

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

No. 5

1940

V. M. MOLOTOV—BOLSHEVIK STATESMAN

A. LOZOVSKY

WHO BETRAYED THE FRENCH PEOPLE?

HOW ENGLAND WAGES WAR

SPEECH OF COMMUNIST DEPUTY BILLOUX

BEFORE THE MILITARY TRIBUNAL

PRICE 20 CENTS

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

No. 5

MAY

1940

CONTENTS

May Day Manifesto of the Communist International	283
Who Betrayed the French People? <i>A. Meunier</i>	289
The Accused Accuse! <i>Deputy Billoux</i>	300
How England Wages War <i>F. Schneider</i>	309
A Bolshevik Statesman <i>A. Lozovsky</i>	325
The War and the Working Class <i>M. Lode</i>	331

Published by Modern Books, Ltd., 4a Parton Street, London, W. C. 1

MAY DAY MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

PROLETARIANS and working people throughout the world!

May Day, the day of international proletarian solidarity, is being celebrated by the working people in the ominous surroundings of a new imperialist war. Never yet has the idea of international proletarian solidarity been of such vital significance for the workers of all lands, as during these days of the war conflagration that has enveloped Europe and Asia.

The war in Europe has already lasted eight months, but the end of it is far from being in sight. The theater of military operations is extending ever further. The imperialist potentates are forcibly drawing into the war the colonial peoples under their sway. The longer the war lasts, the clearer does it become that the small neutral countries are "small change" in the hands of the imperialists. In answer to the gross violation by England and France of the neutrality of the Scandinavian countries, Germany led its troops into Denmark and occupied strategic positions in Norway. England and France in their turn landed troops. The territory of Norway became a theater of war. Belgium and Holland are threatened. Yet another war base is being prepared in the Near East. The struggle of the im-

perialist powers for the Balkans, and for supremacy in the Mediterranean, threatens to draw additional capitalist states into the war. Preparations to intervene in the war are being made by Italy, which has strengthened its positions in Spain and the Balkans.

In the Far East, Japan has for almost three years been waging a war of conquest against China. It wants to transform that great country with its population of four hundred million people into its colony. Ruined and exhausted by the war, it is hastening to force its predatory "peace" on China, so as to have its hands free to participate in the further repartition of the world. The strike between the imperialists in the Pacific threatens to develop into new wars. A dispute has already begun among Japan, England and the United States over the Dutch East Indies. The bourgeoisie of the United States are, as a beginning, stretching out their hands to Iceland, Greenland and the possessions of Britain and France in the Caribbean Sea.

The capitalist miscreants are dragging the peoples into a new world imperialist carnage.

Facing the capitalist world, which is in the throes of the fever of war, stands the great land of socialism.

The British and French warmongers and their Social-Democratic lickspittles are furious at the fact that the Soviet Union occupies a position of neutrality towards their imperialist war. They are in a rage at the fact that the U.S.S.R. is unceasingly growing and gathering strength, whereas they are in the throes of imperialist contradictions and war. They are furious because the U.S.S.R. has secured the benefits of peace for its peoples, is living at peace with Germany, just as it is also desirous of living at peace with other states that do not infringe on its rights. They are in a rage because the U.S.S.R., by its policy of honest neutrality, hinders the spreading of the military conflagration to other countries. They are overcome with fear at the fact that the peace policy of the U.S.S.R. is strengthening the urge for peace of their own peoples.

The warmongers are in a fury because their provocation in Finland fell through, because the glorious Red Army did away with the base prepared by them long ago for war against the U.S.S.R. They are furious at the fact that the U.S.S.R., by concluding peace with Finland, has brought the Anglo-French provocators of war into the light of day, compelled them to show their hand and exposed their real designs to the peoples.

The capitalists would like the U.S.S.R. to conduct a policy that suits them. But the U.S.S.R. pursues its own policy, one dictated by the interests of socialism. The U.S.S.R. defends the interests of its

great people who are completing the construction of classless socialist society. Thereby it defends the interests of the working people throughout the world, the interests of all peoples. The capitalists need imperialist conquest and plunder. The U.S.S.R. needs creative labor, socialist prosperity, a happy and joyous life for the working people.

Proletarians throughout the world are justly proud of their vanguard, the great land of socialism.

Working people of the capitalist countries! The war has already brought you incredible privation and suffering. There have been no big battles yet, but the earth is already covered with the blood of the fallen. Thousands upon thousands of sailors have gone to their death in the seas and oceans. In Europe alone twenty million men have been placed under arms. They have been torn away from productive labor, from their hearths and homes. Hunger and want are knocking at the doors of families whose breadwinners have been driven to the war by the bourgeoisie. The wives, mothers and children of the men who have been mobilized have been cast to the mercy of fate.

