination, there is an increasing tendency to forget or to estimate so lightly the positive contributions to the development of humanity as a whole which have come from Germany in the past, that in comparison with the more immediate negative things, they scarcely count at all.

It would never occur to any German worker or other anti-fascist to reproach the members of the nations oppressed by German fascism for not being fastidious in their criticism of the oppressor nation. The German workers, peasants and soldiers who are being used to "super-vise" the nations oppressed by German fascism, utilize every opportunity to show that they do not hold the same view as those who have deprived the oppressed nations of their independence. They feel and act as members of a totality of which they are often not even fully conscious and which is not only not identical with the Germany of fascism but is directly opposed and contrary to it. In this groping for community of action with the members of the oppressed nations, which is often instinctive as yet, we recognize the formation of that force which is destined "to restore German honor."

The German people—we have no doubt of that—will restore German honor. To do this, deeds are needed, and nothing but deeds will suffice, that is, for the overthrow of the fascist regime of force. The toilers of the world have a right to expect this deed from the German people. But the German toilers likewise have the right to demand respect and a just appraisal of all that which occurs in the course of the performance of this deed—sometimes hard to recognize as a result of the shroud in which fascism has wrapped Germany.

The German toilers fighting against fascism are fulfilling a task which is all the more difficult because hitherto the

Hitler regime has been put on its feet again and again in critical situations with the help of foreign reactionaries, enabling this regime to renew its influence and authority among those sections of the masses that were still vacillating.

If, in countries whose reactionary bourgeoisie have built golden bridges for the Hitler regime, the "radical" proposal is now made to defeat German imperialism once for all by trying to deprive the German people of the basis for independent existence—something which they have never done to Hitler—then such "proposals" can only be viewed as an expression of political impotence. It is hard to believe that politicians finding themselves confronted with the danger of fascist invasion and undertaking to oppose this invasion, at the same time, and even before everything, want to combat *that* force which will fulfill one of the most important tasks in subduing and destroying the fascist aggressors: the toiling German people.

Such politicians would be very ill-advised if they should want to base themselves on the utterly subjective judgments of isolated German emigrants concerning the German people's purported "incapacity for freedom." For it is no accident that these isolated individuals are the same ones who, prior to the establishment of the fascist dictatorship in Germany, helped to bring Hitler to power by their "anti-communism." Now it is their "anti-communism" which is again driving them to formulate obscure "proposals" to put the German people under guardianship. They want to eliminate the *decisive* factor, that is, the German working class, in the establishment of a new Germany which would take its place in a peaceful Europe, just as they wanted to do it before by more or less openly tolerating the reactionary preparers of fascism. But a policy wishing to base itself on elements that allowed fascism to come to power out of fear of the working class, and that now out of fear of the working class are already trembling at the prospect of

Hitler's overthrow, can never lead to peace in Europe and to the collaboration of European nations.

The German working class will not allow itself to be sidetracked by such "proposals" of its enemy, German fascism—which would suit fascist propaganda. Unlike the publications of the leadership of German Social-Democracy abroad, it will not arrive at the fatalistic conclusion that the same kind of nationalists are to be found here as well as there. The wholesome and natural hatred concentrated in the German working class against fascism will not allow itself to be swerved from its object in order to be frittered away in fruitless chatter. The German toilers have felt the specific feature of German fascism and chauvinism on their own bodies. Thus, they will not follow people like those of the *Neue Vorwärts* who suddenly take the field against "nationalism over there" and who, it may be noticed, would not mind having a little spot in the sun of "nationalism over here."

The German anti-fascists could confidently leave it to the further course of events to reduce the "proposals" for guardianship of the German people ad absurdum. They are so eager to settle accounts with the fascist regime of force that they may be sure that in so doing they will at the same time lay the foundation for the new Germany and its relations to the other nations of Europe. But, unfortunately, there are tendencies within the anti-fascist movement itself which must be vigorously rejected.

The leadership of German Social-Democracy living abroad has taken the discussion of which we are talking here as the occasion to avow its unequivocal support for the old policy of German imperialism. It has tied up this avowal which harks back to the policy of class collaboration of official German Social-Democracy during the first imperialist World War, with characteristic attacks against the revolutionary traditions of the international working class, in order to make it even clearer that the present

leadership of German Social-Democracy by no means desires a revolutionary solution of the German question.

But what does it wish? What can it wish if it does not want—in the sense of Marx and Engels—a revolutionary Germany which will dissociate itself from its entire past, that is, precisely from the cursed imperialist past which only brought misfortune to Germany and its neighboring countries? Can this avowal to the imperialist past of Germany formulated in the *Neue Vorwärts* of Geyer and Stampfer be understood as anything but the wish and speculation for a modification of the present regime? And aren't we fully justified in saying—in the sense of Marx and Engels—that the proof demanded of the German nation and which is in its own interests must appear different "from allowing the old indecisiveness, weakness and disunity to continue existing in other forms" and even to allow the breeding ground of aggressive imperialism to go untouched—as actually occurred in 1918?

The criticism which Marx and Engels made of the bourgeois revolutionary movements in Germany of the nineteenth century is fully valid today. It is valid all the more as shown by the development of Germany up till now since the guarantee of a new relationship between Germany and the other nations can only be the working class on whose strength and solidarity depends whether the German people will again fall victim to the political plans of German imperialism or whether it will actually dissociate itself from this past. It is valid all the more, as the past has shown, for the added reason that the infection of the German labor movement with bourgeois ideology can only make the working class incapable of realizing its historical mission.

The guarantee of a new Germany is the German working class firmly allied with the peasants and urban middle classes in the struggle against fascism. The attempt to lead the German working class away from this path and back

onto the old declivitous path which brought it under the power of the bourgeoisie would only lead to further continuing the "squalid muddled official German economy" on a somewhat

changed basis. And that would be to the harm of Germany and Europe. But in this case, the wheel of history does not allow itself to be turned backwards.

Thaelmann, the Great Symbol

IN THE process of the development of a strong front of resistance in countries threatened by German fascist aggression, the question is now being ardently discussed as to whether the decisive part of the German people is behind fascism and whether German fascism is not really the expression of the national character of the German people. Let us remind those who hold such views of a man whose life's work and attitude toward fascism are evidence that Germany is not identical with fascism. That man is Ernst Thaelmann.

Ernst Thaelmann is a son of the German working class. He became its leader and worthiest representative, because the consciousness of the historical mission of the German proletariat and its will-to-struggle, which was determined to overcome all obstacles, found its clearest and purest expression in him. Ernst Thaelmann embodies the best features of the German working class: ardent, unshakable internationalism, the determination to abolish imperialist oppression, the irreconcilable rejection of any compromise with one's own bourgeoisie, the love and inviolable devotion to the people which was the first to uproot the shameful exploitation of man by man—the great people of the Socialist Soviet Union marching at the head of humanity.

Ernst Thaelmann waged the most decisive struggle against those elements and factors within the German and international labor movement which are primarily responsible for the fact that the hands of the working class have remained tied and that fascism was able to become the ruler of several central European nations.

Ernst Thaelmann was most indefatigable in bringing the great teachings

of Lenin and Stalin to the German working class; he is the most consistent disciple and representative of this teaching, which has really freed humanity for the first time in its history on one-sixth of the earth and has led it to the heights of socialism which previously could only be surmised.

Because he represented so clearly and decidedly the interests and tasks of the most progressive class of society, the working class, Ernst Thaelmann also became more and more the recognized spokesman and the hope of broad masses of the toiling people in city and country. He personified the beginning of a new, real unity of the German people which aimed to achieve a complete break with Germany's imperialist past and which thereby would have become one of the decisive factors in producing a peaceful co-existence of the nations of Europe.

Since the fascist myrmidons have laid hands on him, Ernst Thaelmann has been condemned to silence. But out of the darkness of the dungeon, his personality radiates so much power, so much confidence in the final victory of the just cause of the toiling German people that his name has become the symbol and the drawing force of the anti-fascist struggle. The army of anti-fascist activists which he trained and whose model he has become—surrounded by the silence of compulsory "illegality"—is fulfilling its duty, conscious that it is thereby serving Germany and the world. With their sweat and blood, they are preparing the ground so that the tree of freedom may one day grow up out of it and bear fruit.

Together with Ernst Thaelmann, hundreds of thousands of German people are muzzled in horrible concentration camps, prisons and jails. Walls and barbed wire

separate them physically from the masses of the people, but they have a permanent place in their hearts. They are the fettered conscience of Germany and Ernst Thaelmann has become its great symbol.

Politically and culturally progressive people of other countries have already recognized Ernst Thaelmann's significance for Europe and have drawn the conclusion from this recognition that it is necessary in the interest of peace to stand up for Ernst Thaelmann, just as Ernst Thaelmann, in the interest of peace and humanity, at all times stood up against the main enemy of peace which he knew in his own country; aggressive German imperialism.

Vaillant-Couturier, who unfortunately died prematurely and who was one of the most important political writers, wrote:

"Yes, the struggle for Thaelmann is the struggle for peace, against the fascist aggressors on the other side of the Rhine. This struggle is an act of friendship for the great German people and for the hundred thousand toilers languishing in the hell of concentration camps and in the frightful prisons of the Gestapo for the cause of freedom. To mobilize the consciousness of the French toilers on behalf of Thaelmann means to strike at our own Hitlerites and at the same time at the Nazi General Staff. International unity to save Thaelmann and peace!"

Romain Rolland, the great artist and warning voice in the struggle against imperialist war, sent the following words to Thaelmann:

"In this fateful hour when capitalism and fascism have led the nations of Europe to the brink of a war of annihilation, you are for us the symbol of the great peace among the liberated nations and of the fraternal international of the workers of the entire world."

Pierre Cot, former French Minister and Member of the Chamber of Deputies, declared:

"Because Hitler Germany is a war danger and we are for all who represent

peace in that country, we are for Thaelmann."

Moro Giafferi, one of the most important jurists in France, wrote:

"From his earliest youth, Thaelmann in all of his political activity was not only a defender of the working class in the sphere of its social demands, he was also the enemy of militarism and an apostle of peace. I am certain that it was actually this which brought down upon him the stupid and thereby dangerous and murderous hatred of the suspicious bankers, of the equivocating politicians, of the army contractors, in short, of all those whom already Aristophanes had called "helm sellers." He represents a threat to their interests, for he is a weapon for peace. His thoughts belong to the moral cement which welds the nations together against the universal crime. Defend him in order to defend yourself!"

Marcel Prenant, professor at the Sorbonne, wrote:

"Thaelmann's name has become a great symbol to all anti-fascists, to all those throughout the world who are defending their bread, their freedom and peace, for he personifies the struggle against fascism in its most barbarous, devastating and belligerent form."

Thus, important Frenchmen see two things in the struggle for the freedom of Ernst Thaelmann: Support of the struggle for Germany's liberation by the masses of people in Germany who are muzzled by fascism; and the strengthening of the forces of peace in the entire world by helping the opponents of aggressive German imperialism in Germany itself.

And thus the international working class, regardless of all the political differences still existing in its ranks, should take up the cause of Ernst Thaelmann with that characteristic energy and with that power which it represents when it fights unitedly for *one* goal, in order to support *that* force which, in Germany itself, will strangle the enemy of the international proletariat—German fascism.

The Expulsion of the Spanish Youth From the Socialist Youth International

THE reactionary leaders of the Socialist Youth International, who carry out what the Second International orders, have launched a furious attack against the unity of the working class and its youth organizations, against the Communist Party and the Communist Youth League. This attack is directed primarily against the Youth League of the British Labor Party, against the United Socialist Youth and the Belgian Young Guard because these organizations have carried through a consistent policy of unity among the working class youth.

The so-called group of National Socialists in Belgium, led by Spaak and De Man, utilized the confusion in the ranks of the Belgian Labor Party which lost a considerable number of votes in the April elections, as well as the fact that after Vandervelde's death the leadership passed into their hands, to deliver a blow at the Young Guard which had arisen on the basis of the merger of the Communist and Socialist youth. At the Young Guard Congress in Mouscron and also in the actions which followed it, this group secured the expulsion of the Brussels and Luettich Federations, the largest and most influential organizations in the country. It split the Young Guard, and did all this because Brussels and Luettich held fast to unity of the youth and resisted all the splitting maneuvers of the National Socialists.

In England, the reactionary leaders of the Labor Party have resisted the policy of collaboration with all youth organizations in the country, including the Communist youth, a policy pursued by

the Youth League of the Labor Party. They removed the leadership and liquidated the League as a militant anti-fascist organization.

As a result, the reactionary leaders of the Socialist Youth International have now gone over to the offensive in the international arena also. They began by splitting the International Union of Socialist Students. But this was only the introduction to more far-reaching reactionary measures. The congress of the Socialist Youth International met at the end of July—at a time when the situation was extremely acute, when the danger of world slaughter hovered over the nations more menacingly than ever, when German and Italian fascism in Europe and the Japanese fascist military clique in Asia were kindling the flame of the second imperialist world war.

It should have been the duty of this congress to decide on action to ensure peace and freedom, to promote improvement of the condition of the youth and to increase aid to all victims of reaction and fascist aggression but primarily aid to the heroic Spanish youth which was fighting against Franco and against the Italian-German conquerors under incredibly difficult conditions and are suffering in the concentration camps of France.

The congress of the Socialist Youth International should have developed a broad mass movement in order to give effective and practical aid to the Socialist youth of Spain in the struggle which it is waging in common with the entire Spanish people against the fascist regime and against the conquerors.

In this way it could protest against the barbaric terror and against the reprisals of the Gestapo, the Ovra and the Franco police who are shooting tens of thousands of the best sons of Spain without trial. It should have been concerned to secure the right of asylum in the democratic countries for the Spanish fighters interned in France among whom there are about 50,000 members of the United Socialist Youth of Spain.

Instead of this, the splitters in the ranks of the Socialist Youth International, blinded by their hatred of Communism, secured the adoption of one decision at the congress in Lille after four days of deliberations, namely, expulsion of the United Socialist Youth of Spain, one of their strongest organizations. A clique of young Social-Democratic Party officials, sitting behind closed doors, has dared to expel from the Youth International the heroic young fighters for freedom who have set a shining example in taking the lead of the anti-fascist youth.

Why did the splitters and capitulators in the ranks of the Socialist Youth International, the Chochoys, Ollenhauers and Hansens adopt this shameful decision? The day after the Lille Congress, the anti-fascist and revolutionary youth of the whole world asked the Socialist Youth International the entirely justified question: Is the thirty-two months' armed struggle against fascism, the creation of seventy youth battalions during the first months of the national war of liberation of the Spanish people, the heroic defense of Madrid for two years, a crime?

To the Chochoys, Ollenhauers, Hansens and others who praise the Munich policy and represent the theory that "slavery is better than war," the crime of the United Socialist Youth of Spain consists in uniting their ranks against fascism, in taking up arms, in overcoming the split and uniting the whole Spanish youth. Chochoy and Co. are dissatisfied with the fact that the example of the Spanish youth has proved to be unprecedentedly contagious, that it might serve as an impetus to call forth a

mighty international movement for the unity of the working class youth. To prevent this, they are doing everything to split the large organization of the Spanish youth.

But in order to conceal their treachery and to mislead public opinion, the reactionary leaders of the Socialist Youth International have leveled the following "charges" against the United Socialist Youth of Spain: Its leadership consists partly of members of the Spanish Communist Party, the works of Comrades Stalin, Dimitroff and Diaz were studied in the schools established by the Spanish Youth League and many of the leaders of the United Socialist Youth of Spain had taken a stand against the "leaders" of the Spanish Socialist Party, especially against the "Socialist" Besteiro, one of the most active organizers of the Madrid putsch.

The "charges" which are leveled against the United Socialist Youth of Spain as a pretext for their expulsion are utterly untenable. The United Socialist Youth of Spain had arisen on the basis of the merger of the Communist and Socialist youth; in accord with this, its leadership was composed of an equal number of representatives from both organizations. It is not the fault of the United Socialist Youth of Spain that many of the leaders of the former Socialist Youth joined it when they were convinced of the role of the Communist Party of Spain in the national struggle of liberation of the Spanish people. Moreover, this was no secret to the leadership of the Socialist Youth International when they admitted the United Socialist Youth of Spain to membership in 1937. The statement of the representatives of the Socialist Youth International in Spain (Nielson, Ollenhauer, Papanek), Ollenhauer's speech at a meeting in Spain and his statement to the editors of the youth paper *Ahoro* were full of pride in the Spanish Youth League and in the new section of the Socialist Youth International. Why, therefore, the sudden "discovery" now of something which never was a secret?

The second "charge" of the Socialist Youth International is also entirely untenable. Since when is the reading of Marxist and Communist literature a crime which calls for expulsion from the the Socialist Youth International?

As for the third point of the "charges," its whole nature reveals the true character of the reactionary leaders; it shows whom and whose interests they are defending. The exposure of a traitor of the type of Besteiro and others is a service rendered by the United Socialist Youth of Spain. And if one has already taken the road of Chochoy, why shouldn't one also demand the expulsion of individual leading functionaries of the Socialist Party, as for example the Frenchman, Jules Moch, who also condemned the behavior of Besteiro and the other traitors?

The real reason for the expulsion of the United Socialist Youth of Spain is perfectly clear. The capitulators and Munichmen in the ranks of the Socialist Youth International want to get rid of an active fighter for international unity, a fighter who stood in the way of the reactionary and opportunist entanglements of the International. They want to get rid of the United Socialist Youth of Spain who have shown the indispensability and the value of unity of the proletarian ranks in the struggle against inner and international fascism; they want to split the Spanish youth and to oppose the United Socialist Youth of Spain with a splitting group of so-called "National Socialist Youth" which was formed by the traitors Casado and Besteiro. In his speech at the Lille congress, the well-known commander of the Spanish Republican Army and member of the executive committee of the United Socialist Youth of Spain, Taguena, said clearly:

"We Republican fighters are accused to speak the rough language of truth. Then listen to us: The splitting of the United Socialist Youth of Spain can only serve the interests of Franco; those who split the Spanish youth play into Franco's hands."

In the end, however, the speculations and plans of the splitters will fail. The unity of the Spanish youth will not be destroyed. Their struggle to unite all the forces of youth in every country and internationally will be continued and will receive all-around support despite the criminal maneuvers of the Chochoys, Ollenhauers, Hansens and others. The unity of the Spanish youth is not only on paper; its cement is the blood of the best sons who fell on the Madrid, Catalanian and Biscay fronts, the blood of all those who were murdered by the hangman Franco.

After the congress of the Socialist Youth International in Lille, the executive committee of the United Socialist Youth of Spain made a statement to the Socialist anti-fascist youth of the world. It says:

"The leaders of the Socialist Youth International who had adopted the resolution on the expulsion of the United Socialist Youth of Spain did not only want to destroy the unity of the United Socialist Youth by this act, but in doing this they simultaneously destroyed the unity of the Socialist Youth International itself. The young English Laborites, the Brussels Union of the Young Guard, the International Union of the Socialist Students have likewise fallen victim to this splitting measure of their leaders. *Only those who want to liquidate the influence which the Socialist Youth International exercises among the masses of youth, only those who want to weaken the struggle of the Socialist youth of the whole world against fascism, only capitulators can expel the most powerful and best fighting sections from the ranks of the Socialist Youth International.*

"We appeal to the Socialist youth, to the anti-fascist youth of the entire world to come to the aid of the United Socialist Youth of Spain and to support them in strengthening unity and in realizing the unity of the entire patriotic youth of Spain in the struggle against the fascist conquerors."