The hungry and the poor are plundered by the bourgeoisie: by increased prices for articles of prime necessity. The people have their food rationed by the bourgeoisie, while the rich men spend their money like water and gorge themselves to the full. The workers are made to work like convicts on the chain gang, they are enslaved in the factories. By the unexampled

lengthening of the working day, by monstrous wage cuts, by terrific intensification of exploitation, the bourgeoisie sap the last drops of blood out of them. By calling the sons of the peasants to the war, they bring desolation to the countryside. By requisitioning horses, cattle, food supplies and fodder, they are ruining millions of peasant farms. Those who, by the sweat of their brows, till the land are deprived by the bourgeoisie of the fruits of their labor. The young generation of today is being doomed to death and destruction for the sake of the interests of the moneybags. Grievous thoughts torment the soldiers in the trenches as to what the morrow will bring them, as to what will happen to their families tomorrow.

The rear, however, is the scene of the disgusting orgy of the war pillagers and profiteers, who are piling up profits from the poverty of the people. For them, war is a rainfall of gold. Human blood and tears are transformed by them into shares, dividends and fabulous profits.

But the bourgeoisie, employing the slavish services of the Blums, Jouhaux, Attlees and Citrines, are conducting a furious offensive not only on the living standards of the working people. In all the capitalist countries they are establishing a reign of reactionary obscurantism, arbitrary practice, terror and disfranchisement for the working people. They are making use of the war so as to deprive the industrial workers and the toilers of town and country of the last vestiges of their

rights, where they still remain. They answer the will of the masses for peace with courts-martial, sentences of hard labor, and shootings. The Communists, the foremost fighters for the freedom and happiness of the people, are placed beyond the pale of the "law" by the bourgeoisie. They imprison, cast into concentration camps, hundreds of thousands of Communists, Spanish refugees, political emigres.

Such is what the war brings today, such is the bourgeois system of today.

And what, working people, are the bourgeoisie preparing for you tomorrow, if you do not put an end to the war, if the capitalists continue further to hold sway over you?

Europe and Asia, and perhaps other continents as well, will become transformed into the arena of sanguinary battles, the like of which the history of mankind has never seen. The war brings in its train millions of killed and crippled, millions of widows and orphans. An unbearable load of new annexations and indemnities. A wastage of material wealth and immeasurable ruin for the peoples, on a scale such as even the World War of 1914-1918 did not bring.

The bourgeoisie will place all the enormous costs of the war on your backs, working people. They will still further increase the already intolerable burden of taxation hanging round your necks. The trust magnates, bankers and stock exchange sharks will enslave you still further, will make of you, your

wives and your children their forced payers of tribute. They will establish for you a regime of brutal exploitation such as they have till now only applied in the colonies.

Under the flag of "Federated Europe" and "a new organization of the world," the imperialists are preparing to dismember big states and annex small countries, still further to intensify colonial oppression and to enslave the peoples of Europe. They will carry national oppression to such limits as were even unknown by the great empires of the past, which rose up on the bones and blood of subjugated peoples.

Proletarians and working people! Who helped, and are now helping, the bourgeoisie to deprive you and your children of your last crust of bread, to throttle you with the terror regime of bourgeois dictatorship? Who, along with the bourgeoisie, prepared the sanguinary, heinous crime of which we are witness? *The leaders of Social-Democracy and of the reformist trade unions!*

Would the world be the spectacle it is now, if they had not helped the bourgeoisie to crush the movement of the working people against capitalism that followed from the World War of 1914-1918? Like dogs on the leash they defended the capitalist system, and are defending it now. It was their Noskes who shot workers down. It was their Bauers who dulled the workers' heads with the dope of "bourgeois democracy." It was their MacDonalds who smashed general strikes. It was their Blums who, together with world reaction,

openly called, and are now calling, for a crusade against the Land of Socialism. By their policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, they prepared the way for the present arbitrary rule of the capitalists. By capitulating and surrendering to the bourgeoisie the achievements won by the working class, they assisted in bringing about the present orgy of reaction. By their complicity in acts of imperialist conquest, they contributed to the outbreak of the present war. By the policy of "non-intervention" they opened the floodgates to the deluge of war in Europe. By betraying republican Spain they made the collapse of the People's Front in France a foregone conclusion, and cleared the way for reaction throughout the capitalist world. By their shameless support of the present imperialist war, they are helping the bourgeoisie to fasten on the people chains of still worse slavery.

But the wishes of the bourgeoisie and their Social-Democratic hangers-on will not come to pass. However much the ruling class may rage, they will not escape responsibility for the present war before the peoples. They rage because the working people want freedom and not slavery, peace and not war, socialism and not capitalism. The working people are coming to understand with ever-growing clarity that there is no other salvation from the tribulations into which they have been dragged by the bourgeoisie than by a self-sacrificing, resolute struggle against imperialist wars, reaction and capi-

talism. They know that this struggle brings sacrifices in its train. But the sacrifices demanded of them by the bourgeoisie for the sake of maintaining their domination are a hundred times greater.

Millions of people at the front and in the rear are talking in an undertone as yet of what the Communists are saying for all to hear. Now it is not individual heroes who are opposing the imperialist war, but tens of thousands of advanced workers in all corners of the globe are raising aloft the sacred banner of *proletarian internationalism*. It was courageously raised on high by the French Communist Deputies as they were being court-martialed. Fighting under this banner are hundreds of thousands of obscure French workers. This banner is in the firm grip of the heroic fighters of republican Spain. Under this banner the foremost workers of England are demanding peace. Against the imperialist war, for peace, stands an army of five million young people in the United States; peace is the desire of the German workers and peasants, and Japanese soldiers are thirsting for the end of the war.

There is a growing and extending movement against imperialist oppression in the colonial and dependent countries. A sturdy struggle for the independence of their country is being waged by the foremost workers and peasants of India. A gallant fight is being fought for their national liberation by the great Chinese people against the Japanese invaders.

In all capitalist countries the working peoples want to put an end to the imperialist war, to the arbitrary rule of bourgeois reaction, to the mockery it makes of them. They are demanding the restoration and extension of their political rights and liberties, of human conditions of existence, a reduction of the working day, increased wages, increased pay for soldiers and allowances for their families. *Peace, bread and freedom—such is the battlecry of the many millions of the army of labor.*

But the mass movement is as yet divided; the bourgeoisie are attempting to hold it back by their military and police terror. To break the barriers set up by bourgeois reaction, the proletarians and working people need united action. They need it so as to merge the as yet divided and scattered movements into one mighty current. In each separate country they need a *united workers' front, a popular front of the working people, established from below by the masses.* To conduct the struggle against the imperialist war the proletariat need *united action on an international scale.*

Proletarians, working people, colonial peoples! *The guarantee of the success of your struggle lies in the unification of your forces.* Hammer out the united front of labor against the offensive of capital, the front of freedom against reaction, the front of peace against imperialist war, the front of the exploited and oppressed against their exploiters and oppressors.

Only in a ruthless struggle against the Social-Democratic leaders, against the treacherous top leaders of the Second International, can the working people establish such a fighting front. Close your ranks with the great Land of Socialism. Defend its peace policy, which expresses the innermost aspirations of the peoples of all lands.

Demonstrate on May Day for peace, against the provocators and incendiaries of war.

Mothers, wives and sisters! Demand for all to hear, before it is late, the return of your sons, husbands and brothers!

Working people! Fight for the financial burdens of the war to be placed on the backs of the rich! Demand the confiscation of war profits!

Demand freedom for your press, organizations and meetings!

Demand the liberation of the gallant French Communist deputies and all fighters against the imperialist war and reaction. Prison for the war pillagers and profiteers! Freedom for the captives of capital!

The Communist International calls on you, workers, to take your stand under the glorious banner of proletarian internationalism, under the great banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, for only under this banner will you win victory.

Down With Imperialist War!

Down With Capitalist Reaction!

Peace to the Peoples!

Long Live the U.S.S.R., the Bulwark of Peace, Freedom and Socialism!

Long Live the Fraternal Alliance of the Workers of All Lands!

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

WHO BETRAYED THE FRENCH PEOPLE?

BY A. MEUNIER

THE imperialist bourgeoisie and ruling circles of France who have dragged the French people into war are persecuting the French Communists and all revolutionary workers with unprecedented ferocity. In conjunction with Blum, Jouhaux and other leaders of the Socialist and Radical-Socialist Parties, they are waging a wild campaign of lies and vilification against all those who refuse to support the imperialist bourgeoisie, against those who are opposing the war and advocating peace.

The French "Socialist" leaders, headed by Blum, are doing all they can to convince the world with their vows, tears and "word of honor" that France and England (i.e., the French and English financial oligarchy) are not pursuing the present war for imperialist aims. To deceive the masses the French bourgeoisie and the "Socialists" go on repeating the threadbare story: France and England are pursuing the war wholly and solely for the purpose of protecting the democratic rights and liberties of their own and other peoples, of ensuring equality and independence for all peoples. The crude reality of the whole foreign and home policy of

France after the first imperialist war proves the opposite, however.