There is no doubt that this appeal of the United Socialist Youth of Spain will find a strong response among the broad

masses of toilers. Even before the congress of the Socialist Youth International in Lille, when the mere intention to expel the Spanish League from the Youth International was heard, the General Secretary of the United Socialist Youth of Spain, Comrade Santiago Carrillo, and the leadership of the Socialist Youth International received hundreds of letters and telegrams expressing solidarity with the Spanish youth and indignation at the criminal plans of the splitters in the ranks of the youth movement. Many of these letters and telegrams came from outstanding functionaries of the Socialist movement.

The former chairman of the Second International, de Brouckere, wrote the following in a letter to Santiago Carrillo:

"I have no right to interfere in the discussion which will take place at the congress of the organization. I am no longer the chairman of the Socialist International but only an old fighter who in speaking only obligates himself, but I at least have the right to express my own personal opinion and I consider it necessary under the present circumstances to exercise that right. . . .

"The struggle in Spain is not finished. It is continuing in a new form. Tomorrow it may resume its full force. Under such circumstances, shall we make the position of the Spanish proletarian organizations more difficult by imposing a sort of punishment in the form of non-recognition on one of its strongest organizations? In my opinion, that would be such a serious error that it is inconceivable that anyone could commit it."

The Socialist Deputy of the Swiss Parliament, Leon Nicole, published an article in the Geneva organ of the Socialist Party *Travail* in which he wrote:

"The United Socialist Youth of Spain has saved the honor of socialism and of the working class of the entire world by its defense of the republic, freedom and democracy. The United Socialist Youth of Spain has shown the Socialist work-

ers the road to honor and to the defense of socialism. The place at the head of the international youth movement belongs to it."

A veteran of the labor movement, Alex Gosip, Secretary of the Furniture Workers Union, who in his youth was a delegate to the first conference of the Socialist Youth International, protested against the plan to expel the United Socialist Youth of Spain. He wrote:

"It must be regretted that a few reactionary elements want to expel the United Socialist Youth of Spain from the Socialist Youth International. Such a procedure will be most sharply condemned by all true anti-fascists. It seems that many people are still unable to understand the meaning of fascism and its barbarism, its destruction of all freedom. Formerly I participated in international youth congresses and maintained warm connections with my good friend, Karl Liebknecht. The spirit of these bygone times was glorious and it is our young Spanish comrades who have preserved that spirit in our day."

Similar letters and telegrams were sent by other labor functionaries: by Zyromski, member of the leadership of the French Socialist Party and the Executive Committee of the Second International; by the chairman of the British Miners Union, Lawter, whose brother fell in Spain as a volunteer in the International Brigade; by Marchbank, chairman of the English Railway Union; by Professor Harold Laski; by French, Swedish, Swiss and other volunteers of the International Brigades.

Now, after the decision of the Lille congress, this protest movement will increase to a still greater extent.

The United Socialist Youth of Spain has always mastered every situation in face of the most difficult tests. By preserving the unity of its ranks, it will continue the struggle for uniting the toiling youth of the entire world, the struggle for the unity of the Socialist and Communist Youth Internationals.

The Struggle of the Communist Party of France for the Peasants

THE soil of France is rich in all kinds of produce, but the mass of peasants are poor, despite hard labor! "The land to the peasants who cultivate it!" This ardent call that is resounding through the villages has been heard by the Communist Party of France and it has elevated it to a slogan of the masses in the brilliant "Protect the peasants" campaign now being conducted by it.

One hundred and fifty years ago the peasants of France, who at the news of the storming of the Bastille rose up in revolt, forced the abolition of feudal tribute: Tithes and feudal services were abolished, persecution for failure to fulfill their previous feudal obligations ceased. The common struggle of the people of the cities and villages led to a historic victory on August 4, 1789, and three years later, on August 10, 1792, to the overthrow of the monarchy. How rich were the summer harvests of those years, not only in crops, but also in hopes!

But today, 150 years later, the peasants see that in various districts of France the estates of the feudal lords expropriated by the Revolution of 1789 are arising again, only with this difference, that "these marquis and counts today add the income of their estates to the dividends from their shares in large industrial and finance enterprises." (Maurice Thorez, "Defense of the Peasants.")

Who owns the land in France? A few figures of sad eloquence may suffice as an indication: One million peasants (or one-fourth of the total) possessing one hectare or less cultivate about 725,000

hectares or 1.5 per cent (imagine, *one and one-half per cent!*) of the total soil statistically recorded. If we add to this first group of farms the group of from one to ten hectares, we get the following picture: About 2,880,000, that is, 72 per cent of the total, cultivate only 10,250,000 hectares or 22 per cent of the soil. *Three-quarters of all peasants, according to this, do not even own a fourth of the soil!* And why? Because 2.8 per cent of the total number of farms have over 13,486,357 hectares, that is, over 30 per cent of the total soil. *Less than 3 per cent of all landowners, according to this, own nearly 30 per cent of the entire soil.*

The earth does not feed him who tills it! The farm is daily growing too small for the farmer's growing sons and daughters, for the fruit of their heaviest toil can scarcely secure them a bare existence. And while the aging parents, worn out at an early age, are spending their last energies on their little plot of land which is at the same time the only basis and the only possibility for their livelihood, the young people "meanwhile" move to the city and, for the most part, never return.

Thus the villages are depopulated, the small peasant farms disappear and the advantage goes to the new feudal lords, the feudal lords of grain and wine, not to forget the feudal lords of usury. In 1892 there were still 4,852,963 farms of ten hectares of land. In 1922 only 2,878,598 of these remained. From 1892 to 1929 the total number of farms decreased from 5,702,752 to 3,966,430.

"The Communists want to take away

your plot of land." With this lie they try to incite the peasants against socialism. But as early as 1847 Marx and Engels pointed out in *The Communist Manifesto*:

"There is no need to abolish that [the property of the small peasant]; the development of industry has to a great extent already destroyed it, and is still destroying it daily."*

The full weight of this horrible truth is felt only too well by the *two million* peasants who in the course of the past fifty years were driven off their land and the one million peasants who can scarcely eke out an existence on their small plot of land of one hectare, as well as by the gigantic army of peasants without land—tenants, semi-tenants, agricultural workers. How much mute suffering have the fertile hills and laughing valleys of beautiful France seen!

This suffering is no longer mute now; it has been given a voice. A passionate cry burst forth from the sod when the Communist Party of France issued its appeal to the peasants and invited them, together with the Party, to bring the life of the French peasants before the public so that it could better organize the struggle for their demands and forge a closer alliance between the toilers of city and country in common struggle against the threat to their democratic liberties and to peace.

When Maurice Thorez released his now-famous "Questionnaire," which today constitutes the center of discussions on the farms and fields and in the inns of the French villages, he issued the following appeal to the toilers of the countryside:

"Let your cooperation make it possible for us to throw light on all sides of village life, to make known the needs and demands of the countryside and to better support the cause of the peasants."

* *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, p. 23, International Publishers, New York.

In its "Questionnaire" the Communist Party takes into account all the details of economic, social and cultural life.

"Who owns the land in your community? Who tills it? What are the general conditions of tenancy and semi-tenancy? What are the wages of the hired hands, stablemen, shepherds, servants, men and women day laborers, migratory workers? Do the day laborers own any land? To what extent are agricultural machines, tractors, used? What are the living conditions of the employer, the servants, the day laborers? How do the peasants group themselves? Is there a doctor in your community? A midwife? Where is the drug store, the ambulance, the hospital? How many children attend secular school? Do you have a library? A cinema? Are there radio receivers? What has been the growth of population in your community?"

And these are only a few of the questions asked. The appeal of the Communist Party hardly reached the ears of the peasants than the *Temps*, the arch-reactionary organ of the Comité des Forges, showed its anxiety:

"In every community, and every canton [the Communist Party] will . . . hear the dissatisfaction, the complaints, the demands. . . . This examination overlooks nothing."

The *Temps* has good cause for its anxiety. For the peasants of France have joyfully greeted this "examination" by the Communist Party and have not only drawn a stirring picture of their harsh life but have also manifested the attachment of wide sections of peasants to the Communist Party and their confidence in it as the leader in the struggle of the farming masses for their liberation.

Old and young, men and women, Socialists, Communists, non-party people, semi-tenants and tenants, agricultural laborers and small peasant proprietors, vineyard farmers and other farmers have reacted to the appeal of the Communist Party, often in their simple,

touching language, often by conveying frightful figures. And they have all exposed the two frightful consequences of capitalism which are devastating the countryside—the decline in births and the flight from the land.

A Socialist farmer wrote:

“This questionnaire has made a splendid impression. The farmers are glad to see people take an interest in them.”

A semi-tenant, who has been working a plot of land for 46 years and which his father before him had already watered with his sweat, describes how the owner had him forcibly driven off his plot of land with the help of the courts and the police.

Other semi-tenants report how for decades they have been compelled to work without an agreement, with the constant threat of being driven away on the eve of the harvest. Or how, in the cases where there is a rental contract, they resort to various clauses to betray the confidence of the peasant who is little acquainted with legal formulas. But these letters also contain magnificent examples of the solidarity of the peasants and the struggle against the police and courts.

In some districts “Mr. Marquis” is still the ruler who compels “his” tenants to make annual contributions, a sort of obligation which they have to bring into the castle themselves. From various places, numerous survivals of the feudal regime are reported: obligations to render services, labor obligations, obligations to make contributions, prohibition of fishing and hunting, payment of taxes for the owner. Here there is a marquis who forbids his tenants to hunt on the land which they cultivate under threat of cancelling their contract. But the friends of Mr. Marquis may hunt to their hearts’ content, trample down the gardens of the tenants and ruin their cultivation. “For that is our pleasure.”

One understands better and better why the *Temps* is disturbed. Often one

can spend a whole day traveling in some districts and always get the same answer: The 700 hectares of the community belong to Mr. X; the 500 cows and oxen belong to Mr. X; the 250 hectares of sugar beets also belong to him; and just as many hectares of wheat and pasturage; this brewery also belongs to him.

The inquiry of the Party has extended to the most diverse sections of the peasant population. The wives of tenants have described their slavish life in a deeply affecting manner: the first to arise, the last to lie down, to take care of the children whether well or ill, to tend the cattle in all seasons, to be in the kitchen and everywhere at the same time, in the farmyard, milking, in the stable, in the fields. . . . How deeply moving is the brief description which Maurice Thorez gives of Marie, the “employer” for whom he worked as a young man during the war in a village of the Department of Creuse:

“Marie stands before me. She went to bed after I was fast asleep. She had to milk the cows every morning, then to strain the milk and wash and clean the milk pails and cans. She had to feed the chickens. She had to prepare breakfast, while I had to clean the stables, change the straw bedding for the horse, and lead the cows to the pasture. . . . She had to weed the fields with the spade, dig potatoes, gather the fresh cut hay, help bind the sheaves of wheat or oats, and at the same time help in the threshing. Marie worked as I did with the spade, pitchfork and flail. She had to load the heavy sheaves, she pitched the sheaves high upon the wagon-load, and then to milk the cows. . . . Half an hour before lunch or the evening meal Marie rushed from the field. While on the way she hurriedly gathered a few heads of cabbage. . . . Hardly was the last bite swallowed, and she was again on her feet, either cleaning and washing the dishes or else in the stable watering the calf. . . .

“One morning she was unable to rise; she was in terrible pains; she was feverish and soaked through and through

with sweat. She was unable to get up any more. . . ."

There are millions of such "Maries" in the countryside. For official statistics record four million women among the seven million persons employed in agriculture.

But the young people also suffer. As Thorez, who merely needs to dip into his recollections a little, describes it, "there are peasants who lavish more care on their colts which they are careful not to harness prematurely than on their young servants and even on their own sons."

There is no end to the young peasant's working day. They demand work of him that is beyond his strength. The young peasant has little free time and no intellectual life. His only place of amusement is the tavern. Is it surprising that under these circumstances, the young people flee from the land in order to escape from this life as if from a disease and an early death?

Old people have also written. Old people who have been waiting for a long time to be able to take a rest, who see their energies vanishing and yet have to work:

"Only one family can live on a small peasant farm. As long as the father can work, he must do it and take the young man's place away. And the young people cannot set up their own household, cannot establish a family in their father's house as long as their father is alive. They must do as the bees do who move away when there is not enough room in the beehive. . . ."

There are old people from 60 to 75 years of age who, in order to be able to eat, hire themselves out as day laborers, old people who have raised large families and now, attended only by their friends and neighbors, die; old people without money to pay for their bread so that the baker gives it to them for nothing because "he hasn't got the

heart to condemn them to death. . . ."

But the most frightful tale is told by the figures on the depopulation of the country. Whole villages are dying out, vanishing. . . . Quiet settles over the farms and spreads out like a terrible contagion to the small workshop and to the small store. The village pines away, the village dies.

In their replies to the "Questionnaire," the peasants gave doleful figures concerning their own communities. As an example we want to cite a community in the Saone-et-Loire Department which had 3,763 inhabitants fifty years ago and since then has lost more than half. In the twenty-six years from 1913 to 1938, this place recorded 464 births and 1,241 deaths.

And everywhere the same: only the name of the village varies, the misery is the same. The man who tills the land has no land himself. The man who feeds man must go hungry himself. For that reason, the plains are being depopulated.

Developing its activity with the help of the "Questionnaire," the Communist Party of France is setting as the content and goal of its cooperation with the peasants the task of helping "to secure a happier life for all the peasants of France."

Tirelessly, it is dedicating its energies to this goal. Thanks to its activity and thanks to its initiative in the people's front, the demand for a grain department was accepted. Thanks to its stubborn fight, several other demands, like those for support of large families, were given a hearing even if to an insufficient extent as far as the peasants are concerned. And the Communist Party is waging an unremitting struggle for the introduction of insurance against agricultural disasters, for a law in favor of tenants and semi-tenants.

This unity of the working people in city and country, in the struggle against the common exploiter, is the best guarantee for the common victory.

The Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the First International

BY P. DENGEL

SEVENTY-FIVE years ago, on September 28, 1864, an international meeting took place in London organized by English and French workers to express solidarity with the Polish people whose struggle for national liberation had been crushed in blood by tsarism.

Karl Marx who participated in this meeting as the representative of the German working class supplied the impetus for the historic decision of this international meeting to establish an *international workers' association*. Seventeen years earlier, in *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels had issued the call: "Workingmen of all countries, unite!"

During the years of reaction, after 1848, Marx and Engels did not cease propagating the international union of the workers, the gathering and encouragement of the scattered revolutionary forces. Their call of 1847 found its first temporary fulfillment in the International Workingmen's Association.

"In the meanwhile the labor movement in various countries of Europe had so far regained strength that Marx could realize a long-cherished wish: the foundation of a Workers' Association embracing the most advanced countries of Europe and America, which would demonstrate, so to speak, in person the international character of the socialist movement both to the workers themselves and to the bourgeois and the governments—for the encouragement

and the strengthening of the proletariat, for striking fear into its enemies." *

From the first day of its existence, Karl Marx was the intellectual head, the brilliant theoretician and practical leader of the first workers' international. Thanks to his tremendous intellectual power, his tactical skill and his unflagging perseverance, the First International overcame the difficulties of its beginning and played an imperishable role in the history of the international working class struggle for emancipation.

"Uniting the labor movement of the various countries," Lenin said in his article on Karl Marx, "striving to direct into the channel of joint activities the various forms of the non-proletarian pre-Marxian socialism (Mazzini, Proudhon, Bakunin, Liberal trade unionism in England, Lassalle's vacillations to the Right in Germany, etc.); fighting against the theories of all these sects and schools, Marx hammered out the common tactics of the proletarian struggle of the working class in the various countries." **

The difficulties were enormous and manifested themselves right from the start. In 1864, Scientific Socialism, established by Marx, was understood by only a few people. The labor movement in

* Karl Marx, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 8-9. International Publishers, New York.

** V. I. Lenin, "Karl Marx," *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.

France, Germany, Italy, Spain, England, etc., which was experiencing a strong revival, was under the leadership of "non-proletarian pre-Marxian Socialism" (Lenin), of Mazzini's petty-bourgeois democratism in Italy, of semi-Anarchist Proudhonism in France and Belgium, of Lassalle's opportunism in Germany, of Liberal trade unionism in England. At the same time, however, the labor movement was outgrowing sectarianism.

The experiences of the Revolution of 1848, the mighty upswing of capitalism on the European continent and in America since 1848, the growth of strikes and trade union organizations, required the political organization of the working class.

When the First International was established, sectarianism in the ranks of the working class of the most important capitalist countries had already been strongly shaken, had already become reactionary; but its ideology continued to prevail. The first drafts of the program and the statutes of the International Workingmen's Association showed this very clearly. Marx, who was assigned to rewrite these drafts, was unable to use a single line of them, as he wrote in a letter to Engels. Marx made his own draft, the immortal Inaugural Address and the general statutes of the International Workingmen's Association. Marx, who had recognized the powerful, advancing movement of the working class under the cover of the bombastic, utopian, even reactionary programs of the various labor organizations in the separate countries, chose the simplest, most popular language for this program, "*fortiter in re suaviter in modo*" (bold in content, moderate in form), as he wrote to Engels. As his starting point, he took the cooperative movement which was praised as a panacea by the various leaders of the various labor organizations. While recognizing the importance of this movement for the development of the labor movement, at the same time he struck a mortal blow at the utopian

and reactionary conceptions tied up with it.

"At the same time, the experience of the period from 1848 to 1864 has proved beyond doubt that, however excellent in principle and however useful in practice, cooperative labor, if kept within the narrow circle of the casual efforts of private workmen, will never be able to arrest the growth in geometrical progression of monopoly, to free the masses, nor even to perceptibly lighten the burden of their miseries." *

And Marx showed the working class the only road to freedom:

"To conquer political power has therefore become the great duty of the working classes." **

What does the working class need in order to conquer political power?

"One element of success they possess—numbers; but numbers weigh only in the balance, if united by combination and led by knowledge." ***

In its struggle for emancipation, the working class in every country must be united and, at the same time, it must depend upon the help and solidarity of the working class of other countries. If the workers impose national restrictions on their fight without any connection with the labor movement of other countries, they must suffer defeat. The guarantee of the victory of the working class is its internationalism.

"Past experience has shown how disregard of that bond of brotherhood which ought to exist between the workmen of different countries, and incite them to stand firmly by each other in all their struggles for emancipation, will be chastised by the common discomfiture of their incoherent efforts." ****

* Karl Marx, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 440. International Publishers, New York.

** *Ibid.*

*** *Ibid.*, p. 441.

**** *Ibid.*

In the general statutes of the International Workingmen's Association, Marx formulates the same thought:

“. . . That the economic emancipation of the working class is therefore the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinated as a means;

“That all efforts aiming at that great end have hitherto failed from the want of solidarity between the manifold divisions of labor in each country, and from the absence of a fraternal bond of union between the working classes of different countries.”*

Internationalism for Marx was not a matter of phrases but of deeds. Despite the weakness of the labor movement at the time, despite its undeveloped character and its looseness, Marx gave it the task of intervening in the relations of states to one another and of watching over the foreign policy of the cabinets in order to prevent the crimes of the reactionary cabinet. Who, on reading the conclusion of the Inaugural Address, is not struck by the similarity to our own time and the present tasks of the international labor movement?