Ever since Versailles, the foreign policy of France has been distinctly imperialist, military-aggressive and reactionary.

As a result of the World War of 1914-18 and of the Versailles Treaty, France not only established her military and political hegemony in Western Europe, but also enlarged her territory and greatly changed the structure of her national economy. France, which next to England is the biggest colonial power and whose colonial possessions are from eighteen to twenty times her own size, thus became the most powerful economic and military state on the continent in Western Europe. The aim of the whole foreign policy of the ruling classes of France since Versailles has been to establish, consolidate and increase this hegemony and to build a durable financial and economic foundation for the whole of the Versailles system with the object of using it as a base and a powerful weapon for further expansion and further conquests.

This policy has been most consistently pursued against Germany. French imperialism was not satis-

fied with having defeated, disarmed and dismembered Germany and Austria-Hungary. It imposed on Germany enormous indemnities amounting to tens of billions of marks in the form of "reparations." In addition, French imperialism pursued the object of imposing its direct financial and military control over Germany. The French bourgeoisie systematically interfered in the internal politics of Germany, it helped the German bourgeoisie to overthrow and suppress the democratic forces in the country and to strangle the revolution. Lastly, the French imperialist bourgeoisie occupied the Rhine and Ruhr provinces and tried to dismember Germany still more by separating Bavaria and by establishing a buffer state on the Rhine. The imperialist plans of the French bourgeoisie were so far-reaching that they threatened the position of British imperialism, and British imperialism began to resist them.

From the very outset the foreign policy of France towards the Soviet Union was distinctly reactionary and aggressive. For three years—from October, 1917, to the end of 1920—France was at the head of a number of military campaigns against the Land of Soviets. France organized and supported military intervention in the Crimea, in the Ukraine, in Siberia and in the North. It was France who instigated Poland to go to war against the Soviet Union in 1920.

But this did not satisfy the French bourgeoisie: it organized on the Western frontiers of the Soviet

Union what was called the "sanitary cordon" against Bolshevism. France was the initiator of various "anti-Soviet blocs" and "ententes" from the Baltic to the Black Sea. France persistently set everything in motion to achieve Marshal Foch's plan of forming a European "Holy Alliance" against the Soviet Union. She stinted no capital in Poland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Jugoslavia, she lent billions to Poland, reorganized and controlled the Polish army, all with the object of setting up a military coalition against the Soviet Union. More than that, it is common knowledge that the French imperialist bourgeoisie had planned a great military invasion of the Soviet Union in 1929-30. Even after 1930, the foreign policy of France still strongly reflected the aggressive anti-Soviet propensities of the French bourgeoisie.

Towards the colonies and the so-called "mandate territories" the French bourgeoisie has been pursuing a reactionary policy of unbridled exploitation. On the pretext of utilizing the resources of the colonies in a rational manner, France set to work to exhaust these resources and in doing so subjected the population of these territories to unprecedented exploitation. France established its rule in the colonies by means of fire and sword.

In conjunction with the Spanish dictator Primo de Rivera, France in 1925 waged a war of extermination against the Riffs in Morocco, certainly not with the object of "democratizing" the country and of protecting the "freedom and inde-

pendence" of the people. In her war against the Druses in 1926, which ended with the seizure of Syria, France, likewise, was not prompted by humanitarian considerations. Nor was it a sense of justice and love of freedom that prompted the French bourgeoisie to wage a sanguinary war against the peaceful population of Indo-China.

* * *

The foreign policy of the ruling circles of France remained virtually unchanged even after the establishment of the People's Front in 1936. The program of the People's Front demanded the adoption of decisive measures against the reactionary parties in the country and against the financial oligarchy, which was influencing the foreign policy of France. The program of the People's Front demanded the protection and extension of the democratic rights of the French people, a struggle to protect universal peace and the freedom, independence and security of all peoples. The leading circles of France, however, pursued a policy that was the very antithesis of this. The governments directed by Blum, Chautemps and Daladier pursued a policy which nullified the struggle to protect universal peace and thus accelerated the outbreak of war.

By its policy of "non-intervention" in Spain, the Blum Government paved the way for the betrayal of the interests of democracy and of the French people. The war waged by the Spanish people

against internal reaction and foreign military intervention was a just, democratic and progressive war, a national war for liberty. In this war the Spanish people not only fought in their own interests, but also in the interests of the French people. Nevertheless, the Blum Government, and later, the Chautemps Government, deprived republican Spain of the right to purchase arms. These governments pursued the object by every means, even by direct intervention, of securing the defeat of republican Spain.