“It was not the wisdom of the ruling classes, but the heroic resistance to their criminal folly by the working classes of England that saved the West of Europe from plunging headlong into an infamous crusade for the perpetuation and propagation of slavery on the other side of the Atlantic. The shameless approval, mock sympathy, or idiotic indifference, with which the upper classes of Europe have witnessed the mountain fortress of the Caucasus falling a prey to, and heroic Poland being assassinated by, Russia; the immense and unresisted encroachments of that barbarous power, whose head is at St. Petersburg, and whose hands are in every cabinet of Europe, have taught the working classes the duty to master themselves the mysteries of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective governments; to counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power; when un-

able to prevent, to combine in simultaneous denunciations, and to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations.

“The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes.”*

The activity of the International Workingmen's Association reached its peak at the outbreak of the Franco-German War of 1870. On the French as well as on the German side, the workers who were under the influence of the First International adopted a truly revolutionary position, under the complicated conditions of the war, inspired by proletarian internationalism. The French as well as the German side (the Eisenacher) showed the influence of Marx.

In the Address of the General Council of the International Workingmen's Association of July 23, 1870, on the Franco-German War, Marx showed how the sections of the First International knew how to expose the reactionary, dynastic character of this war. A few days after the outbreak of the war, the members of the Paris section of the International published a manifesto “To the Workmen of All Nations.”

“Brothers in Germany! Our division would only result in the complete triumph of the despotism on both sides of the Rhine. . . . Workmen of all countries! Whatever may for the present become of our common efforts, we, the members of the International Workingmen's Association, who know of no frontiers, we send you, as a pledge of indissoluble solidarity, the good wishes and the salutations of the workmen of France.”**

Wherever there were members of the First International, the workers in France adopted similar resolutions. The German workers replied to them. Of the

* *Ibid.*, p. 442.

* *Ibid.*, pp. 441-42.

** *Ibid.*, pp. 462-63.

numerous resolutions adopted by German workers at this time, we take the one adopted by a meeting of delegates at Chemnitz, representing 50,000 Saxon workers. It says:

"In the name of the German Democracy, and especially of the workmen forming the Democratic Socialist Party, we declare the present war to be exclusively dynastic. . . . We are happy to grasp the fraternal hand stretched out to us by the workmen of France. . . . Mindful of the watchword of the International Workingmen's Association: *Proletarians of all countries, unite*, we shall never forget that the workmen of all countries are our *friends* and the despots of all countries our *enemies*." *

The First International had passed its most difficult test, its sections had not capitulated to chauvinism, they did their duty as class conscious fighters and internationalists. It was with pride that Marx asserted in the first address on the Franco-German War:

"The very fact that while official France and Germany are rushing into a fratricidal feud, the workmen of France and Germany send each other messages of peace and good will; this great fact, unparalleled in the history of the past, opens the vista of a brighter future. It proves that in contrast to old society, with its economical miseries and its political delirium, a new society is springing up, whose international rule will be *peace*, because its national ruler will be everywhere the same—*labor*! The pioneer of that new society is the International Workingmen's Association." **

After Louis Bonaparte's collapse and after his capture together with his army in September, 1870, the First International directed its entire energy against the war of conquest waged by Prussia following the downfall of the Second Empire and the proclamation of the French Republic. Bebel and Liebknecht came out in the North German Reichs-

tag for the immediate conclusion of peace with the French Republic and against the annexation of Alsace Lorraine. For this they were arrested at the close of the North German Reichstag. In many cities of Germany, the workers arranged protest meetings against the war of conquest. Marx and Engels did everything to help the French workers with advice and deeds. Wherever they could, they organized the movement of solidarity with the French people's war of defense after September, 1870. In the second Address of the International Workingmen's Association, of September 9, 1870, Marx wrote the prophetic words:

"History will measure its retribution, not by the extent of the square miles conquered from France, but by the intensity of the crime of reviving, in the second half of the nineteenth century, the *policy of conquest*!" *

France's war of defense found its worst opponent in France itself, in the new republican government which had been formed after Napoleon's downfall. In the Address of the General Council on the Civil War in France, Marx said:

"Paris, however, was not to be defended without arming its working class, organizing them into an effective force, and training their ranks by the war itself. But Paris armed was the revolution armed. A victory of Paris over the Prussian aggressor would have been a victory of the French workmen over the French capitalist and his state parasites. In this conflict between national duty and class interest, the Government of National Defense did not hesitate one moment to turn into a Government of National Defection." **

These traitors to their country and people had not only turned Paris and all France over to the Prussians, they also concluded an agreement with Bismarck which left them enough armed forces to disarm the Parisian proletariat. To the

* *Ibid.*, p. 465.

** *Ibid.*, p. 466.

* *Ibid.*, p. 470.

** *Ibid.*, p. 476.

provocation which was to begin the disarmament, the Paris workers replied with the Revolution of March 18, 1871, with the establishment of the Paris Commune, the first workers' power, "the glorious harbinger of a new society" (Marx), "the most glorious deed of our Party since the June uprising." (Marx to Kugelmann.)

It is well known that after two months of heroic efforts, the first workers' republic was defeated by the coalition of French reaction with Bismarck. The pack of exploiters throughout the world were jubilant, and enthusiastically applauded the mass slaughter of Parisian workers after whipping the philistines of the entire world into a frenzy by a flood of slanders. But in his Address on the Civil War in France, Marx erected an eternal monument to the Parisian Communards:

"Workingmen's Paris, with its Commune, will be forever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society. Its martyrs are enshrined in the great heart of the working class. Its exterminators history has already nailed to that eternal pillory from which all the prayers of their priests will not avail to redeem them." *

The establishment of the Paris Commune had called forth tremendous enthusiasm among the class conscious workers of the entire world and especially in Germany. They recognized their own strength, their own capacities in the victory and activity of the Parisian proletariat. Large demonstrations took place in all German industrial centers, despite the wave of arrests and in contempt of the flood of slanders which inspired the philistines with fear and horror. This solidarity flamed up anew after the overthrow of the Paris Commune and in view of the barbaric slaughter of the revolutionary workers of Paris. Under the influence of Marx and Engels, and giving expression to the feelings of the German workers, Bebel cour-

ageously proclaimed his endorsement of the Paris Commune in a speech in the first German Reichstag where he alone represented the German working class.

"You may be firmly convinced, said Bebel, that the entire European proletariat and everyone that still has any feeling for freedom and independence is looking towards Paris. And if, at the moment, Paris is suppressed I want to remind you that the struggle in Paris is only a small vanguard skirmish, that the main battle is still ahead of us in Europe, and that, before many decades elapse, the battle cry of the Parisian proletariat: War to the palaces, peace to the cottages; death to poverty and idleness will become the battlecry of the entire European proletariat."

The Paris Commune which was "the child of the International intellectually . . . and for which the International—thus far with full justification—was held responsible" (Engels in a letter to Sorge of September 12, 1874),* raised the International Workingmen's Association to a "moral force in Europe" (Engels in the same letter). But "the events which elevated it to the seventh power of the world simultaneously prohibited it from setting its fighting forces in motion and actively utilizing them on pain of certain defeat and setting the labor movement back for decades." (Engels.)

After the frightful blood-letting suffered by the Parisian proletariat, the heroic French working class needed time to recover and to gather its forces. The "respectable" leaders of the English trade unions withdrew from the International because of the position of the General Council on the Paris Commune. At the same time, all the leaders of sects and petty bourgeois phrasemongers sought to profit from the tremendously increased prestige of the International and from its weaknesses.

* *Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, p. 330. International Publishers, New York.

* *Ibid.*, p. 525.

Bakunin, who had organized his own petty bourgeois, anarchist "International" within the First International, gathered all kinds of adventurers around himself. At the Hague Congress in 1872 Marx and Engels defeated the phrasemongers and Bakunin's sect was expelled from the International. The danger that the historic achievement of the First International under Marx's leadership, the penetration of Scientific Socialism to a minority of class conscious workers in various progressive countries, the education in international cooperation and international solidarity might be shattered, was dispelled. But under the changed conditions the prerequisites, under which the First International had been founded, were no longer present. By transferring the General Council from the center of the labor movement at that time to New York, the Hague Congress actually decided the end of its activity in its previous form. And its dissolution in 1874 was more or less only a formal decision.

In his letter to Sorge of September, 1874, quoted above, Engels very penetratingly showed the peculiarity of the situation which made possible the establishment of the First International.

"With your resignation, the *old* International is entirely wound up and at an end. And that is well. It belonged to the period of the Second Empire, during which the oppression reigning throughout Europe entailed unity and abstention from all internal polemics upon the workers' movement, then just reawakening. It was the moment when the common, cosmopolitan interests of the proletariat could be put in the foreground."*

When Marx decided to take part in the establishment of the First International, he concluded from the relatively stormy growth of the labor movement that it was now possible "to replace the Socialist or semi-Socialist sects by a real organ-

ization of the working class for struggle." (Marx to Bolte, November 29, 1871.)*

At the same time, he was keenly aware of the limitations confronting this First International as a result of the undeveloped character of the labor movement and the influence of the sects which still prevailed. In his Inaugural Address and in the statutes as well as in his program which he sent along with the London delegation for the first Congress of the International in Geneva (September, 1866), he restricted himself:

". . . deliberately . . . to those points which allow of immediate agreement and concerted action by the workers and give direct nourishment and impetus to the requirements of the class struggle and the organization of the workers into a class." (Marx to Kugelmann, October 9, 1866.)**

The *form* of the First International corresponded to this necessity of bringing together the workers' organizations which were still primitive, still scattered on a national scale, and on different theoretical and general levels of development, of educating them for the organization of the workers as a class. When Bakunin and his "Socialist Democratic Alliance" made their first attempt in 1869 to capture or destroy the International, Marx smashed these intentions by referring to the wide framework of the First International. He replied to Bakunin's supporters—as he tells Engels in a letter (March 5, 1869)—by referring them to the statutes which admit every workers' organization which has as its goal the protection, progress and complete emancipation of the working class.

"As the stage of development reached by different sections of workers in the same country and by the working class in different countries necessarily varies very much, the actual movement necessarily expresses itself in very different theoretical forms.

* *Ibid.*, p. 329

* *Ibid.*, p. 315.

** *Ibid.*, p. 214.

"The community of action which the International Workingmen's Association called into being, the exchange of ideas by means of the different organs of the sections in all countries, and, finally, the direct discussion at the General Congresses, will by degrees create for the general workers' movement its common theoretical program also.

"With regard to the program of the 'Alliance,' therefore, it is not necessary for the General Council to submit it to a critical examination. The Council has not to examine whether it is an adequate, scientific expression of the working class movement. It has only to ask if the *general tendency* of the program is in opposition to the general tendency of the International Workingmen's Association—the complete emancipation of the working classes!"*

This form of the workers' International was outmoded after the Paris Commune, after the foundation had been laid for the "organization of the workers as a class" in various countries. It had fulfilled its great historic task.

"For ten years the International dominated one side of European history—the side on which the future lies—and can look back upon its work with pride. But in its old form it has outlived itself. In order to produce a new International after the fashion of the old one—an alliance of all the proletarian parties in every country—a general suppression of the workers' movement like that which predominated from 1849-64 would be necessary. But for this the proletarian world has become too big, too extensive. I think that the next International—after Marx's writings have had some years of influence—will be directly Communist and will openly proclaim our principles. . . ."

These hopes of Engels were not fulfilled. The period of the "peaceful" development of the labor movement began. In his article "Karl Marx," Lenin characterized this period in the following manner:

* *Ibid.*, pp. 258-259.

** *Ibid.*, p. 330.

"After the fall of the Paris Commune (1871)—which Marx analyzed with so much penetration, pertinence, and brilliance, with such *effectiveness*, such revolutionary spirit (in *The Civil War in France, 1871*) and after the International had been split by Bakuninists, it became impossible for that organization to keep its headquarters in Europe. After the Hague Congress of the International (1872) Marx carried through the transfer of the General Council of the International to New York. The First International had accomplished its historic role, giving way to a period of an infinitely larger growth of the labor movement in all the countries of the world, precisely the period when this movement grew in *breadth* and *scope*, when *mass* socialist labor parties were created on the basis of individual national states."*

In the ten years of its history, the First International completed a tremendous historical achievement. After existing six years, it conducted itself in a praiseworthy manner during the storms of 1870-71. In this period, Marx forged "the uniform tactics of the proletarian struggle of the working class in the various countries." (Lenin.) In the twenty-five years of its history up to 1914, the Second International showed a profound degeneration of the labor movement despite its growth in breadth.

"Formally, the Second International was headed by 'orthodox' Marxists like Kautsky and others. Actually, however, its fundamental work followed the line of opportunism. Because of their petty-bourgeois adaptable nature, the opportunists adapted themselves to the bourgeoisie; as for the 'orthodox,' they adapted themselves to the opportunists in order to 'maintain unity' with the latter, to maintain 'peace within the Party!' As a result, opportunism dominated, because the links between the policy of the bourgeoisie and the policy of the 'orthodox' were joined."**

* "Introduction," Karl Marx, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, p. 23.

** J. Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 18, International Publishers, New York.

This Second International was ruined by opportunism. It collapsed ignominiously under circumstances similar to those under which the First International had reached its peak and had given an imperishable example of real internationalism.

The organization which constituted itself as a continuation of the Second International after the war has acknowledged internationalism only as a phrase from the time it was established.

The existence of the Soviet Union was and is an ever mightier source for strengthening and awakening true proletarian internationalism in the working class. The leaders of the present-day Second International consider it their task to do everything to combat and undermine this internationalism growing up around the existence and development of the Soviet Union. In the struggle of the Spanish people against fascism, at the head of which stood the Spanish working class, the Executive Committee of the Second International tried to preserve at least the appearance of internationalism; but the leaders of their strongest Sections acted like fellow-conspirators of international reaction, as supporters of the "non-intervention policy" and even as direct assistants of Franco. Now, on the eve of a new world war, this organization drops even the appearance of an acting international.

The hopes which Marx and Engels had set on the coming International as a "directly Communist" International which "will openly proclaim our principles," the principles of Marxism, were later fulfilled as they had expected. The greatest pupil of Marx and Engels who freed their work of all the rubbish of opportunism with which the Kautskyians had covered it, who developed it further, who created the new type of working class party corresponding to the experiences of the proletariat in the revolutionary struggles of many decades and led it to victory in the October Revolution, who realized the power of the workers, the dictatorship of the pro-

letariat on one-sixth of the earth, became the founder of the Third, the Communist, International which faithfully preserves the great historical traditions of the First International and continues the work done by it under new conditions, enriched by new experiences, by the work of Lenin and Stalin.

While the workers' power has been in existence for more than two decades in a large country—in the Soviet Union—thanks to the unification of the working class by the Bolshevik Party, while socialism has been realized and has shown its tremendous superiority over capitalism, while the fraternal existence of free peoples side by side under socialism has become a fact, the workers of large capitalist countries are being oppressed by the dirtiest despots ever known to history, by fascism.

Never before since the existence of civilization have the "simple laws of morals and justice" which ought to prevail "as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations" been so trampled underfoot as today by the fascist despots and by the exponents of the reactionary bourgeoisie in the governments of the non-fascist countries as shown by Spain and the Munich pact. For that reason, Marx's call in the Inaugural Address to the working class "to master themselves the mysteries of international politics," to watch the foreign policy of their governments, to influence it by action on a national and international scale, is of tremendous importance now.

Seventy-five years ago, in his Inaugural Address and in the statutes of the International Workingmen's Association, Marx showed the workers of the entire world the prerequisites for their successes and victories: *unity as a class* on a national scale and "fraternal alliance between the working classes of the various countries." Seventy-five years ago, Marx warned the workers of the world that neglect of the fraternal alliance of the workers of the various countries in all their struggles for their emancipation would find its relentless punishment

in the failure of unconnected efforts.

Because of the disunity and splitting of the working class by the activity of the opportunists, such a large and, in the history of the labor movement, such an important working class as the German working class, could be subjugated by fascism. Because of the neglect of the alliance of the working class in the various countries under the influence of reactionary reformist leaders, the fascist aggressors could crush the heroic Spanish people, reactionary governments, which had transformed themselves into governments of national betrayal in the conflict between national duty and the class interests of the big bourgeoisie, could conclude the Munich pact which delivered up the peoples of Czechoslovakia to the fascist barbarians.

That is why Karl Marx's call for the unity of the workers as a class in the struggles for their emancipation, for international solidarity, is of such enormous urgency precisely in our time. That is why it is well for the workers of Germany, France and all capitalist countries to recall the grand episode of the history of the first workers' international in 1870-71.

French and German class conscious workers, members of the First International, did not hesitate to unite their efforts against the chief strangler of European freedom and the labor movement at the time, against Louis Bonaparte. The class conscious German workers did not hesitate to do everything to thwart Bismarck when, after Sedan, he waged war against the French people and for the dismemberment of France.

The class conscious French workers placed themselves in the front ranks of the French nation in defense of their country against the conquerors, confronted the counter-revolutionary traitorous bourgeoisie with rebellion in a number of cities which was victorious in Paris.

The class conscious German workers and their leaders, in the midst of a world of chauvinism and despite all per-

secution, displayed their fraternal solidarity with the Paris Commune.

At that time the working class was still too weak, was still too insufficiently organized, was not yet clear enough in its aims to be able to prevent the crimes of its bourgeoisie and to come to the aid of its victorious brothers in Paris; but thanks to its just struggle, to its international solidarity, the defeats became a source of strength and progress.

Today, the working class is incomparably stronger than at that time. Today, it has much richer experiences. Today, the victorious proletariat of the Soviet Union has transformed its country into an impregnable fortress, into an impregnable fortress of socialism and for the working class of the entire world. Today, the working class has all the prerequisites for defeating the bloody stranglers of freedom and of the labor movement, fascism, to prevent the crimes of one's own bourgeoisie in foreign policy, to create the conditions for complete emancipation. It is only necessary to answer the call which Karl Marx directed to the workers seventy-five years ago: establish the fraternal alliance between the working classes of the various countries.

The Third, the Communist, International, desired by Marx and Engels, and its sections are fighting ardently for this international union of the working classes of all countries in face of the dangers threatening them from fascism and from the maneuvers of the reactionary bourgeoisie of the capitalist countries. In the period when Louis Bonaparte, Bismarck and the tsar determined the fate of Europe, the *unity* of the labor movement, as Engels said, despite the theoretical and political differences between the various workers' organizations, had become an absolute necessity; "the common cosmopolitan interests of the proletariat" came to the forefront. This is true to a greater extent for the present period and that is precisely the stand of the Communist International.

"The establishment of unity of action by all sections of the working class," Comrade Dimitroff said in his report to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, "irrespective of their party or organization to which they belong, is necessary *even before the majority of the working class is united in the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and the victory of the proletarian revolution.*" *

The Communist International fought for the unity of the working class of all countries, for the defense of the Spanish people and the Chinese people. The

* Georgi Dimitroff, *The United Front*, p. 32. International Publishers, New York.

Communist Parties of Spain and France took the initiative to unite the workers in the separate countries, and it is well known what success the workers of these countries were able to achieve by realizing unity of action. This joining of forces so eagerly desired by the masses of Social-Democratic and non-party workers encounters the most bitter resistance of the reactionary leaders within the Second International. This resistance must be broken, must be overcome and unity achieved, the fraternal alliance between the working classes of the various countries of which Marx speaks in the Inaugural Address. At no time in the history of the labor movement was this call more urgent than today.

The Nature of German Fascism

(Continued)

BY F. LANG

THE stormy years of the economic crisis (1929-1933), which profoundly convulsed the entire life of Germany, were a period of boom for German fascism. The class contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie were sharpened enormously. Beyond this, all classes were in motion.

The contradictions within the bourgeoisie sharpened economically and politically. An intense struggle flared up, a struggle over the division of the greatly shrunken profits and over the orientation of the country's domestic and foreign policy. One faction of the bourgeoisie intrigued against the other: Hugenberg against Bruening, Papen against Bruening and Schleicher, Schleicher against Bruening, Papen and Hugenberg. The bourgeoisie was split; a tremendous competitive struggle was raging within its ranks, but one in which all groups of the ruling class were agreed on shifting the burdens and sacrifices of the economic crisis onto the working class and the rest of the toiling sections of the population. (On this question there was disagreement only on the methods to be applied.)

In this inner competitive struggle, with simultaneous agreement regarding the plundering of the toiling masses, the most aggressive wing of the bourgeoisie, which was the most consistent defender of imperialist policy, gained the upper hand and, transcending all contradictions, became the actual representative of the *fundamental interests* of the rul-

ing class, the trustee of its collective class interests. Thereby fascism gained the upper hand, which was expressed, among other things, in the fact that Hitler, not Hugenberg, became the lord and master of the "Harzburg front."

The economic crisis also deepened the split within the proletariat. Thanks to reformism, the working class was split not only politically, it was also divided economically into employed and those who had been unemployed for many years. And this economic split resulted in widening the political gap to the point where considerable sections of those almost permanently unemployed fell under the influence of fascism. A unified, compact, energetic and conscious labor movement would have been able to win back to their own working class cause these labor elements who were less capable of resistance. But since the reformist leadership was so deeply sunk in the bourgeois swamp that they even renounced the struggle for effective reforms in the interest of the impoverished masses; since this leadership did everything to thwart the united front, the less firm strata could not be saved from the ruin into which they had plunged. The economic crisis and the fatal policy of the reformist leadership thus caused the split within the working class to be deepened and certain labor circles to succumb to the fascist demagoguery.

Ruined peasant masses, ruined artisans and small shopkeepers, small and medium traders who had fallen un-

der the wheels of competition, crisis and bankruptcy, members of free intellectual professions hurled off their course, "superfluous" employees and officials, seeing no way out, were swept into the political stream and radicalized. But since the split labor movement did not have sufficient power of attraction to recruit these groups and strata which were perishing in their poverty; and since the bourgeois parties of a democratic and conservative character were partly responsible for this deadly poverty, partly too uninfluential to be able to attract broad masses to themselves, the circles afflicted by the crisis saw no other way out than to join the Hitler party which violently attacked the "system" as an opposition party.

Constantly new groups formed around the consciously fascist, imperialist, revengeful core of the Hitler party; the mass basis of fascism became more and more variegated, heterogeneous, contradictory: beside the prince stood the unemployed; beside the big landed proprietor stood the puny farmer head over heels in debt; beside the bank magnate, the jobless technician; beside the conscious imperialist and militarist, the intimidated shopkeeper. In this way, fascism acquired the appearance of an all-national movement, the appearance of a party that looks after the interests of the entire people.

Why was it fascism that became the reservoir into which flowed these strata so diverse socially? And how could it absorb and digest this motley mass and render it serviceable to German imperialism which had been reduced to straitened circumstances and was thirsting for loot?

With monopoly capital, an anonymous and, to the masses, weird force enters the lists of society. The worker does not know the big stockholder who determines and dictates the size of his wages, his working conditions, the size of his children's piece of bread. The peasant does not know what sinister force is driving him off the land. The small entrepreneur does not know the forces that take his

enterprise away from him with the aid of entirely impenetrable and very complicated manipulations. The nation does not know the people in whose hands all the riches of society are concentrated, who control the destinies of the people, make and unmake governments, and command and plague it.

This dark, anonymous, concealed power weighed like an Alp on the masses in post-war Germany. During the years of economic crisis, the masses were seized by a veritable panic; they were confronted by phenomena which evoked the same reactions in them as elemental natural occurrences evoked in the heads of savages and idol worshippers. This Alp-like pressure was so much more terrible in Germany since German imperialism, as a result of its defeat in the war, could give full reign to its aspirations only inside Germany.

This inner contradiction between the anonymous, all-powerful imperialist rulers of the destinies of the nation and the shipwrecked, perplexed people found its *apparent* solution in fascism. We say *apparent* because this solution actually reproduced the contradictions on a much higher level and on a much wider front.

In fascism, the *anonymous* power of monopoly capital attains that *visible* power which can come before the nation and say to it: here is your leadership. The apotheosis of the leader, the leader cult that fascism promotes, is the expression of the fact that trust capital has seized full possession of all the riches and treasures of the nation, of the key positions of the economy and public life. Above this almighty, destructive, all-consuming *invisible* imperialist power rises this fascist leadership claiming "omnipotence" and totality, and appearing "infallible" in the dazzling, iridescent light of a thousand spotlights of super-refined advertising; a leadership which, though thoroughly fused with imperialism, because of its social position in a Germany defeated in war and undergoing a raging crisis, appeared to the financial oligarchy as best suited to present itself to the people as their rep-

representatives, to decoy and catch the masses and to turn them over, bound hand and foot, to their worst enemy.

In its very structure, the Hitler party, which links itself to the Prussian traditions, the "militarist" tradition, the subordination of the soldier, blind obedience and strict discipline, represented a tangible protest against the war to large sections of the German people, Potsdam rebelled against Versailles. The Hitler party, the embodiment of the most predatory imperialism, kettle-drummer for the most violent expansionism, appeared to the tormented masses, trampled by the crisis, and driven to desperation by finance capital, as the banner bearer of the national will and aspiration to rise again.

Fascism, with its totalitarian claims to power, with its soldier's discipline, with its corpse-like obedience, corresponds to the domination of monopoly capital. The total domination of the economic life of the nation by a handful of anonymous financial oligarchs corresponds to the total domination over the people by a fascist leading circle surrounded by the nimbus of legend and *externally* appearing to belong to the people. *Anonymous* finance capital, which dominates everything, finds in fascism a *visible* representative under whose wing large sections of the people flee for "protection" against the horrors which they cannot understand. Broad masses stare, as if enchanted, at the "Führer" who possesses the key to the magic castle, who *appears* to be theirs, who appears to them to be predestined to solve the social and national question, to abolish German misery.

The development of fascism into a broad mass movement is a visible expression of the fact that the nation is fissured, is split to the highest degree, yes, that the classes themselves are torn within and their different parts do not find a correct relation to one another. The unbridgeable contradiction between *social production* and *private appropriation*, which is expressed in a particu-

larly crass form in monopoly capital, sharpens all contradictions and conflicts and leads the classes to revolt against their own contradictory existence. But since the working class, thanks to the disastrous policy of the reformist leadership, was not sufficiently capable of action to be able to place itself at the head of the nation and solve the social contradictions and tensions in its own way in the interests of the masses of people, finance capital was able to sink its claws deep into the body of society and "resolve" the contradictions in its own way, to allow the rise of that pseudo-totality in fascism which only means that the nation is placed totally under the command of a thin layer of big capitalists.

The Hitler party constituted itself as a state within the state, often acting as a "counter state" even, but it was most intimately connected with the *official state apparatus* and supported by influential circles of the Reichswehr and the reactionary bureaucracy. But this "state within the state" appeared to the German masses much more "reasonable," "just," "courageous" than the regular Weimar state which fed them with starvation decrees, was incapable of mitigating their misery, extorted taxes from them which it purportedly threw into the maw of the "enemy powers" as reparations. Within this party, the *conscious* fascist, *conscious* imperialist nucleus which partly coincided with the section of so-called old "fighters" formed a party of its own. And this nucleus was (and is) the actual clasp with which the motley mass was and continues to be held together, since this nucleus externally appeared related to the dissatisfied and embittered masses.

The filling up of the fascist party with masses belonging to the most diversified groups and classes of the population made it possible for German finance capital to break through its isolation and to secure a broad and tenable mass basis, though, of course, only a temporary one. The first contradiction of German imperialism came nearer "solution," only

to become sharper and more acute in the course of time, since it is precisely the social basis of fascism that is one of its most vulnerable spots, one of its fractures.

"What is the Achilles' heel of the fascist dictatorship?" Comrade Dimitroff asked in his report to the Seventh Congress of the Communist International. "Its social basis. The latter is extremely heterogeneous. It is made up of various classes and various strata of society. . . . But since it is a dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie, fascism must inevitably come into conflict with its mass social basis, all the more since, under the fascist dictatorship, the class contradictions between the pack of financial magnates and the overwhelming majority of the people are brought out in greatest relief."*

Already, this heterogeneity of the composition of the fascist "following" is calling forth violent convulsions, now latent, now open. The provocation of the Reichstag fire, the massacre of the S.A. "comrades" on June 30, 1934, the frequent change in the fascist leading lights, the constant intrigues inside the Hitler party, the rumbling, grumbling and "bleating" of the members and sympathizers, are eloquent signs that the inner contradictions have not been resolved and cannot be resolved.

On January 30, 1933, Hindenburg called Hitler to head the government. The party which most brutally embodied the mania for expansion, the inner unrest, the deepest contrasts and conflicts of German imperialism, branded with the stigma of defeat in the war, took things firmly into its own hands, supported by its mass basis, and has been in the saddle now for the seventh year.

This "activity" of nearly seven years took two directions which merged organically into a unified whole:

1. It brutally abolished the independence, the individual life of the various social groups, strata, classes, countries

and races with every means of force, terror and suppression, in order to extend and consolidate the mass basis of monopoly capital, to weld the entire people into a totalitarian entity and to subordinate it without contradictions to the fascist leadership, to centralize the state power to the utmost and incorporate it in *all* sectors of public and private life.

2. It did all this in order to orientate and use all the forces of the nation, all of its energies and activities, all forms and manifestations of the national spirit towards the single goal of leading German imperialism out of its confinement, to conquer new territories, markets, countries and people for it, constantly to acquire new plunder, in short, to subjugate Europe to Germany.

Can anyone discover even a grain of anything progressive, even a breath or a suspicion of socialism in this activity of the fascist government, its organs and the party serving it, as many sorry figures of so-called "revolutionary Socialists" want an astonished world to believe?

In the name of the "people's totality," fascism proclaimed the abolition of all the democratic rights of the masses, the prohibition of all organizations, parties, clubs, cultural bodies of the workers, peasants, artisans, employees, civil service workers, etc., prohibited their press, robbed the workers of the right to strike and destroyed all freedom of movement. By depriving the toiling people of their legal representation, atomizing them and rendering them politically homeless, it delivered them up to the mercy of rapacious monopoly capitalism. But fascism not only atomized the masses of people; it forces them into "organizations" (as, for example, the "German Labor Front," "Hitler Youth," etc.) which are directed and guided and led by their enemies, by capitalist exploiters. Thus we have the paradoxical situation that organizations, the overwhelming majority of whose members belong to the working people, do not represent the interests of their members but the interests of the

* Georgi Dimitroff, *The United Front*, pp. 49-50. International Publishers, New York.

enemies of these same members of the fascist organization, justifying themselves on the ground that they base themselves on the people and have had their misdeeds legitimized by them. Fascism has not only destroyed bourgeois democracy; it has also placed it on its head and put the masses themselves in the service of their own enslavement by a handful of exploiters.

The revolutionary workers are no blind worshippers of bourgeois democracy whose limits and shady sides they know well, and which they know to be a form of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, if they are fighting to defend bourgeois democracy against attacks and to reconquer democracy in the countries of fascist dictatorship, they are doing this because they are aware that this limited, restricted democracy facilitates their struggle.

The revolutionary working class is aware that compared with fascism, bourgeois democracy is progressive because it offers more or less free room for the class struggle, because it frees the struggle of the exploited class from additional obstacles. As long as society is divided into exploiter and exploited, everything that promotes the *unhampered* class struggle is at the same time progressive because it gives the plundered class the possibility of developing its forces, of broadening and intensifying its struggle at the head of all toiling strata.

The relatively free development of the class struggle under capitalism is not only not directed against the interests of the nation but, on the contrary, serves the interests of the nation since the class struggle of the proletariat aims to abolish the *causes* for the division of the nation into classes, capitalist exploitation, thus unifying the nation, as we witness it in the land of victorious socialism, in the Soviet Union.

It is clear, therefore that the destruction of bourgeois democracy means that the class struggle of the proletariat is rendered more difficult, means the prohibition of parties which set into motion the relation of forces of the various

classes and groups, means the worst reaction, means favoring the most predatory wing of the ruling class, the freebooters and robber barons of finance capital.

But there are curious "revolutionary Socialist" pedants, conscious and unconscious under-strappers of the fascist way-layers who, to put it respectfully, try to dish up the "theory" that the fascist movement is, so to speak, a "classless" devil of a fellow since it also prohibits the Krupps, Thyssens and whatever the financial oligarchs may be called from organizing their own "parties," that it not only "suppresses" the proletariat but also the bourgeoisie, which is the best proof that fascism "stands above classes." What blockheads and "revolutionary" charlatans!

In its mammoth trust, monopoly capital has veritable strongholds; under fascism it literally merges with the state; in the fascist party it possesses its monopoly party; the entire state apparatus of force is at its disposal. If the workers in the monopoly plants even dare to offer the slightest resistance, fascism mobilizes its factory cells, its factory gangs, its S.A. and S.S. executioners, its Gestapo, its police, its technical auxiliaries which have recently been given the function of a technical auxiliary police, in short, fascism places its entire tremendous apparatus of hangmen's assistants, bailiffs, and man hunters at the disposal of the monopolists.

But those "revolutionists" who apparently are unable to distinguish counter-revolution from revolution raise a howl about the cannon and poison-gas kings being "oppressed" because they are not allowed to form a party of their "own" and "do not have a parliament in which they can bring up . . . their complaints" against striking, greedy workers. The inspector of streets and fortresses, Dr. Todt, recently boasted that hundreds of thousands of workers were working fourteen to sixteen hours a day on the "West Wall" under the most difficult conditions. But "revolutionary Socialists" find this fascist

slaveholders' state "progressive," and even "classless"!

Fascism centralized the entire state apparatus and built it up into a dreadnaught of gigantic dimensions. Its octopus tentacles reached into the entire public life, even into the private life of every individual. It abolished the independence of the German countries and coordinated the entire cultural, intellectual and political life.

The totalitarianization and centralization of the fascist state is the most faithful reflection of the totalitarianism of trust capital dominating economy. Monopoly capital, which directs the course of the nation's life and activity, creates *in its own image* the state which it needs in order to command society, to impose its law upon it and to put it in its chains. The state ceases to be "liberal"; public life ceases to be the arena of private inclinations and fancies, the arena for the struggle conducted under "free" competition according to "democratic rules of the game." The "iron epoch" begins; the fist is in command, the "golden calf" dances on the head of the entire people, the nation is put in a straitjacket, the sadism of the totalitarian state engages in wild orgies. The worker is chained to his place of work; the labor power of the proletariat is disposed of at a "norm" determined by the state to the profit of the financial potentates; the peasant is ensnared in a chaotic mass of decrees and "ordinances"; the artisan, the small industrialist are expropriated; all relations between people, population groups, and classes are jumbled together; parasitism, which is the shadow of monopoly capital, is spreading; the fascist, monopolist, state-authorized inquisition develops profusely in the social organism.

This fascist totalitarian state is merely the sword and executioner's axe, the instrument of power and profit-making of the monopolists who can say with greater justification than Louis XIV that "*we are the state!*"

He who wants to discover bearers of "progress" in this viper's brood, these

executioners of culture, is either as dumb as an ox or an arrant knave who sees his "destiny" in providing the totalitarian imperialists, the totalitarian imperialist burglars with a "Socialist" recommendation of good character in order to drive the masses into a peat-bog, into the swamp, into the shambles of the "great" robber war.

Like a woodchopper run wild, fascism smashed the entire, historically-developed structure of Germany and replaced it by something *entirely new*. In its dynamic unrest, which reflects the dynamic unrest of seriously injured, sick German imperialism, it destroyed everything that Germany ever had of a progressive, human character and is building up a gigantic barracks, a fortress, a dungeon on its ruins.

The "new" that fascism has established cannot be characterized more sharply than by saying that fascism has transformed Germany into a *monopoly capitalist robbers' den*. Literally a handful of bloated plutocrats are plundering all Germany, the workers, the peasants, the artisans, the intellectuals, commerce, the non-monopolist smaller, middle and larger entrepreneurs, the Jews; are expropriating them and stealing the bread out of their mouths. Trust capital and state, state and fascist party grow together into Siamese twins, permeate one another, merge into a unified colossus which oppresses the people. Economy, agriculture, wages, prices, the allocation of raw materials and bills of exchange are regulated. The entire life of the nation has been put in leading strings, has been regulated, put into stocks, throttled, strangled.

This highway robbery in broad daylight could not be pulled off by the big concerns without the all-around, maximum, daily help of the state, without its intervention. The state helps them to increase the speed-up in the factories to the utmost; the state helps them to keep wages down; the state helps them to acquire cheap raw materials by means of smuggling, robbery and extortion (just look at the economic agreements

concluded with Rumania and other states!); the state feeds and over-feeds them with orders and commissions; the state that squeezes the population dry is, at the same time, the milch cow of the trust magnates.

The means of production remain the property of the monopoly capitalists; capitalist appropriation remains; the exploitation of the working class has reached unparalleled dimensions. How is the "Socialist," "progressive," "overcoming of capitalism" to take place here? Must one not be the most contemptible lackey of finance capital to want to discover "socialist features" in this system of naked robbery?

A Social-Democratic daily, the *Berner Tagwacht*, in order to prove "how the scope of capitalist enterprise has been narrowed down," published the following survey on June 12 of this year:

	1913	1938
Wage setting	Free	Restricted
Price setting	Free	Restricted
Membership in organizations	Free	Compulsory
Cartelization	Free	Many compulsory cartels
Stocking of production goods	Free	Numerous orders and prohibitions for the stocking of production goods
Capital borrowing on open market	Free	Suspension of private loans
Capital investment	Free	Considerably restricted, capital export
Rate of interest	Free	Restricted
Supply of raw material	Free	Considerably restricted by quota limitations
Foreign trade	Free	Rigorously regulated
Amount of labor used	Free	Restricted
Profit taking	Free	Partially restricted
Competition	Free	Partially restricted

This survey undeniably shows how deep have been the changes that have occurred in German economic life. But are these changes of a *socialist* character? Do they prove in any way that the means of production, the factories and shops, the mines and banks, commerce and transport, have been turned into communal property? The survey published by the *Tagwacht* shows only one thing clearly, that under fascism, free competition has been completely

crowded out by monopoly capital, that trust capital has taken full possession of the entire "state sphere" so that the non-monopolist entrepreneurs have had their "sphere of activity" considerably restricted.

With every means of force and compulsion, with the full weight of its concentrated power, the fascist state comes to the aid of monopoly capital, takes care of its affairs, not only in relation to the exploited masses but even to capitalist circles. The compulsion to keep wages low, compulsory cartelization, the establishment of quotas in the allocation of raw materials, the prohibition against making loans, etc.—all these state measures hit the masses of workers and non-monopolists very hard, but help trust capital to keep its competitors and opponents down, to eliminate the "outsiders," to increase the accumulation of

capital and to control the small stockholders. Monopoly capital triumphs. In order to "resolve" the inner contradictions of German imperialism in an imperialist way, the state *must* intervene and place the entire wealth of the nation at the disposal of this imperialism, all the means of power and organs of force; it must put this imperialism on its feet.