By this disgraceful policy of "non-intervention" the French bourgeoisie and the leaders of the Socialist Parties once again displayed their hatred for democracy in general, and for the democratic liberties and independence of other peoples in particular. The roots of this policy are profoundly reactionary and imperialist. The French and English financial oligarchies were deeply interested in securing the defeat of the national revolutionary struggle of the Spanish people, for a victory of the Spanish people would have strengthened and extended the People's Front in France. But such a victory would have also strengthened the resistance of the French and English people to the reactionary and imperialist policy of their governments. The reactionary bourgeoisie of France and England were aware that a real People's Front at home would have prevented the preparations for a great imperialist war as well as the conduct of such a war. By sacrific-

ing Spain they undermined the democratic unity of the masses in France and England. By eliminating the masses of the people from political life, the English and French bourgeoisie strove to create a safe rear in the event of war.

It was these considerations that guided the rulers of France and England in their conduct during the Czechoslovakian crisis. They traded in the freedom and independence of peoples with the object of provoking war between Germany and the Soviet Union. On March 19, 1939, Coulondre, the French Ambassador in Berlin, stated in an official report to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, Bonnet, that he was trying to ascertain "what direction the advance of Germany's dynamics would take." And he added: "I will ascertain *whether we can still count on these dynamics taking an exclusively Eastern direction*, and will then draw certain practical conclusions for our objects."*

Thus, it is openly stated in this official document that the main line of French foreign policy was to divert Germany to the East. Germany, however, hesitated. Then the so-called "information" campaign was started with the object of inducing Germany to set up a separate Ukrainian state as a German protectorate. This campaign conducted by the French, English and American imperialists was exposed by Comrade Stalin, six months be-

fore the outbreak of the present war in Europe, in his report at the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The imperialists of France and England did not desist, however. In France and England, as well as in the colonies, hurried measures were taken on a large scale to mobilize material and human reserves. The armies and navies were put on a war footing. At the same time, military alliances were ostentatiously concluded with Poland and Rumania in order to stimulate these countries to plunge into military adventures.

This criminal plan of the English and French warmongers was nevertheless strongly counteracted by the Soviet Union with its consistent peace policy. The masses of the people in England and France demanded that their governments establish a peace front with the Soviet Union in order to avert the outbreak of war. The warmongers were compelled to pretend that they were prepared to discuss this with the Soviet Union. Indeed, they started negotiations in anticipation, however, that the Soviet Union, like tsarist Russia in its day, would place its army at the disposal of the English and French imperialists. They obviously overlooked the fact that the Soviet Union was pursuing its own independent foreign policy, the object of which is to protect the interests of its people who are engaged in the work of socialist construction. They overlooked the fact that it was not the object of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union

* Quoted from the *Yellow Book*, document No. 80, in *l'Europe Nouvelles*, special number, December 23, 1939, p. 1434.

to protect the interests of the London and Paris bankers.

The Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact aroused the rulers of England and France and their "Socialist" lickspittles to fury, for this pact thwarted all their war plans and intrigues. Above all, this pact dealt a severe blow to England's traditional policy of using others as her cat's paw, of provoking conflicts and war, of fishing in troubled waters and of playing the role of supreme arbiter in the relations between countries.

As is well known, the English and French imperialists who had provoked their ally and vassal Poland to plunge into the military adventure against Germany subsequently left Poland in the lurch. This thoroughly corrupt and reactionary Polish state, this prison of disfranchised peoples, collapsed at the first impact. Nevertheless, the war is being continued, and the French and English bourgeoisie are exerting every effort to spread the war and to convert Europe, and even the whole world, into one vast field of military operations. This new plan of the French and English imperialists is also being thwarted by the peace policy of the powerful Soviet Union, which is maintaining strict neutrality.

The English and French imperialists, having dug themselves in behind the Maginot Line, next instigated Finland to go to war against the Soviet Union, always with the object of extending the area of war. The Finnish adventure, now collapsed, was only a link in the chain

of strategical and political plans of the Anglo-French bloc. The latter has many war plans of this kind on its shelves. As the plan to provoke Germany to fight the Soviet Union has fallen through and the plans to draw the Scandinavian countries into the war has failed, why not build and concentrate an army of colonial troops in Syria? Let us send Weygand to Syria and bring pressure on Turkey and the Balkan countries! Let us get hold of Belgium and the other neutral countries and force them into the war! Let us create major and minor theaters of war in as many parts of the world as possible! Such is the point of view of the ruling circles in Paris and London.

The leaders of the French Radicals and "Socialists" are loath to speak about the aims of the war openly. They make shift in their declarations with demagogical and commonplace phrases about equality, justice and ethics. The war aims, however, are determined by the ruling classes and not by their political lackeys, the Blums, Attlees, Jouhaux and Citrines.