In doing this, there is certainly no lack of bureaucratic excesses as is always the case when the state is compelled to

intervene. These "excesses" are necessary concomitants which distort the picture here and there, but in *essence* do not change matters. Comrade Stalin has pointed out how, in the struggle of the ruling class of the dominant nation for the "national" market, the bureaucracy intervenes "with its police club methods," and adds:

"Of course, such measures are designed not only in the interest of the bourgeois classes of the dominant nation, but also in pursuit of the specifically caste aims, so to speak, of the ruling bureaucracy. But from the point of view of the results achieved this is quite immaterial. . . ."

Only he who will not see the forest for the trees will discover "socialist planning," "progressive," "liberating," "socialist" features in such specifically caste interventions!

In the long run, however, it is no service to German finance capital to restrict its hunting ground to *inner Germany* alone. German imperialism strives to reach out into the world arena, to conquer new spheres, to redivide the world. An imperialism which "stews in its own juice," so to speak, which is confined to the borders of its "own" land of origin, must stifle, is a contradiction in itself. Already in *Mein Kampf*, Hitler issued the slogan: "*Germany will either become a world power or will cease to exist altogether.*" (Italics in the original—*F.L.*; *Mein Kampf*, fourth edition, p. 742.)

In order to reach this imperialist goal, the very "existence" of Germany is put at stake. The entire economy of the country was transferred to a "war footing."

"It means," Comrade Stalin said at the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, "giving industry a one-sided, war direction; developing to the utmost the production of goods necessary for war and not for consumption by the population; restrict-

ing to the utmost the production and, especially, the sale of articles of general consumption—and, consequently, reducing consumption by the population and confronting the country with an economic crisis."*

This putting of Germany on a war basis cannot be undertaken by monopoly capital at its own risk and with its own forces; for this it needs state help, state "authority," "intervention" by the state organs of force. Of course, such a "change" and such vigorous "intervention" cannot take place without friction. But finance capital accepts these "inconveniences" into the bargain since it knows that it is solely in the interest of its expansion. The social formation of fascism, the most brutal bearer of German imperialism, utilizes all the reserves, all the possessions, all the labor forces of Germany in order finally to get German imperialism "going," to give it the possibility of subjugating foreign peoples, of annexing foreign countries, of becoming a *world power*.

Fascism transformed Germany into an *imperialist robbers' den* from which armed forces break into foreign countries.

With brutal frankness, Doctor Ley recently wrote that "These two countries [that is, Germany and Italy—*F.L.*] took with sovereign freedom what the goddess of fate offered them." (*Der Angriff*, June 21, 1939.)

In the less poetic language of criminal law, such "sovereign freedom" is called robbery and burglary.

But who profits from this "sovereign" theft? Finance capital! The authoritative weekly *Der Wirtschaftsring* writes quite openly in its issue of May 26 of this year:

"The business of the big banks has outgrown itself, but it has experienced a noteworthy expansion thanks also to the political strengthening of the Reich, through the return of the Ostmark, the

* Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, p. 15. International Publishers, New York.

* Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, pp. 8-9. International Publishers, New York.

Sudetenland and Memel [that is, through the occupation of these areas and countries—*F.L.*] as well as indirectly through the incorporation of the protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia.”

All Germany became an armed camp; the national wealth is being plundered; labor is becoming veritable slave labor; the national health is deteriorating; the entire economy is becoming a war economy. Long repressed German imperialism is making up for what it missed at a breath-taking tempo. No nation, no country is secure in face of it.

At home, fascism means the surrounding and strangling of the German people by predatory finance capital. The entire people is welded, by every means of terror, deception and demagoguery, into a “totality” whose sole purpose is to increase and enhance the power and the wealth of the monopolists. Abroad, fascism means disturbances, threatening all peoples whose countries possess valuable raw materials, natural resources of strategic value.

The German people is being plundered, boundlessly exploited and enslaved; its *national* dignity is violated; a gang of imperialist thieves is compelling it to

become the torturer of foreign peoples, the taskmaster of occupied territories; the economy is being ruined, culture destroyed, in order to help monopoly capital constantly acquire new booty.

No matter what intrigues, evasions, sharpers’ tricks fascism may utilize in preparing and carrying through its acts of robbery, one thing is certain: imperialist robbers, burglars, criminal assaulters are at work here! He who attempts to surround the crimes of the fascist waylayers with a halo, whether he likes it or not becomes their accomplice, the assistant of the executioners of the freedom of nations. The day on which the unnatural social mass basis of fascism revolts against the humiliating and debasing, tormenting and torturing top; the day on which the masses of the people settle accounts with the fascist warmongers and encirclers; the day on which the peoples of Austria and Czechoslovakia, who have been forced under the yoke of national slavery by great-German imperialism, rise up, on that day they will also settle accounts with the “theoretical” accomplices of the fascist myrmidons and will show them where they belong: in the ash-can of history!

A New China Is Being Born in the Struggle

BY W. LEITNER

AT THE end of the sixteenth century, the Japanese army leader and dictator Hideyoshi, driven by the dissatisfaction of his unoccupied praetorians and his own ambition to be a great man, tried to conquer China. Boastingly he invited the Koreans to participate in the campaign. But they replied derisively that the intended invasion of China resembled the attempt "to measure the ocean with the aid of a mussel shell." Hideyoshi's armies brought home as prizes of victory only the ears and noses of the Koreans and Chinese who had fallen in battle—proof of the fact that the Japanese militarists, in committing their present atrocities, are loyal to an old tradition of the Samurai of the Japanese war nobility. At his death, Hideyoshi was tormented by the thought of the spirits of his fallen soldiers wandering about in Korea.

The feudal rulers of Japan have not learned a lesson from Hideyoshi's blunder. After Japan had taken over from Western capitalism its modern capitalist industry, its modern military system and the drive for imperialist expansion, the conquest and subjugation of China became the guiding aim of the extreme militarist cliques. The imperialist countries of the West tore pieces out of China's giant body, imposed unequal treaties on it with the help of warships and expeditionary forces and forced it to consent to the extra-territoriality of the foreign settlements. But imperialist Japan was not satisfied with such crumbs. By means of the war of 1894-95 it forced China to grant the "independence" of Korea and to give up Formosa,

and only the intervention of its imperialist rivals of the West prevented the realization of more far-reaching predatory aims.

However, China's defeat in the war of 1894-95 helped to produce a revolutionary movement against the foreign rule of the Manchu dynasty which prevented the modern development of China and made the country a helpless victim of foreign conquerors.

After the peace of Shimonoseki, Japan took possession of Korea by means of assassination and violence, began the penetration of Manchuria and in 1915 while its imperialist rivals had their hands full, it handed the government of Yuan Shih-kai in Peking the notorious twenty-one demands which amounted to the complete enslavement of China. While the Revolution of 1911 led to the overthrow of the Manchu Dynasty, it did not result in a deepgoing change. In alliance with reactionary provincial governors, the reactionary Yuan Shih-kai succeeded in defeating Sun Yat-sen's bold, revolutionary plans, following which he tried to play himself up as the founder of a new dynasty. The Peking government accepted the 21 demands with some qualifications. The Anfu clique, which was bribed by Japan, came to the helm in Peking.

Nevertheless, when Japan demanded the cession of Shantung in 1919 in realization of its 21 points and was supported by the Western imperialist powers in this demand, the masses of Chinese people replied with a mighty movement of national resistance, so that the ministers of the Anfu clique who were most

seriously compromised fled the country and the Peking government had to support the Chinese delegation at the Versailles Peace Conference in rejecting the Japanese demands.

Throwing itself into the work of building up its positions in Manchuria and Shantung, Japan promoted the struggle of the various provincial generals against one another, a struggle which lasted for years, weakened China enormously, and prepared the ground for further campaigns of conquest. When the Nationalist movement of 1925-27 finally appeared to establish the national unification of China, Japanese imperialism held back temporarily in order to divert the force of this movement primarily against the other imperialist oppressors of the Chinese people, but without surrendering the aim, which it was stubbornly pursuing, of completely subjugating China, and which found expression in the notorious, secret Memorandum of the Japanese Prime Minister Tanaka.

In 1931-32, Japanese imperialism once more showed its claws. The occupation of Manchuria was a link in the plans of conquest which had their beginning in the war of 1894-95 and which have reached their peak in the present war.

Every one of the stages of this policy of conquest was characterized, on the one hand, by increasing objectives of Japanese imperialism and, on the other hand, by the growing will to resist on the part of the Chinese people. In the war of 1894-95 Japan saw itself confronted by an important empire in which the Manchu Dynasty represented a disruptive, alien body. Today it is confronted, by a united Chinese people. Whereas in 1931-32 provincial governors and militarists surrendered entire provinces to the Japanese conquerors without striking a blow, in the present war treacherous generals are punished by shooting. Whereas formerly, provincial generals jealously dreamed of enlarging their own power and sources of income at the expense of other parts of the country, carried on incessant intrigues and reaped the hatred and contempt of the masses of people, today the unified na-

tional will for defense against the enemy prevails. In the years of the disintegration of the Manchu Dynasty, numerous provincial generals bore foreign trade marks, so to speak. Almost everyone of them was the servant of a certain imperialist power. Today, the armies of China are under the authority of the unified will of the Chinese national government.

This great renaissance can only be explained by the deep-going changes that have taken place within Chinese society. In this war both in the north and south, the coastal provinces and the interior of China are developing into a new unity as if in a large crucible. The industrialization of China carried on principally by foreign capital had been confined essentially to the coastal centers and to the banks of large rivers. Here a Chinese industrial proletariat arose; here were the Chinese intellectuals educated in the modern spirit; here the universities and modern institutions of China; cities like Shanghai had become bases for the modern development of China.

Nevertheless, the new China is directing attention again to the tremendous areas in the interior of the country, so rich in people, where the thousand-year-old forms of life have been preserved. Millions have set out upon the great trek to the interior from the destroyed cities of the coastal provinces, fleeing from the barbarous atrocities of the Japanese militarists. Together with the masses of peasants, artisans and students, college professors, engineers and doctors educated in Europe and America have gone into the interior. In this great migration to the west, wide areas of old China, provinces like Szechuan, Kweichow, Yunan are being fructified by new people and new ideas and are finding their place in the modern development in the common national struggle for defense.

The war of defense is extinguishing century-old religious and internecine conflicts. The history of the Chinese Empire is replete with bloody uprisings of the Mohammedans living in the provinces of Yunan, Singkiang and Kansu and of the indigenous population in

Southwest China. Japanese agents had done everything to harness the Mohammedans to their aims. In vain. The national government is receiving support from the remotest parts of the realm in the form of Mohammedan troops and in the form of material means. Native tribes in the deepest interior of China, which were brutally oppressed by the old dynasties, are being embraced by the wave of national uprising. They are enlightened on the common cause at village meetings and are involved in the common efforts.

China's national upsurge is finding its most elevating expression in the new relationship between the army and the people. Formerly the armies and soldiers were a scourge in the eyes of the Chinese peasants, something unspeakably low and contemptible. The permanent wars which the provincial generals and their subordinates waged against one another were conducted on the backs of the Chinese peasants.

Bleeding the peasants dry was the basis of existence of these military bands. When the peasants were not being plundered outright, new taxes were being imposed on them by the militarists. Roving provincial armies which constantly replaced one another had carried their arbitrariness so far that in many parts of China the population had to pay taxes years in advance. The peasants spontaneously resorted to acts of defense, attempting to protect themselves against the militarist plague with primitive weapons.

What a complete change today! The relationship of the armies of the national government to the masses of people rests on mutual confidence, on the consciousness of the struggle for a common cause. The Eighth Route Army and the Communist Party of China have especially done a great deal to make this possible. It is of tremendous historical importance that even in the districts of guerilla war, the fighters observe the strictest respect for the property of the peasants, conduct political schooling among them and give them advice and help. Where formerly the village popu-

lation fled in fear at the approach of Chinese troops or received the soldiers in sinister silence, now the fighters for national liberation are greeted, informed of the enemy's movements and hidden away by the peasants. Even the fascist *Frankfurter Zeitung* was compelled to admit in a report from Chungking: "There are two things today about which even the most uninformed Chinese peasant has a decided opinion. . . . He believes in Chiang Kai-shek's leadership and is convinced of the necessity of the fight against Japan." Compare this with the constant and agitated complaints of the Japanese press that the "spiritual mobilization" of the Japanese people for war leaves a great deal to be desired.

It is to the great merit of the Communist Party of China that from the very beginning of the war of defense and the united front with the Kuomintang, it emphasized the necessity of enlightening and mobilizing the broadest masses of people. The tireless activity of the Kuomintang, the Communist Party, the National Salvation Association and other organizations is bearing fruit. Indicative of the will to resistance which has been aroused in the Chinese people was a national demonstration in the coastal city of Wenchow which was reported as follows in an English newspaper in Shanghai:

"No less than a hundred thousand men, women and children took part in the demonstration. . . . Multitudes of enthusiastic Chinese marched through the main streets of the city with flags, banners, lanterns and torches accompanied by trumpets and bands. . . . The most noteworthy feature of the great demonstration was the confidence manifested everywhere. There was no sign of superficial optimism. A cheerful crowd filled with hope and confidence in the final triumph of their cause. The whole atmosphere was a complete negation of the mere thought that China could ever become a Japanese protectorate."

Peasants, workers, artisans, professors and students pledge never to cooperate with the conquerors and never to betray

the national cause. The war has produced a national consciousness which is making itself felt as public opinion. It is the public opinion of the new China which exposes the weaknesses of government organs, flays traitors, sounds the alarm and rouses at danger signals, and assures the constant participation of the masses of people in all the affairs of the nation. The national mobilization of the Chinese people will lead to results of great cultural significance far beyond the conclusion of the present war. It requires and hastens the spread of the written language as an important means of linking up the nation.

On the initiative of the armies and the emigrated universities, the soldiers and peasants are taught to read and write. In the interior of China, often housed only in primitive caverns, numerous new universities have been established, taught by professors from universities destroyed by the Japanese militarists. The leader of the Communist Party of China, Mao Tse-tung, is an active professor at a cavern-university in Yen-an and one of the chief initiators of this movement for popular education.

By becoming aware of the tremendous significance of the war, the view of the Chinese peasant is broadened; he sees beyond his narrow family circle and becomes conscious of belonging to a nation. Its Great Wall, its system of canals are grand evidence that old China possessed state-organized labor. Nevertheless, the gigantic achievement of the Great Wall symbolizes forced labor imposed upon the masses of people by the rulers of old dynasties. Now the masses of China participate voluntarily in the great collective undertakings of the nation. When the Japanese airplanes regularly bombed the railroads of South China, the peasants voluntarily formed repair brigades. Concerning the new spirit which has gripped the peasant masses, the former mayor of the city of Canton said to an American woman writer:

"Don't the Japanese understand that their bombings only help to organize our

province? In past years, the peasants of the surrounding villages did not interest themselves at all in state enterprises. They were occupied only with the thought of how to escape taxes. But now, I merely need to announce that we are building an anti-Japanese highway and a hundred thousand volunteers are at my disposal."

The construction of highways, extending from the interior of China to Burma and French Indo-China, by hundreds of thousands of Chinese workers, peasants and engineers, accomplished in record time, is a national epic worthy of taking its place beside the heroic struggles of the Chinese national armies. Chinese workers who transported the equipment of entire plants from the coast to the interior under enormous difficulties offer just as much evidence of the will for national self-preservation as the death-defying partisans fighting behind the enemy lines.

Sun Yat-sen bequeathed Three People's Principles to the Chinese people: (1) National Independence, (2) Democracy and (3) the Welfare of the People. They constitute the foundation of the unity of the Chinese people, especially of the united front between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party of China. While the Chinese people resist the predatory enemy, it is working simultaneously to realize Sun Yat-sen's other two principles. Democracy and the people's welfare are unthinkable without national independence just as, conversely, the mobilization of the masses presupposes the granting of democratic rights, the freedom of press and assembly, active participation in the administration of the country and the improvement of the economic condition of the masses. Important steps have been taken for the democratization of political life.

The newly formed People's Political Council of the National government represents all national parties and groups of the Chinese people. The leader of the Communist Party of China, Comrade Mao Tse-tung, showed the necessity of democracy in the struggle for national liberation in the following words:

“Armed resistance against Japan should be accompanied everywhere by the introduction of democracy. Only the realization of broad democracy can lead to victory in the war against Japan. When the people are assured of freedom of speech, organization and assembly, when soldiers and commanders, army and people are closely bound up with one another, when education throughout the country is conducted in the spirit of democracy, when the mobilization of all the people’s forces for economic construction is carried out simultaneously with the improvement in the living conditions of the people, and the elective system is put into effect in all government organs of the country and when all this is directed towards a single goal—the achievement of victory by armed resistance—then we can determine the time of China’s final victory over Japan.” (Interview with Foreign Student Delegation, July, 1938.)

The new democracy of the Chinese people is a creative and fighting democracy because it draws its strength from the energetic activity of the masses themselves. That insures its further development in harmony with the needs of the Chinese people.

The Japanese militarists and traitors of the stripe of Wang Ching-wei vainly try to sow distrust among the various parts of the Chinese people by speaking of an alleged “bolshhevization” of China. In an appeal to the Japanese people, Chiang Kai-shek emphatically countered these suspicious attempts to undermine China’s national unity in the following words:

“How can the Japanese militarists tell the world that their penetration of China is for the purpose of fighting Communism? The nation has the absolute right to have its own opinion about its own affairs and it cannot tolerate the interference of outsiders. The assertion concerning the bolshevization of China is an invention of the propaganda of the Japanese militarists.

“In 1938, the Communist Party of China expressed its full support of the Three People’s Principles. The ideas and the acts of the Chinese people are entirely united under the Three People’s

Principles, which represent the highest principles of our state, the laws of our country. All acts not contradicting the Three People’s Principles are legal and enjoy the protection of the government organs. The facts show that all political parties and groups recognize the leadership of the Kuomintang and are honestly participating with all their might on a legal basis in the war of liberation. . . .

“The most important factor of our war is the unity of our nation, its unswerving faith in the Three People’s Principles. China is united as never before on the basis of the Three People’s Principles which represent the mighty weapons for the successful accomplishment of China’s two-fold task—armed resistance and national reconstruction.”

In realization of the third of the Three People’s Principles—the Welfare of the Peoples—and to strengthen the political defensive power of the country, the Chinese people is exerting itself tremendously for an all-around increase in production. While with one hand it is defending itself against the armed hordes of a predatory imperialism, with the other hand it is handling the trowel of economic reconstruction. In the past, the initiative for the establishment of an industry in China lay primarily in the hands of foreign concessionaires and corporations and their Chinese flunkys.

The Chinese National Government and the Chinese people are putting an end to this semi-colonial past and are boldly undertaking the establishment of a national industry in the interior of China. The reconstruction of economy is taking place in the most diverse forms. Side by side with large industrial establishments built up by the state, hundreds of cooperative workshops have been established for the manufacture of all kinds of products. Whole factories have been transported from the occupied industrial districts into the interior. Important industrial branches, especially those serving national defense, are directly under the control of the state. Millions are expended by the government in order to secure the treasures of raw materials in the interior of China and

to construct new railways and highways.