What are the aims of the financial oligarchies of France and England? Above all, they want to hold fast to their colonial empires and to their "right" to rob, exploit and oppress the Indian, Indo-Chinese and other people without hindrance. They want to bring about the military collapse, territorial dismemberment and complete subjugation of Germany. They want to convert Germany into an obedient tool of the Anglo-French war bloc in its

struggle against the Soviet Union. They want to establish the military, political, financial and economic tutelage of France and England over all the other European nations. They want to establish a European federation, or federations, in which the Anglo-French bloc will be supreme.

This war, for which the English and French imperialists have been systematically preparing for the last twenty years, and which they are now extending and desire to bring to a "victorious conclusion," is nothing more nor less than a continuation and consequence of the imperialist foreign policy they have been pursuing for years.

* * *

By betraying the program of the People's Front in the sphere of foreign politics, in regard to protecting peace, Daladier, Blum, Faure and Jouhaux betrayed this program also in the sphere of French home politics.

The bourgeoisie considered that it would be impossible to wage an imperialist war unless they enchained "their" workers, unless they increased working hours, speeded up labor, reduced wages, oppressed still further the colonial peoples and overthrew the "internal" enemy.

The rallying of broad masses of the people under the banner of the People's Front, which for three years (1934-36) organized vast mass actions of the working people, and the unity of the trade unions

brought about on the basis of the class struggle, represented a great political achievement for the proletariat. During the period of the People's Front the industrial workers, office workers, peasants and the petty bourgeoisie succeeded in achieving a number of concessions and reforms which improved their conditions.

The reactionary bourgeoisie, determined to nullify the achievements of the People's Front, launched a counter-offensive. This counter-offensive of the bourgeoisie was made possible by the assistance rendered it by the leaders of the Socialist and Radical-Socialist parties, by the Jouhaux-Belin groups in the Confederation Generale du Travail, and several other politicians who had formerly belonged to the People's Front movement.

At the culminating point of the success of the People's Front, the Blum Government set all the machinery of government in operation against the workers and the masses of the working people. It proclaimed a "pause," that is to say, actually a cessation of social legislation. The Blum Government suspended the introduction of the peasant's insurance plan, refused to pay old-age pensions and emphatically opposed the introduction of democratic reforms in the system of taxation. The Blum Government suppressed the workers' strike movement with the aid of the police, and condoned the flight of capital. In this manner, the Blum Government sabotaged the People's Front, which had put it into

power. At the same time it helped the big capitalists who sabotaged the financing of industry and caused a panic on the money market. The Blum Government did everything to discredit the People's Front politically and to weaken it.

After Leon Blum had achieved "considerable success" in this direction, he went a step further. He took the trouble to form—as a counterblast to the People's Front, this unification of the masses of the working people under the leadership of the proletariat that was fighting the bourgeoisie—a coalition of all parties except the Communist Party.

The Daladier Government took more decisive measures to smash the People's Front. In this it was supported not only by the Radicals and "Socialists," but also by all the parties and groups of the big capitalists. From the time Daladier came to power (April, 1938), to the beginning of December, 1939, the Chamber of Deputies was in session in all only fifty hours. This was enough, however, for it to pass the following decrees: abolition of the forty-hour week; penal measures against workers in munition factories who refused to work overtime; prosecution of those who opposed the working of overtime; as well as a number of other decrees which have greatly worsened the conditions of the working class.

In March, 1939, the Chamber granted Daladier emergency powers which authorized him still further to curtail democratic liberties, increase working hours, reduce

wages, and partly or entirely to withdraw concessions previously gained by the workers. Several days later, on March 20, the decree introducing a sixty-hour week was promulgated. The National Council of the Socialist Party rejected the proposal of the Communist Party to take joint action against these emergency decrees and adopted a resolution prohibiting joint action with the Communists. Some time later, in May, the Socialist Party, at its Congress in Nantes, prohibited its members from collaborating with the Communists and demanded the dissolution of the Friends of the Soviet Union society, the French People's Aid, and other democratic organizations. The Socialists thus severed their last contacts with the Communists, and gave their "sympathies" for the People's Front a "third class funeral." The Socialists then definitely and openly set out to form a bourgeois imperialist coalition. War was in the air.

Thus, the reactionary offensive against the democratic liberties of the French people and against the social and economic achievements of the working class was started long before the Soviet-German pact of non-aggression was concluded. Similarly, the "Socialists" and Radical-Socialists smashed the unity of the French proletariat in the People's Front long before this pact was concluded.