China is also following new paths in the field of agriculture by means of the establishment of land banks and cooperative organizations of the peasants to improve their economy. The campaign for the increase of agricultural production is proceeding with the particularly active participation of the Communists. This is evidenced by reports from the border territory of Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia where leaders of the Communist Party of China, including Comrade Mao Tse-tung, are actively cooperating in the campaign for the extension of the cultivated area and a higher quality of cultivation. That national China is determined to follow new paths in its economic construction is indicated by the initiative of the government in promoting new industries which the president of the Executive Council and Finance Minister Kung expressed in the following words last February:

"In the past our industries were not developed on the basis of a planned policy. The needs of national defense were not taken into account and no attention was paid to the natural resources in the various territories. That has proved to be a period of waste. Since the beginning of the war of defense, the government has done everything to avoid the repetition of such mistakes. The Ministry of Economy has cooperated in the allocation of factories from the coastal cities into the interior of the country. It has likewise begun to develop new industries.

"The future development of industries will not be accidental but will proceed on the basis of a definite plan. . . . The coordination of the enterprises conducted by the state with private enterprises is a very important although complicated problem. On the basis of Sun Yat-sen's principle concerning the living standard of the people, we shall have to find ways and means of imposing restrictions on capital and of preventing the monopoly of the market and the financial domination of a few capitalists."

It was to be expected that the work of economic construction would call forth the special rage of the Japanese mili-

tarists since it would ultimately nullify their plans for the economic enslavement of China. When the Japanese militarists and their reactionary echoes describe China's economic initiative and its aspiration for independence and democracy as "bolshevism," then the Chinese people can reply with the venerable words of Confucious, China's famous philosopher:

"The ideal state belongs to all and is no one's private matter. The officials should be selected from among the talented and virtuous. . . . There should be no exclusive regard for one's children alone. The old people, the orphans, widows and cripples should be fed and taken care of when necessary at public expense. All able-bodied men should have the opportunity to make full use of their capacities and be able to develop them so that every man may have his share in the realm and every woman her place in it. . . . The youth shall receive from the state the same opportunities for education. All this will insure general peace and true happiness."

In order to enable Sun Yat-sen's Three People's Principles to triumph, the Chinese people can learn much from its past and from the teachings of its great seers, while the Japanese imperialists in their predatory attack against the Chinese people can only copy the worst features of western capitalism and would like to conceal their own lack of ideas with a lot of obtrusive clamor.

Boastfully, the Japanese militarists announce that they are striving for the establishment of a new order in Eastern Asia. This new order is already here. Four hundred million people have united as a nation in order to construct a new foundation of national and social life. China, which the imperialist powers have considered as a geographical expression, as space for their own expansion, as a passive object in the course of historical events, is becoming a new, mighty factor in modern history and politics. The Chinese people, which had already made important discoveries in the sphere of human labor and had developed agriculture into a science when the peoples of the West were still living a primitive

nomadic existence, which had handed down human knowledge to posterity in great libraries when the conceptions of European peoples were still very primitive—this people is now winning for itself in the life of nations the place which is worthy of its great past. The Chinese people, petrified in its primitive forms of life, did not make its connection with modern development in time and had to pay for it in a world of rapacious imperialism. What Comrade Stalin said regarding old Russia applies to an even greater extent to China:

“ . . . the history of old Russia is the history of defeats due to backwardness. She was beaten by the Mongol Khans. She was beaten by the Turkish beys. She was beaten by the Swedish feudal barons. She was beaten by the Polish-Lithuanian ‘squires.’ She was beaten by the Anglo-French capitalists. She was beaten by the Japanese barons. All beat her for her backwardness. . . . ”*

These words of Comrade Stalin, permeated by profound historical insight which spurred the toiling masses of the Soviet Union to almost incredible efforts in socialist economic construction, contain a great truth today for the Chinese people who have been in constant danger during the last decades of falling prey to a rapacious imperialism. Nevertheless, the Chinese people developed in time the forces of resistance, of national unity of the masses for the struggle for their menaced independence and freedom.

The classical bourgeois-democratic revolution, one hundred and fifty years ago, welded the French people into a modern nation in the struggle against feudalism and the reactionary powers of Europe. By freeing the peasants from bondage to the nobility and the Church, by forcibly abolishing the absolutist regime with its tyranny and corruption, by introducing a unified system of law, and politically activating the masses of peo-

ple, the French Revolution cleared the ground for the unhampered development of capitalism.

In the present war, China is experiencing a similar process of national emergence which is dissolving the contradictions between the separate parts of the country, subjecting the armies and the administration of the country to a central power, awakening the masses of people to participation in the political life of the nation and producing a strong national consciousness. But, the historical period is altogether different. The mass levy of the French people in the revolutionary wars was concentrated against the feudal emigres, their foreign allies and their agents in the country proper. The free competition of the young rising capitalism still wrapped itself in the ideological cloak of human rights. The mortal enemy confronting the Chinese people is Japanese imperialism, the rotten fruit of a capitalism marked by death and which has raised force, devoid of ideas, to a dogma. Its Chinese allies are the flunkies of Japanese corporations in China who find in the traitor Wang Ching-wei the embodiment of their slavish mentality.

The capitalist governments of other countries, primarily of England, are highly concerned about saving the investments of their capitalists in China even at the price of base betrayal of the heroic struggle of four hundred million people. These differences between now and then have as a result the fact that the Chinese people are not seeking their progress along the well-trod paths of the capitalist West and its Japanese imitators, but along their own paths on the basis of Sun Yat-sen's Three People's Principles.

The only country which is giving the Chinese people effective and unselfish support is the Soviet Union. Here again is revealed the great turn in the life of nations produced by the great Socialist Revolution. Victorious socialism not only signifies the liberation of the toilers of the Soviet Union from the yoke of capitalism. It is not only the source of

* Joseph Stalin, “The Tasks of Business Managers,” *Leninism*, Vol. II, p. 365. International Publishers, New York.

strength of all the toilers of the world. Victorious socialism is a support of the oppressed peoples in the struggle for the right to their own free development.

Capitalist development has turned the principles of the French Revolution, which bind nations together, into their opposite. The banner of liberation has given way to the scourge of oppression. The banner of liberation has passed over into the hands of the Soviet people which is also showing that it is the most faithful and unselfish ally of the Chinese people struggling for its freedom.

The Chinese people are not struggling for the immediate realization of a socialist society which is exemplified for it in the form of the Soviet Union. It is fighting for the most elementary right of all peoples: to determine for itself the path of its future development. But in order to secure its independence for all time, it must overcome its economic backwardness. Through its own tremendous progress in the sphere of economic construction, the Soviet Union has shown that modern technique need not be the monopoly of the imperialist countries. Whatever paths of its own a national and democratic China may take in its economic construction, the economic victories of the Soviet Union will always serve as an encouraging example.

Thousands of years ago, so history tells us, a Chinese ruler decided to get rid of progressive ideas by a great bonfire of books. Such things are a regular occurrence in Europe today, while the Chinese people struggling for its national liberation holds aloft the torch of human progress. In the capitalist West, the destruction of the progressive ideas of the French Revolution is celebrating increasingly barbarian triumphs, the fascist bourgeoisie is turning its back on

progress and human reason in order to rouse in men once more the most bestial instincts of his earliest epochs. In the so-called bourgeois democratic countries of the West, governments are at the helm that compromise with fascism because they despise nothing more than the freedom of nations and socialism. However, the more barbaric conditions in capitalist Europe become, the more magnificent is the picture of a nation of four hundred million hurling itself against the brutal war machine of Japanese imperialism and resolutely following the path of progress and democracy. The Chinese people are fighting on a decisive section of the human front against war and fascism. At the side of the Soviet people and the international working class, it is defending human civilization. The more resolutely the international working class supports the struggle for liberation of the Chinese people, the more it serves its own future, for the final victory of the Chinese people over Japanese imperialism will signify not only a turn for China but for the entire world.

The active entrance in the world arena of a people of four hundred million, awakened to democratic life and national consciousness, will produce a change in the relation of all forces; the ultimate victory of this people which has recognized its mortal enemy in the imperialist aggressor, self-seeking speculators in the other imperialist governments, and true friends only in the Soviet Union, in the working class and toilers of all countries, will energetically scotch the plans of the fascist robbers, open a new road to freedom and give all nations incalculable aid in the struggle for peace. The ultimate victory of the Chinese people of four hundred million will be a victory for humanity.

The Besteiro Trial

BY JESUS HERNANDEZ

*"The Moor has done his duty,
The Moor may go."*

AFTER the fall of Catalonia, the only possibility for the salvation of the republic consisted in the organization of even more heroic and comprehensive resistance in Central Spain and in the Southern provinces.

The possibility for such resistance was not based on the hope and desire of a few persons, it was not rooted in the courage of despair; on the contrary it was based on the existence of four armies: the armies operating in Central Spain, in the Levante, in the Estremadura and Andalusia, on the navy and on the air fleet whose superiority over the enemy regardless of its small size was generally known. In addition to this, there were more than a thousand cannon, thousands of machine guns and the splendid morale of the bulk of the army.

The Negrin government had published its "Three Conditions of Figueras" in which it summarized the minimum program of the Spanish people's struggle and resistance, setting as its goal conclusion of the war. These points were: withdrawal of the invading troops from Spain, democratic referendum by the people on the form of government to be established in the country, and no reprisals of any kind at the conclusion of the war.

The Spanish people were profoundly permeated with the justice of their cause. Regardless of the long suffering and sacrifice imposed upon them by the war—they were ready to make even more heroic sacrifices against their enemies

in case they did not accept these Three Conditions of Figueras, and to offer the most stubborn, unyielding resistance in a war which was more than ever an unequal war and therefore more than ever sublime and heroic.

Far from this chivalrous magnanimity, alien to the noble and human feelings of the entire people, the capitulators, these poisonous reptiles, considered their task throughout the war to sow skepticism, instigating the vilest sabotage, in order to force the people to surrender and lay down their arms before fascism which was afflicting the country.

And, disguised as "heralds of peace," they spread utter confusion among well-meaning people who wanted to spare the people bloodshed, horror and sorrow. They mouthed high-sounding phrases about "an honorable peace" which was to be concluded without delay and, in order to induce the objectors to make up their minds and to undermine the morale of the masses, they spread the report that the enemy "once he has begun the offensive, would unconditionally reject all peace negotiations and would simply demand submission at his discretion." With this filthy lie, they wanted to cool the enthusiasm of the masses for the correct policy of resistance which was represented by Negrin and energetically carried through by the Communist Party and, at the same time, make them appear in the eyes of the masses as supporters of "an interminable war."

For the purpose of disruption and in order to compel the professional officers of the army to capitulate, these con-

temptible agents of the enemy spread the legend that Franco, once peace was attained, would not only spare them physically but would even accept them in the existing army "in case they submitted before he had broken the resistance of the people and the army by force of arms." But since these people did not find the desired echo among the people and in the Republican army which, in their resistance, fully entrusted themselves to the leadership of Negrin and the Communist Party, they proceeded completely to disrupt the unity which they had been sabotaging all along anyway. They selected one of the most difficult moments of the struggle, a moment when, after the fall of Catalonia, the international situation had worsened frightfully and when a common front had actually risen against the republic, a front from Hitler to Chamberlain, from Mussolini to Daladier, in order to disrupt unity and to carry out a traitorous coup d'etat from ambush.

In this way, therefore, all the scum of Spain met. The clique of intriguers around Caballero, all those who were possessed by a bestial hatred for the Communists, all those who were enraged because their narrow-minded, incompetent and resentful leader had lost his power in the country, all the furious enemies of unity as well as the Trotskyites lying in ambush in the Socialist Party and tied up with the provocateurs and highway robbers of the F.A.I. and with the P.O.U.M. groups, all the trusted agents of German and Italian fascism, all those who at first met as ideologists of betrayal and later as its armed shock-troop—saw their task in butchering the republic and its best defenders.

This pack grouped itself around a few men whose names will be eternally cursed by the Spanish people, around people of whom Colonel Casado and Mr. Julian Besteiro are the chief figures. The former, an ambitious officer, cowardly and traitorous; the latter, a Socialist of the type of Noske, both ideologists of collapse, unscrupulous capitulators.

In March, 1939, they rebelled against the legitimate government and formed the Casado-Besteiro-Miaja junta. Twenty-three days later, after they had already committed the most cowardly crimes against the Communists and had thrown thousands of them into jail, the doors of the heroic Spanish Republic were opened to Franco's hordes and the soldiery of German and Italian fascism by this vile and shameless betrayal.

The Spanish people, most vilely deceived by promises of an "honorable" peace, was simply delivered up to the hatred and discretion of the victors. And from this moment on begins the fiercest and most unbridled repression, the most incredible and savage terror which mangled the bodies of the brave sons of the Spanish people. In a few days, the Spanish people had shed more blood, suffered more agonizing torture than during the entire thirty-two months of war and infinitely more than it would have suffered with the most bitter resistance for the purpose of victory and to force the enemy to accept the Three Conditions decided on by the Cortes in Figueras.

That was the work of Mr. Julian Besteiro, the ex-President of the legislative Cortes of the republic, the deputy from Madrid, the professor of logic, the State Counselor in Casado's Junta.

In an article on Besteiro which appeared in the Buenos Aires *La Vanguardia*, one of his supporters stated that Besteiro's participation in this Junta of betrayal was due solely to his "will to serve." In whose interest was this "will to serve"? Did Besteiro serve the Spanish people? The workers and peasants of Spain? No! This "will to serve" was in the service of the Chamberlain gang which, as is well known, selected the names of those who were to constitute the Junta of betrayal and named three individuals: Besteiro, Casado and Matallana, the commander of the army group operating in the Central Zone. The *Daily Telegraph* report of March 7 may serve as public evidence of this fact which, moreover, has been elucidated

in the press time and again. It reads:

"The events that have been taking place in Madrid and Cartagena during the last forty-eight hours reveal to the world the existence of a situation which has been well-known to the British and French governments for at least a week. It was known in London that Colonel Casado and Besteiro were preparing a coup d'etat. It was said that they had already conducted conversations with Franco's agents and that immediately after seizing power, they would proceed to the conclusion of an armistice."

It must be said that it is more than clear to all Spaniards in whose service was Besteiro's "will to serve."

Besteiro was always an alien in the Socialist movement of Spain. Coming from the camp of political gangsterism, from the party of Lerroux, Besteiro was out "to make a career" in the Socialist Party. Right from the first, he acted as the representative of reactionary Socialism in Spain.

Besteiro was pampered and cherished by all the reactionaries; he was also maintained and supported by them. During the years of Primo de Rivera's dictatorship, in closest accord with Caballero, he followed the line of cooperation with reaction. It was Besteiro also who, in October, 1934, when the embattled workers were shot down and murdered, quite openly had sought and found the protection of fascist reaction. Besteiro is the prototype of the furious anti-Marxist, as his inaugural address to the Academy of Linguistics showed. The elegant Besteiro is an open and avowed enemy of everything "plebeian," everything "coarse" in the Spanish people. Besteiro is an agent of capitulation who was sent to England by Caballero under the pretext of attending the coronation in order to come to an agreement with the enemy, as Besteiro himself admitted in June, 1938, in his interview with the Australian ex-Senator, Elliot. During the entire course of the war, Besteiro's attitude was that of a seasoned capitulator, shrouded in very suspicious silence

out of fear of the wrath of the masses, directing all the dirty intrigues behind the scenes against Negrin and his policy of resistance. Besteiro stayed in the background in expectation of the moment when the fruits of his work would ripen.

Besteiro, according to the above-mentioned article, pursued a policy during the war "*which was radically opposed to his policy, which, because it was not his own, he did not approve.*" Besteiro did not sympathize with the people's cause. He was neither in agreement with the struggle nor the victory of the people, nor even with the defense of national independence—so "radically opposed" was his position.

What then was Mr. Besteiro's policy? It was precisely Franco's policy that was "radically opposed" to the policy of the people's front. The policy of Chamberlain and Daladier was "radically opposed" to the policy of struggle for the national liberation of the Spanish people.

We can therefore draw the obvious conclusion that Besteiro's policy was the policy of the worst enemies of the Spanish people. Thus it is also clear that Besteiro's "*will to serve*" was just the opposite of all that was required by the highest and most sacred interests of the Spanish people.

For that reason, also, Besteiro in his "will to serve" had already sent representatives of the Junta to Burgos with the following "conditions" of submission and capitulation at a time when he was still making deceptive peace proposals in the press in order to better dupe the people:

"First: Republican Spain recognizes the government of General Franco as the only legitimate government of Spain and General Franco as the sole head of the state. Second: Republican Spain declares its readiness immediately to demobilize the entire Republican army and surrender all weapons. Third: Before the entry of the nationalist army into Madrid, the Republicans declare themselves ready to render all mines harmless, intended to blow up the city at the proper moment."

Where then do we have the guarantee here that there would be no reprisals, where is the guarantee for evacuation? They are likewise silent here about the withdrawal of the Germans and Italians as well as about the democratic referendum, a demand to which the Negrin government had held fast.

Nor is the slightest attempt apparent in Besteiro's proposal to secure from Franco even the smallest guarantee for the life of millions of citizens of the Spanish Republic. It can be seen clearly therefore that those who had gone out to defend their lives "like wild boars before they agree to an unworthy solution" behaved quite simply like cowardly dogs; those who purportedly would offer resistance in order not to allow the cause of the Spanish people "to perish in shame and derision" plunged the dagger of betrayal deep into the heart of the Spanish people with their own hands.

Let us see how Besteiro behaved before Franco's court which has condemned him. The first declaration of Don Julian Besteiro already gives us an idea of his behavior, the declaration that he is "much more anti-Communist than anti-fascist."

To those who knew him well, that is by no means news. But to the masses of Spanish anti-fascists whose love and admiration the Communist Party had won through its heroism and its selfless devotion throughout the course of the war, through its correct united front policy and through its loyalty up to the end—to these anti-fascists, such words from the lips of Mr. Besteiro are a revelation. Besteiro's road, like that of his colleagues abroad, the Faures, Spaaks, Citrines, etc., leads from anti-Communism into the camp of counter-revolution and fascism.

It is no accident that the reactionary leaders of the Second International have intervened in two concrete cases for accused Spaniards: the first time when they defended the agents of the Gestapo and the Ovra, the P.O.U.M., when the Republic put these traitors on trial; and then for Mr. Besteiro, for him and not

for the thousands and tens of thousands whom fascism is murdering in Spain. While tens of thousands of Communists, Socialists and workers of the National Confederation as well as Republicans are butchered, and poets, journalists and deputies are shot, Mr. Besteiro is given an idyllic trial with amiable judges and an atmosphere of smiling urbanity; finally, he is sentenced to thirty years, that is, they grant him his life and since they are concerned about his welfare, put him in a hospital.

Naturally, this sentence, just like all the others handed down by Franco's tribunals, is a crime. But it is a crime not because they have accused and sentenced a Besteiro but because we deny Franco the right and authority to judge anyone at all. Only the Spanish people are entitled to hand down a verdict on the traitors of Spain, beginning with Franco up to the Casado-Besteiro-Miaja Junta!

But the ugly and filthy trial of Besteiro is now fondly surrounded with an aureole of "martyrdom" by some of his brothers-in-thought abroad.

Thus Paul Faure writes in the *Populaire* of July 13 "that Besteiro has remained in Madrid in order to see that the repressive measures of the victors shall not be of such a savage character," and that he has done this "fully conscious of the danger he was thereby running."

No argument can be more cynical or false.

Besteiro remained in Madrid because he knew in advance that he was in no danger whatsoever. According to statements of his defense counsel, Besteiro behaved like a "cavalier" in court. Moreover, Besteiro constantly appealed to a series of articles and to statements in favor of the nationalist movement which he had written and made in the course of the war. And his defense counsel appealed to the fact that, in reply to ex-Senator Elliot's statement that Franco was "good-natured" and that he would not destroy the Spanish cities, Besteiro said: "Yes, I believe that. In the case of Madrid, I must even acknowledge that

if we had water and electricity it is due exclusively to the tolerance of the besiegers."

Hence, while the Spanish cities were laid in waste and ruins by the bestial bombardments, and women, children and aged were mowed down by machine guns, Besteiro praised the "tolerance" of the invaders. And Besteiro's defense counsel even added that in the constitution of the Junta *"the accused had established contact with secret agents of the nationalists and that there is convincing information on this in the secret archives of the government in Burgos."*

This therefore is the whole secret of Besteiro's "heroism" in Madrid.

Besteiro remained in Madrid, despite the contrary assertions of a Paul Faure, in order to do another extremely valuable service for Franco before the court. When the judge deliberately asked what

Besteiro thought of the legality of Azana's exercise of power, he replied that "taken purely formally, certain reservations would have to be made." At bottom, therefore, this contains an acknowledgment that Franco was right when he rebelled, since the republic in its organ of representation constituted an illegal power.

We have illuminated only a few features here of Mr. Besteiro's activity and character. But this does not close the matter, for the case deserves to be dealt with further. For the present, however, all those who are seeking a tenable basis in the "sentence" of thirty years for the defense of his honor, his chivalry, his "will to serve," should be reminded of the words which Schiller coined in his drama *Fiesko*:

*"The Moor has done his duty,
The Moor may go."*

Triumph of the Alliance Between Workers and Peasants

BY B. PONAMAROV

THE opening of the Agricultural Exposition in Moscow has attracted the attention of millions of people in all countries of the world. What is most striking is the fact itself that peaceful Soviet agricultural labor is honored and celebrated. At a time when people in the capitalist countries are disturbed by the threats of fascist aggression, when the question of war does not disappear from the agenda of parliaments, when test mobilizations and air raid rehearsals are being carried out and the entire economy of the capitalist countries is being adapted to war needs, the land of socialism holds a celebration of peaceful labor, exhibits the triumphs of its socialist agriculture. With quiet strength it rejoices in its great socialist achievements, marches confidently towards communism.

At the exhibition a truly marvelous spectacle is unfolded to the view of countless visitors. The thousand-fold results of the work of the collective farmers and Soviet economy are placed on exhibition in fifty pavilions. In this exhibition are reflected the rich diversity of nature in the Soviet land, its inexhaustible treasures, which are at the command of people today who are freed from the domination of exploiters. It shows the fruits of the labor of millions of collective farmers, it reveals the tremendous performance of agriculture in the U.S.S.R. at present which has been

provided with a fine technical equipment created by socialist industry.

Twenty-six thousand collective farms, 268 machine and tractor stations and 795 Soviet farms are participating in the exposition. Besides this, the results of the labor of 155,000 leading people in socialist agriculture are represented in various forms. The exposition was created, in the truest sense of the word, by the entire Soviet people. It is convincing proof of their successes and victories.

The chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, Comrade Molotov, said in opening the exposition:

"The most magnificent prize samples and achievements from every branch of agriculture, from every branch of animal husbandry, often surpassing the world record, are represented at this exposition. This exposition is an absolutely convincing demonstration of the strength of the collective farm system and thousands of its prize products, represented here from all the republics, territories and districts, give us an idea of the extraordinary wealth of agriculture in the Soviet Union, of its extraordinary variety, its constant progress and its great creative power. Our exposition is not only a summary of the victories but it is also a powerful call to continue the advance of agriculture, to new glorious victories of socialism."

A new world created under the leadership of the Party of Lenin and Stalin—mainly in the last ten years of collectiv-

ization—opens up before the visitors at the exposition. Ten years ago, the bulk of the village consisted of individual peasant households. Their technical level was not far removed from the level of the old pre-revolutionary village. But the small commodity economy of the individual peasants produced capitalist elements. At that time, from twenty-four to twenty-five million peasant households had their own private economy. The bulk of the peasantry consisted of middle peasants; but many of them were still poor. The kulak, the exploiter and the most persistent enemy of socialism, was still in the village. And ten years prior to that, the "Russian village" and the "Russian peasant" were synonymous throughout Europe with backwardness, lack of culture, unmitigated darkness, hopeless poverty. In only one country of Europe—in old Russia—were there such horrible things as "famine years," in the course of which hundreds of thousands of people, in fact, entire villages, perished, entire areas were depopulated. Landowners, gendarmes, kulaks and priests ruled in the village; they acted as judges and imposed penalties on the indescribably impoverished peasantry.

Today, on the contrary, the "old village" figures only in a few displays at the exposition. From this, the great distance covered by the peasantry up to the present-day Soviet village and the achievements of agriculture shown by the exposition is even more clearly perceptible.

Many press representatives of capitalist countries, well-known foreign personalities and statesmen have already been in this wonderful city which has arisen near Moscow and which shows the new Soviet village with its comfortable and happy life of the millions of collective peasants. They cannot conceal the profound impression which this exposition made upon them. Many of them write extensively concerning the exhibits which give evidence of the achievements of agronomy, zootechnique, new plant species and outstanding examples of stock-breeding; they write about the

architecture of the pavilions, etc. But the task of the progressive representatives of the working class consists in pointing out to all toiling peasants *the social lessons flowing from all the achievements of agriculture in the U.S.S.R. which can be seen at the exposition.*

For the workers and peasants of all countries, the agricultural exposition is a visual education in how the most important task of the proletarian revolution after taking over power was solved, the task of leading millions of small peasant households over to the road of socialism and the establishment of a new collective system in the village.

And all that which is so graphically portrayed at the exposition—the big harvests, of which formerly the Russian village did not dare to dream, the unparalleled achievements in stock-breeding, the new species of plants, the models of agricultural mechanization — are primarily milestones of the most profound social processes that have been carried through in the village by the Soviet power, milestones of its victories.

The exposition shows that all the magnificent fruits of the earth which are exhibited by the collective and Soviet farms from all districts of the Soviet Union, the big harvests of rye, wheat, oats, potatoes and other produce, the large milk output, the colossal accomplishments in stock-breeding, the transformation of desert and wilderness into fertile fields—all this was only possible because of collectivization and the victory of socialism in the village.

That is the most important political lesson from all the achievements and records of agriculture which are on view at the exposition. For the Soviet Union, the agricultural exposition in 1939 is primarily important because, in displaying the triumphs of socialist agriculture already achieved in the village, it will serve as the starting point for new, unsuspected achievements. The exposition is a school, a truly Stalinist school, in which the average collective farms learn from the leading farms how to reach unparalleled records (harvesting, advance

in stock-breeding, flourishing of all branches of agriculture). Hundreds of thousands of collective peasants—chairmen of collective farms, shock brigaders, field workers, stock breeders, tractor and combine operators—visit the fair. They take back to their own collective farms the best samples gathered from all the districts of the Soviet land. And the very next day after they have returned from the exposition, they will proceed to apply on their collective farms the best that they saw at the exposition.

And no one can have any doubt that the records of today will become the achievements of the mass of collective farms tomorrow, that the best accomplishments in the conduct of agriculture will appear on their farms tomorrow. That is undoubtedly one of the most important phenomena characterizing the agricultural exposition. This confidence in the morrow possessed by every type of collective farmer and all the toilers of the U.S.S.R.—that is a fact of tremendous political significance.

It shows that millions of people do not wish any other life than to go forward without any interruptions, than a life in the socialist society which they created. Only an attack by a foreign enemy could divert the people from their plans made at the exposition. In such a case, they will all rise as one man to defend their fertile fields, their flourishing gardens, their costly collective-farm buildings against the hostile blows of the aggressor.

The confidence in the morrow and the creative plans for the improvement of their collective farms, which the collective peasants are now making here at the exposition, characterize the difference between the collective peasants of the Soviet land and the peasants of all other countries of the world.

The overwhelming majority of those who perform agricultural work in the capitalist countries drag out their existence in wretched poverty, groan under the pressure of the capitalist trusts and banks which compel them to sell their miserable possessions because of indebted-

ness. The overwhelming mass of peasants in the colonial countries live the miserable lives of impoverished semi-proletarians. Each year the living standards of the peasant masses grow worse in the capitalist countries, and where fascism has come to power as, for example, in Germany, the peasantry is also exposed to the pressure of the fascist compulsory economy.

It is the rule in all capitalist countries that the peasant has long since ceased to be the owner of his plot of land, his farm, since he is completely dependent on big capital and subject to its commands.

For this peasantry and for the working class of the capitalist countries, the agricultural exposition of the Soviet Union is of immeasurable significance. They are enabled to draw lessons for themselves from the visible triumphs of socialist agriculture.

The victories of the collective farms displayed here reveal, as Comrade Molotov said in his speech, the all-conquering power of the alliance of the workers and peasants under the banner of the Party of Lenin and Stalin. The exposition reveals the triumph of Lenin's and Stalin's teaching on the socialist transformation of the small peasant households.

From the first days of its existence, the Party of the Bolsheviks looked upon the peasant question and the role of the working class in its relation to the peasantry in a new way, in an entirely different way from the whole Second International.

The Bolsheviks fought to make the peasant masses of Russia the allies of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, to get the main mass of the peasants—the village poor—to march together with the proletariat towards the socialist revolution and to build up the socialist society in the struggle against the kulak in alliance with the middle peasant, while simultaneously basing itself on the village poor.

That was an entirely new way of putting the question, which differed fundamentally from the position occu-

pied by the Social-Democratic parties.

Social-Democracy, represented by David and Vollmar, by Hilferding and Kautsky in the post-war period, by Bauer and many others, assumed that there were fundamental and irreconcilable contradictions between the working class and the peasantry. For decades, these labor leaders of the Western European proletariat had taught that the peasant must be regarded only as a seller who is interested in selling dear, and the worker only as a buyer who is interested in buying cheap. From this, these Social-Democratic politicians drew conclusions concerning the irreconcilability of the contradictions between the proletariat and peasantry.

In Russia this view was represented by the Mensheviks and especially by Trotsky, who "deepened" it thoroughly and, starting from it, finally landed in the camp of fascism. Against this conception which pushed the peasantry into the camp of the bourgeoisie, and isolated the proletariat from the millions of peasants, the Bolsheviks waged a relentless struggle. For decades the Party of Lenin and Stalin fought against all those who did not want the working class to lead the peasantry and to march shoulder to shoulder with it to the victory of the Revolution, to the establishment of socialist society.

In order to win the peasantry over to the side of the proletariat, the Party waged a struggle of historic importance against the Cadets—the party of the Russian bourgeoisie—and against the Socialist-Revolutionaries who noisily represented themselves as the party of the peasantry and laid claim to leadership of the peasantry, as well as against the Mensheviks and the Bukharinite scum. The Bolsheviks, who expressed the will of the working class, assumed responsibility for the fate of the peasantry. They took leadership of the peasantry, and today the triumphs of collectivization, which are also displayed at the exposition, proclaim what the peasants achieved under the leadership of the Bolsheviks.

The exposition illustrates, by facts that can be understood by every toiler, the *importance* of the alliance of workers and peasants, the *importance* of the victorious road along which the working class has led the peasantry under the banner of Marxism-Leninism.

In the West, the peasantry was for centuries a reserve of the bourgeoisie. The Bolsheviks brought about an abrupt change in this traditional relationship. They transformed the peasantry into a reserve and into an ally of the proletariat in the struggle against the bourgeoisie. And that vouchsafed the victory of socialism which forever freed the toilers of city and countryside from slavery and exploitation, from wretched poverty and from the "idiocy of country life."

Today, it is no longer possible to fight against all this, because the facts are irrefutable. Today, reality is the reply to all those in the capitalist countries who disseminated disbelief in the power of the working class, in the possibility of a socialist transformation of the village. What is there left today of all the Social-Democratic assertions?

If today one should assemble the scribbling of all those who prophesied that the "contradictions between the proletariat and peasantry" were "irreconcilable," it would be the most terrible condemnation of the authors of these statements.

The agricultural exposition in the Soviet Union proclaims, with a compelling power of conviction, the triumph of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the agrarian question, the great vitality of the teaching of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin and its outstanding importance for the workers and peasants of all countries.

To lead millions of peasant farmers along the road of socialism, it was necessary to have a science which fully illuminated the condition of agriculture and the course of its development under capitalism as well as the possibility of new courses of development under the conditions of socialism, which was able to supply a correct estimate of the so-

cialist substance of the peasantry and its various sections. It was necessary to have a science that was able to clarify the tasks and role of the working class in its relationship to the peasantry at every strategic stage of the struggle.

For this a tremendous scientific labor had to be performed. This was all the more necessary since the landowners and the bourgeoisie had invented countless "agrarian theories" for the purpose of preserving their landed property and strengthening their power over the peasantry. In this, very often they made use of the "theoreticians" who were preaching anti-Marxist and anti-proletarian views under the banner of peasant and Social-Democratic parties.

Proudhon and Henry George, Vollmar, Herz, David and their neighbors Kautsky and Hilferding, the Socialist-Revolutionary Chernov and the Menshevik Maslov as well as many, many others appeared with "works" on the agrarian question and endeavored to propagate a false course to the peasantry.

A mighty, relentless struggle of the revolutionary Marxists was required against all these anti-labor and anti-peasant "theories."

Beginning with the analysis of the forms of development of capitalism in agriculture, with the analysis of absolute and differential rent in the third volume of *Capital* and progressing unceasingly up to Stalin's theory concerning general collectivization, concerning the machine and tractor stations and their function in the socialist transformation of the village, Marxism-Leninism created a thoroughly unified theory which gives the working class of the entire world a guide to action in its relation to the peasantry.

The agrarian theory that was worked out by Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin was a guide to action on the basis of which were made all the accomplishments which today are displayed at the exposition. Hence, it may be said with full justification that the successes of socialist agriculture in the U.S.S.R. have their roots in Marx's *Capital*, in Lenin's ar-

ticles on the "Development of Capitalism in Russia," "To the Village Poor," the "Agrarian Question and the Critics of Marx," the "Agrarian Program of Russian Social-Democracy," and others.

These achievements make the collapse of all anti-Marxist "agrarian theories" plain to everybody. The "law of diminishing returns of the soil," the "theory of the preservation of small-scale enterprise in agriculture" and many other pseudo-scientific assertions have been completely refuted by reality.

What can the defenders of the theory of "diminishing returns of the soil," beginning from Malthus up to the German Social-Democratic agrarian "theoreticians," say today? The agricultural exposition in the Soviet Union shows that where formerly in old tsarist Russia the peasants died of hunger, where after the harvest they often had no seed, today in those districts they are harvesting from one hundred and fifty to two hundred poods per hectare. How can one talk of a "law of diminishing returns" when simple collective peasants who carry on their socialist farming on a scientific basis, like the Siberian peasant Yefremov, harvest four hundred poods of wheat per hectare?

The unparalleled cotton yield in Central Asia, the potato and vegetable crops in the central suburban districts, the orange, lemon and tea crops in sunny Georgia and other big crops throughout the Soviet land, make all claims about the "diminishing returns of the soil," to prove which dozens and hundreds of thick volumes have been written, look ridiculous. Now every representative of the proletariat and the peasantry can see for himself that these "scientific" accounts served the landowners and capitalists.

What is left of the "theory of the preservation of small-scale enterprise in agriculture"? If one may say so, that was the *alpha* and *omega* of the Social-Democratic and Socialist-Revolutionary platforms. After being exposed, many years ago, by Lenin and Stalin, they only demonstrate the scientific wretch-

edness and the political servility of a David and Herz, a Chernov and Suchanov, as well as other representatives of Social-Democracy, towards the landowning and capitalist classes.

In place of a miserable existence on their small plots of land which the representatives of the "law of the preservation of small-scale enterprise in agriculture" have glorified so much, the large-scale socialization of agriculture on the basis of collectivization has given the peasantry a happy and comfortable life.

The victory of socialist agriculture in the U.S.S.R. therefore shows all toiling peasants that only one theory correctly defines the basis of agriculture and militantly shows the correct road. That is the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

For that reason the working class and the broad peasant masses of the capitalist world can also draw important lessons from the agricultural exposition in the Soviet Union which displays the triumphs and achievements of a ten-year struggle by the Party of Lenin and Stalin for a better life for the toiling peasantry.

These lessons strengthen the faith of the working class in its own power and ability to accomplish the most magnificent historic transformations in agriculture. They strengthen the faith in the power and ability of the working class to give leadership to the peasantry in the defense of their daily interests against fascism, capitalist exploitation and imperialist oppression as

well as in the solution of the fundamental tasks of the socialist transformation of agriculture. These lessons also prove that the fundamental interests of the working class and the toiling peasantry coincide, that they give rise to the necessity and the possibility of a common struggle. These lessons proclaim to the broad peasant masses that the guarantee for the liberation of the peasantry from exploitation and the burden of feudal survivals and capitalist plundering lies solely and exclusively in leadership by the working class.

The achievements of the development of the Soviet people, which are being exhibited at the exposition, have clearly demonstrated the possibility of leading the small peasant households on the road of socialism and thereby liberate them ultimately from the yoke of the landowners and capitalist trusts, from the fear of ruin, from hunger and impoverishment. The Communists of all countries will not grow tired of explaining to the peasant masses all the tremendous political lessons of the agricultural exposition in the U.S.S.R.

The peasantry constitutes the overwhelming majority of the earth's population and in a number of European states numerically exceeds the urban population. The armies of the capitalist countries are recruited from the peasant masses.

All this obligates us to acquaint the broad mass of peasants with the triumph of socialism so brilliantly displayed at the agricultural exposition in the Soviet Union.

Germany and Europe

BY KURT FUNK

THREE books by German authors* offer the occasion and opportunity for reflections on Germany's relation to Europe and for establishing Germany's place in Europe—problems which of late are being ardently discussed. Heinrich Mann and Thomas Mann have formulated propositions which contain devastating charges against German fascism, the source of the anti-cultural, anti-humanist pollution of Europe. They warn Europe and the world so that they may erect a barrier against the spread of the fascist epidemic.

But that which makes the writings of these authors who are rooted in the bourgeoisie and are only loosely connected with the working class so particularly vital is the fact that they are directed against the expansion of German imperialism, against the fascist acts of aggression. This is also true of Emil Ludwig's book, although this author, in contrast to Heinrich Mann and Thomas Mann, has given a negative estimation of the German people altogether, which, as a result of the one-sided and negative treatment of many characteristics of the German people, cannot rank as a real criticism growing out of concern for the future of the German people.

Regardless of all the objections that could be raised in detail against the theses of these German authors, objections which must be raised to the extent that they give misleading accounts or

evaluations of socialism, like Thomas Mann, for example, or like Emil Ludwig, convey a false picture of the German people—it is of great importance that they have proclaimed their veto of fascist expansion and have called out to the German people: Do not follow the fascist regime along this road which will lead you to ruin! It is an expression of the strong current among the German people directed against predatory imperialism. We may recognize in this a promising sign that fascism—unlike the imperialism of Wilhelm II—is finding embittered and determined opponents in the ranks of the German intellectuals also, who are ready for action and consider it their moral duty to take up the struggle against the fascist warmongers. They do not surrender in face of the external glitter of the power of fascism. They do not lose courage because of its diplomatic successes, which they know would be impossible if they were not handed to them or facilitated by reactionary capitalist accomplices in other countries.