On August 25, 1939, the decree militarizing all munition factories was issued. This decree affected over two million workers. The

workers were subjected to the conditions and requirements of military discipline. Any worker who stays away from work or leaves a job is liable to a penalty of five years' imprisonment.

In August, 1939, the government suppressed *l'Humanité*, the central organ of the Communist Party, which had a daily circulation ranging from 350,000 to 400,000. It suppressed the other publications of the Communist Party and also *Ce Soir*, an evening newspaper that was sympathetic to the Communists. By the end of August, 1939, the reactionary and imperialist bourgeoisie were already in command of all the key positions in the state apparatus.

* * *

After the general mobilization on September 1, 1939, and particularly after the declaration of war on Germany on September 3, 1939, France was put completely under the heel of the military and police dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie. On September 3, the weekly rest-day for workers in state establishments as well as in private enterprises engaged in war work was abolished. On September 7, a decree was issued lengthening the working week to seventy-two hours (eleven to twelve hours per day); at the same time, collective agreements and courts of arbitration were abolished. As a consequence of the mobilization of male workers for military service, women, old men and children were brought into

industry, particularly in the metal and chemical industries, where they are also compelled to work eleven to twelve hours a day. With the issue of the decree of November 11, the last and most important social achievement of the working class, namely, the right to elect factory councils, was liquidated. All these measures were accompanied everywhere by reductions in wages.

The cost of living is rising, but the purchasing power of the workers is steadily declining. The decree of November 10, 1939, established a "stabilized" wage, completely ignoring the steadily rising prices. Since August, 1939, the publication of the cost of living index, as well as of the wholesale prices of a number of articles of mass consumption, has ceased. *Le Peuple* in a leading article in its issue of January 25, 1940, was compelled to admit on the basis of a private investigation that "in a number of districts in France, the cost of living index has risen 25 to 30 points."

Although large numbers of workers have been called up for military service, and in spite of the fact that the war industries and agriculture need labor, there are still large numbers of unemployed in France. It must be stated that in many factories mobilized workers are working for a miserable soldiers' pittance. The *London Economist* in an article comparing the conditions of the workers in England and France wrote that five million Frenchmen had been mobilized, and a large number of these are working in the munition factories getting no more

than soldiers' pay. In the other industries in France, mostly women, old men and children are employed, and their wages are much below the average.

The conditions of the working class have become worse for a number of other reasons; speed-up, police supervision in the factories, and difficulties connected with the evacuation of factories, etc. At the slightest protest, the workers are sent off to the front, or to prison or concentration camps.

Since the war began, the conditions of the peasantry and, in particular, of the small and middle peasants, have also steadily become worse. Exceptionally hard are the conditions of the agricultural laborers who even before the war barely eked out a livelihood. The whole bourgeois and "Socialist" press is discussing the catastrophic condition of agriculture. *Matin* of January 30, 1940, reported that thousands of tons of beets are rotting in the ground. The fields remain unplowed and barely 10 per cent of the winter crop was sown.

All this is due mainly to the shortage of labor in agriculture: 60 per cent, and in a number of districts up to 90 per cent, of the able-bodied rural male population have been mobilized for the army. The mass requisition of agricultural produce, as well as the requisition of cattle by the military authorities, is still further ruining agriculture.

The conditions of agriculture have been aggravated by the fact that owing to the shortage of fodder a large number of horses have per-

ished. At the same time, however, the big landowners and the rich peasants are becoming richer with the aid of the state. They are making enormous profit out of army contracts and by speculating in agricultural produce. The peasants' program of the People's Front was betrayed by the Socialists and Radicals just as they betrayed the program of struggle for peace and the program of social and economic demands of the working class.

* * *

The program of the People's Front, which the Communist Party alone is consistently defending, contained the demand for the democratic reform of the fiscal system, the demand for reducing the burden of taxation for the masses of the people, and for a heavy and graduated tax on big capital. It also demanded a fundamental reorganization of the Banque de France, control of banking, prevention of the flight of capital, etc. The Blum, Chautemps and Daladier governments hindered the execution of this financial program of the People's Front, and, obeying the dictates of the bourgeoisie, pursued a policy of plundering the masses.

During the past four years, military expenditure has increased almost fourfold. In 1936, this expenditure amounted to 15,250,000,000 francs; in 1939 it amounted to over 50,000,000,000 francs. The ordinary budget for 1940 amounts to 79,000,000,000 francs, whereas the expenditure on war for 1940 is estimated

at 250,000,000,000 francs (calculated from the sum assigned for this purpose in the first quarter). To this must be added the sum of 15,000,000,000 francs for the maintenance of soldiers' families. In the press, it is being freely stated that the amount of 1,000,000,000 francs per day on war expenditure is an underestimation rather than an overestimation.