In these complicated times, they feel and act like Europeans and they prove that this Europeanism does not contradict their Germanism. In this attitude they are related to the greatest and deepest German thinkers and poets. But they go a substantial step further than German poets of their rank have been accustomed to go: They are becoming active fighters. Much as the manner of their struggle may vary, much as it is impossible in detail to reduce their views to a common denominator, still they have

*Heinrich Mann, *Courage*; Thomas Mann, *Attention Europe!* Emil Ludwig, *The New Holy Alliance*.

one thing in common: their determination, which has arisen out of their concern for the German people and humanity, to fight against the common enemy, German fascism. Their passion against this tyrannical regime is genuine. Their contempt for its baseness is profound. Their concern for the salvation of human culture is intense. In his essay "Spain," contained in his book, Thomas Mann admits:

"The man who today declares 'I do not care about politics' appears absurd to us; we feel that his statement is not only egoistic and naive, but also a foolish self-deception, inferior and stupid. . . . Today the question of man himself is posed in a political form with a final and mortal seriousness—and should the poet, who by nature and destiny always holds the most exposed post of humanity, be allowed to run away from a decision?"

And he himself replies:

"I am convinced that the poet who, in matters of human opinion today, fails in the face of the question of man posed in a political form and betrays the cause of the spirit to self-interest, is a spiritually doomed man. He must perish. . . ."

These words which are a personal avowal of the poet but, at the same time and far beyond that, are also an expression of the opinion of broad sections of the German people, indicate that these sections and their intellectual representatives have gone a remarkably long way—remarkable to everyone who today wants to determine the relationship of the German people to the regime which poses as the representative of the collective will of the German nation.

Beside the working class in Germany, there is a growing army of those who have realized or are realizing that fascism is trampling upon everything beautiful, good and capable of development that has come down from the past into the present and that can serve as building stones for a brighter future. Perhaps the term "army" for these sections, groupings and individuals goes too far. Nevertheless, their development towards

militant activity is already clearly noticeable. Here something is growing up, different from that contemptible philistine of the past who tried to cloak his capitalist interests and political impotence with high-sounding hollow phrases. An important factor is thereby arising for the future of Germany and its cooperation with the other peoples of Europe.

Heinrich Mann has stated what it is ultimately all about in the most incisive and pregnant terms:

"Everything depends on the liberation of Germany, its own future and the decision as to whether civilized humanity shall end up in a horrible fate."

He sees the prerequisites for averting this fate among the German people themselves. And of all the German poets, he is the most indefatigable in speaking to the German people themselves, he is the most persistent in enlisting support abroad for the struggle to liberate the German people from the fascist yoke. Shortly after the annexation of Austria, Heinrich Mann wrote concerning the relation of fascism to the German people and vice versa:

"In the history of nations, there are specters. It displays atavistic forces that attack a nation and degrade it more than is necessary. National-Socialism is only a specter. Its strength is lifeless. Against it is everything that is healthy, alive in that Germany which is ruined and dishonored by such a regime. The cowardly attack on Austria is a shame; Germans worthy of the name blush with shame. The hour will strike when all the insults will be avenged and all the errors will be atoned."

From observation of the struggle against fascism in Germany proper, Heinrich Mann sees how the precious heritage of German thinkers and poets is being freed from rubbish and cobwebs, how thoughts which had been buried between leather covers by a stupid bourgeoisie, decades before Hitler, are coming to life again—and only partially as yet.

"In this Germany, Goethe can no longer be read with simple devotion. The reader's conscience troubles him and he is disturbed by questions. He sees: Here is a perfectly free spirit. . . ."

That is how Heinrich Mann writes in an essay in which he deals with events among the student youth. In another essay on "The Spiritual Heritage," he writes:

"Wherever you take hold of German literature, it is concerned with man, the understanding of his nature in its heights and depths. Your poets have never been exclusively occupied with a German being or German interest: The very ones who were the most popular among you have included everything that bears a human countenance. . . . What the Germans, whose name and word have become known throughout the world, desired so greatly during their time, was invariably the uniting of people. It was never their hostile separation. . . . In times which often appeared as difficult as the present, the great Germans have paid attention to the final goal, that is, human happiness. No matter what happened, they bore testimony against the power that overstepped its bounds. Their cause is reason and not obedience."

From history and the present, Heinrich Mann adds proof upon proof of this:

"For the best of the contemporaries who were at the same time the most influential, for Humboldt and Freiherr von Stein, the external war of liberation was no pretext for exalting the inner lack of freedom to a patriotic duty. That came later when the concept of the national had already degenerated. The traditional and solely legitimate concept of the national is derived from human liberation and overflows into that same humanity which is German at all times. . . . Germans who are now fighting for freedom in Spain are alone following in the spirit of their great literature and not the others. Germans who take Soviet Russia as it is are correct when they accept it as the greatest attempt at the absolute liberation of man. Kant would accept it as such."

While Heinrich Mann thus establishes the continuity between the thoughts and progressive acts of Germans in the past and the anti-fascist struggle of the present, while he recognizes that the Hitler regime can by no means claim to be the executor of German history or the expression "of the German character," we find some entirely different conceptions concerning this in Emil Ludwig.

Both authors reject and combat German fascism, both oppose the fascist warmongers. Nevertheless, they diverge on essential questions and the discussion which has recently arisen concerning the "character of the German people" and Germany's future shows us how essential it is at bottom to clarify these questions.

To Emil Ludwig, Germany appears as the so-called natural breeding ground for fascism, a country whose people appear to be predestined for fascism because they are purportedly profoundly hostile to revolution and are inclined to absolute obedience because of their innermost requirements. Ludwig abstracts from the real people living, suffering and struggling in Germany in order to construct a German "normal person" whose entire past history was allegedly driving on towards its "crowning" culmination in fascism.

The present discussion, which is being conducted primarily in France concerning the future relation to a Germany freed from Hitler's rule, actually proceeds from this thesis in its practical conclusions. Ludwig's conceptions agree to a great extent with the conceptions of the French bourgeois opponents of Hitler who are now—after aggressive German imperialism, not without their toleration and support, has already done sufficient damage—seeking assurances against further acts of force and want to prevent him from growing strong again after he has resumably been tamed.

Moral indignation at such conceptions is not in place. German fascism, through its acts of violence against other peoples, has piled up so much guilt that no one need be astonished if now in petty bour-

geois circles contempt and hatred for this rule by force is also turning against "everything German."

In any case, it is necessary to distinguish the identity of the bearers and promoters of such feelings, and no special reasons need be advanced in telling them that their attitude gives evidence neither of particular sagacity nor of a strongly developed sense of justice.

To petty bourgeois who only recently displayed no concern over the aggressions of German fascism and their consequences, and from whom nothing was heard when it was a matter of bagging Hitler's accomplices in their own countries, the names of Thaelmann, Peter Foerster, Niemoeller and Rossaint perhaps do not mean much. In reality, however, they are names that represent the German people, the German people that is suffering under fascism and whose best and boldest fighters are waging the struggle against fascism in a manner worthy of entering into the history of humanity's struggle for liberation.

But when, for example, Emil Ludwig asserts that Hitler embodies and combines those decisive features which the German character needs, there certainly ought to be very few people prepared to agree to such a "judgment."

Although it may be the fashion at present among these few people to replace a real and faithful explanation of the causes of German fascism and its expansion policy by superficial, glittering bon mots concerning the "German people's national character," they will not harm fascism itself thereby and will scarcely contribute towards the promotion of all-around resistance against the aggressions of fascism. All experience shows that the construction of so-called "national characters" and explanations of the political situation by one's "character" can only lead to vulgar political twaddle.

Thomas Mann has included a speech in his book which he delivered in 1930. In it he asked—and the questions are, at the same time, the answers:

"Is that German? Are fanaticism, limbo-throwing thoughtlessness, orgiastic denial of reason, human dignity and intellectual values a part of some deeper soul of Germanism? . . . Can the wish-picture of a primitive pure-blooded, simple-minded and simple-hearted, heel-clicking, blue-eyed, obedient and strict probity, this perfect national simplicity, be realized, even after ten thousand expulsions and purge executions, in an old, mature, experienced and civilized people with high aspirations such as the Germans, who have behind them such intellectual and spiritual adventures, who have experienced and carry in their blood a cosmopolitan and noble classicism, the deepest and most refined romanticism, Goethe, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, the exalted morbidity of Wagner's Tristan music? . . . If, then, radical ecstasy cannot possibly be the natural mien of the German bourgeoisie, how shall it conduct itself and stand politically?"

The fact that political rule by violence could be established in Germany and become a menace to Europe obviously proves that there are elements and forces in Germany on which fascism bases itself and whose nature it therefore embodies. But these reactionary elements are not identical with the German people. All peoples have experienced periods of reaction in their history without generalized conclusions about the "national character" having been drawn from these periods.

Who, today, would think of calling Napoleon III a "typical Frenchman," Metternich a "typical Austrian"? There is hardly anyone who, let us say, would dare to describe Farinacci as a "typical Italian." Then why should it become the fashion to give his German counterpart, Streicher, the title of "typical German"?

There can be no doubt that the German people need strong self-criticism reaching down to the root of things. Marx and Engels have given examples of this in the nineteenth century, from which we can still learn everything today. The German people do not need to be painted in bright colors. Its most progressive

forces know very well that they have no reason today to be "proud" of the "German people." But they also know that that part of the German people which is resisting the fascist dictatorship with increasing strength can already be counted among the progressive forces of humanity and that the behavior of the known and unknown heroes of the German struggle for liberation must ultimately become the model for millions upon millions of the German people whose deeds will lay the foundation for the inclusion of a liberated Germany in a peaceful Europe.

Thomas Mann wrote:

"Fascism admits that in a war it will have to contend no less with its own people and country; that it is by no means certain that they will go through thick and thin with it; that, on the contrary, foreign war would almost immediately become civil war. No wonder that to this risk it prefers peace or rather the intermediate position between peace and war which is its own invention and which permits it to continue with greater security its domestic and foreign bluff, its blackmail of the democratic love for peace, and to achieve its objectives of power perhaps without actual war."

To that extent, therefore, the German

people, even in their fettered condition, are already checking the fascist regime and help to make it easier for the jeopardized peoples to resist and strike back at fascist aggression. That is always a factor with which politically minded people will calculate and whose effectiveness will increase to the extent that Hitler's aggressions are curbed.

It is certainly quite revealing that an author like Heinrich Mann, who, of all of them, is closest to the living struggle in Germany and who has relatively most contact with the labor movement, can look confidently into the future, while others who isolate themselves from the working class, regardless of their anti-fascist orientation, are pessimistic about the future of the German people and run the danger of thereby eliminating themselves from the fructifying influence and help of the aspiring German masses.

"We believe, with Goethe, in the future of Germany, since without disgraceful cunning and without cheap acts of violence, it will be truly strong and less feared than esteemed. Goethe speaks to us: 'I am as firmly convinced as you. Yes, the German people promises a future and has a future.'"

Thus speaks Heinrich Mann.

“Soviet Policy and Its Critics”

BY FRANZ SCHNEIDER

IN HIS book, *Soviet Policy and Its Critics*,* Campbell aims first of all to counteract the disruptive Trotskyite propaganda as well as the other anti-Soviet literature, the inspiration and source of which can be traced back to Trotsky in nearly every case.

The present volume is primarily written for the post-war generation, for those who find it particularly difficult to grasp objectively and in its entire historical scope the tremendous social, political and cultural transformation which has taken place in the Soviet Union.

The construction of socialism raised and continues to raise countless new problems. The methods which the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet government use in order to master these new problems are not always immediately understood in the capitalist countries. Very often a certain length of time elapses before a correct understanding of the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet Union penetrates the outside world—many times even to the friends of the Soviet Union. For that reason it was frequently possible, at least for a short time, for its enemies to slander and cast suspicion on the policy of the Soviet Union, which invariably happened at every decisive turn of domestic and foreign policy. It happened with Brest-Litovsk in the early days of the October Revolution; it happened with the transition to the New Economic Policy, the Five-Year Plans, collectivization, the

Stakhanov movement, the entry of the Soviet Union into the League of Nations, the peace policy of the Soviet Union, and especially the trials against the anti-Soviet bloc of the Trotsky-Zinoviev and Bukharin gangs and the Tukhachevsky clique.

If it was once the arch-reactionary representatives of Anglo-American finance capital, the notorious Hearst and Rothermere press, that hurled slanders and lies against the Soviet Union, today it is preeminently the Trotskyites who perform this task. As faithful servants of fascism they want to destroy by means of their tactics of slander the growing power of attraction which the Soviet Union has among the toiling masses of the capitalist countries. If once this was accomplished by blunt methods of raising the Bolshevik bogey, today they must use more refined methods, pseudo Marxist methods, full of pseudo revolutionary criticism, of Left phrases and theatrical pathos.

For many years now Trotsky has been the most sought-after and best paid “ideological” caterer of fascism and reaction for this purpose.

Campbell's book sets itself the task of destroying the veil of deception and slander which Trotsky and the other anti-Soviet critics have put up, in order to distort the insight and judgment of the pro-Soviet masses.

By giving the reader a mass of facts, Campbell's book becomes an aid to the study of the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks). Regardless of the fact that the authori-

* J. R. Campbell, *Soviet Policy and Its Critics*, Victor Gollancz, London, 1939, 374 pp.

tative *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* is already available, Campbell's book does not lose its value, if only for the reason that it gives a number of quotations in connection with every question dealt with, which make it possible for the untrained reader to be immediately orientated.

The questions of the possibility of socialism in a single country, the estimation of the role of the peasantry, the New Economic Policy, and the reconstruction period, the questions of industrialization, the national question, and the questions of foreign policy—in all these questions the correctness of the Leninist policy, which has been brilliantly continued by Stalin, is graphically and convincingly demonstrated.

Campbell successfully combats the speculations of certain uncritical intellectual circles based upon ignorance of the facts and revolutionary romanticism, who at times permit themselves to be ensnared by the political sophistries of Trotskyism.

The victory of socialism in the Soviet Union is recognized by friend and enemy alike today. Here we have the most conclusive refutation of the pseudo theories of all varieties according to which the construction of socialism in a single country was impossible and utopian. Whenever the Soviet Union is mentioned even the most indifferent masses of the capitalist countries begin to prick up their ears, and the political power of attraction of the Soviet Union is constantly growing.

Despite the desperate resistance of its internal and foreign enemies, socialism in the Soviet Union has proceeded from victory to victory on all fronts, in a manner unparalleled in world history and, in an unheard-of short time, a backward country has become a country which is already undertaking to overtake and surpass the leading capitalist countries not only with respect to the speed of production but also with respect to the level of production. The old Russia of starvation and misery, of oppression and illiteracy, has become a country of happiness, culture, democracy and socialism.

The enemies of the Soviet Union deliberately ignore these facts. The Hearsts and Rothermeres, the Goebbels and Gaydas, fascism and Trotskyism, have to equip their propaganda machines with new tunes; they must give their slanderous art a new front in order to conceal and distort the truth about the Soviet Union which is penetrating more and more, despite everything.

Campbell's book will undoubtedly contribute a great deal towards combating and disarming the anti-Soviet propaganda. The book would certainly have profited if Campbell had agitationaly sharpened his extensive investigations and condensed them in concise language. A lot could also have been said more concisely; generally, a compact summary of this book in the form of a handy pamphlet would be very useful for propaganda purposes, not to speak of the value of such a pamphlet in other languages.

UNITY for PEACE and DEMOCRACY

By EARL BROWDER

96 pages

Price 10 cents

What are the tasks confronting the American people to insure unity around policies which will guarantee that our country will keep out of the imperialist war and go forward toward greater democracy, social and national security? What are the tactics of the reactionaries? What is the outlook for the crucial 1940 elections? What are the tasks of the Communist Party in promoting unity, democracy and peace?

These questions are answered in the report of Earl Browder, General Secretary, to the National Committee of the Communist Party, meeting at the moment of outbreak of the imperialist war. They are a clear analysis and guide for every progressive American.



THE MEANING OF THE SOVIET-GERMAN NON-AGGRESSION PACT

By V. M. MOLOTOV

16 pages

Price 1 cent

The historic message of the Premier and Commissar for Foreign Affairs to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., suppressed by the whole capitalist press of America, demonstrates with irrefutable facts the responsibility of Chamberlain, Daladier and the Polish government for the breakdown of the great effort to establish a peace front in Europe. It demonstrates the responsibility of the Chamberlain-Daladier gang for the outbreak of war, and the consistent peace role of the U.S.S.R. in signing the pact which broke up the fascist Axis and preserved peace for hundreds of millions.



WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

New



Books

FIGHTING FOR PEACE

By EARL BROWDER

A program for a positive peace policy by the General Secretary
of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. **50 cents**

Theory of THE AGRARIAN QUESTION

By V. I. LENIN

Volume XII of the Selected Works. **\$2.00**

THE THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES OF MARXISM

By V. I. LENIN

Volume XI of the Selected Works, 763 pages. **\$2.00**

A HANDBOOK OF FREEDOM

An anthology of the democratic tradition in English history from the
time of Alfred the Great to the present. **\$2.00**

WHAT IS PHILOSOPHY? A Marxist Introduction

By HOWARD SELSAM

Revised edition of a popular seller **\$1.25**



WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

20TH ANNIVERSARY GIFT OFFER

YOURS FOR THE ASKING!

ANY ONE OF THESE TITLES WILL BE
SENT TO YOU AS A PREMIUM WITH
ONE YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION TO

THE COMMUNIST

12 MONTHLY ISSUES, \$2.00

AGAINST AGGRESSION, Maxim Litvinov
BRITONS IN SPAIN, William Rust
CHILD WORKERS IN AMERICA, K. D. Lumpkin and D. W. Douglas
THE CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE, Karl Marx
CRITIQUE OF THE GOTHA PROGRAMME, Karl Marx
DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM, V. Adoratsky
FIGHTING FOR PEACE, Earl Browder
FOUNDING OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL, Karl Marx
GEORGE DIMITROFF, S. Blagoyeva
I LOVE, A. Avdeyenko
THE IRON FLOOD, A. Serafimovitch
JEWS WITHOUT MONEY, Michael Gold
LETTERS FROM PRISON, George Dimitroff
PROLETARIAN LITERATURE IN THE UNITED STATES
LABOR FACT BOOK NO. 4
LAST PLAYS OF MAXIM GORKY
LETTERS TO KUGELMANN, Frederick Engels
LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF V. I. LENIN, R. Palme Dutt
LUDWIG FEUERBACH, Frederick Engels
THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION, Joseph Stalin
PASIONARIA: ARTICLES AND SPEECHES, Dolores Ibarruri
THE SPIDER AND THE CLOCK (Cloth), S. Funaroff
TRAITORS ON TRIAL
WHEN JAPAN GOES TO WAR, E. Yohan and O. Tanin
WORKING WOMEN IN GREAT BRITAIN, Joan Beauchamp

THE COMMUNIST
P. O. Box 148, Station D
New York, N. Y.

Enclosed find \$2.00 for which please enter my subscription to **The Communist** for one year beginning with the.....issue. At the same time please send me without additional charge a copy of..... as announced in your 20th Anniversary Gift Offer.

Name

Address