Where does the government get the money to cover its expenditure, and where will it obtain these sums in the future? On August 31, 1939, the national debt of France amounted to 445,000,000,000 francs. In the middle of August, notes in circulation amounted to 144,000,000,000 francs. With these astronomical figures how is the financial problem to be solved? Who will pay to meet this war expenditure? To this question the premier, Paul Reynaud, then Minister of Finance, made the following reply in the Senate on December 28, 1939: "The French will pay—we must always bear that in mind!" In other words, the working class, the peasants, the masses of the people, will pay. They will have to meet the expenditures for a war waged in the interests of the capitalists.

* * *

The program of the People's Front demanded an energetic peace policy. Blum, Daladier, Jouhaux and Co., however, pursued a policy that is dictated by the interests of French imperialism. They prepared

for the imperialist war, and they drove the French people into it. *They betrayed the cause of peace.*

The People's Front united the proletariat and the masses of the working people to fight reaction and to protect and extend democratic rights and liberties. Daladier, Blum, Jouhaux and Co., however, pursued a policy of systematically restricting these liberties; they paved the way for their complete abolition and for the introduction of a military police dictatorship. *They betrayed the cause of people's liberty.*

The People's Front demanded a number of social and economic reforms for the benefit of the working class, the peasants, office employees, civil servants and the urban petty bourgeoisie. Blum, Daladier, Jouhaux and Co. pursued a policy that was entirely in the interests of big capital and nullified the achievements of the proletariat and the working people. *They betrayed the interests of the workers, the peasants and of all working people.*

Blum, Daladier, Jouhaux and the other leaders of the Socialist and Radical-Socialist Parties and trade unions solemnly promised on July 14, 1936, that they would exert every effort to carry out the People's Front program. They posed as stern Jacobins and threatened the bourgeoisie with a new edition of the revolutions of 1848 and 1871. *Actually, however, they have proved themselves to be thrice perfidious: they have betrayed the cause of peace, the cause of demo-*

cratic liberties and the vital interests of the people!

It is becoming clearer and clearer every day to the French proletariat and the French people who are their friends and who their enemies and betrayers of their interests. They are seeing more and more clearly who is deceiving them and robbing them of their freedom.

* * *

The Communist Party of France is the only party that has remained true to the program of the People's Front. It is still championing the demands and interests of the proletariat and the masses of the people. It is continuing the struggle to protect these interests, to unite the proletariat, to restore and strengthen trade union unity, to strengthen the Confederation Generale du Travail, to achieve the fighting alliance of the proletariat, the peasants and the other working people. The outbreak of the war and its continuation have exposed the shameful treachery of the leaders of the Radical-Socialist and Socialist Parties, of the Jouhaux followers and of all the other elements who had joined the People's Front with the object of disrupting it. That is why the Communists now regard it as their duty to fight these "Socialist" and Radical-Socialist leaders, to fight these

traitors who have proved to be an obstacle in the people's path of emancipation from the yoke of reaction and police tyranny, from the burdens and sufferings of the imperialist war.

The discontent of the proletariat, the masses of the working people and the soldiers, their movement for peace, their resistance to the capitalist offensive, their anger at the oppressive laws and military and police terrorism of the reaction are only in their initial stages as yet.

The longer the war lasts, the harder and more terrible will its consequences be for the masses of the people, and the more will its imperialist, predatory and reactionary class character be revealed. The more unrestrained the police tyranny becomes, and the more the vile and repulsive treachery of the "Socialist" leaders and their cringing before the bourgeoisie are revealed, the more clearly will the masses understand that the political position of the Communist Party, its directives, advice, warnings and slogans were right, and the more will the workers, peasants and soldiers heed the voice of the Communists, respond to the calls of the Communist Party and wage the struggle against the war and against their own imperialist bourgeoisie.

THE ACCUSED ACCUSE!

SPEECH OF DEPUTY BILLOUX IN THE NAME OF THE ACCUSED COMMUNIST DEPUTIES

NEITHER the Communist Deputies nor Communism are on trial here.

There is not a single serious element in the entire arsenal of laws established to serve the capitalist class that can justify the Communist Deputies being imprisoned and hauled before the courts.

The history of societies and regimes contain periods when the ruling classes are only able to maintain themselves in power at the cost of violating their own legal system. We know of such examples in the history of our country, but we also see that sooner or later the people put an end to such dictatorships by revolutionary means.

With what are we charged?

We are charged with having, in accordance with parliamentary procedure, formed a parliamentary group, and as Deputies written to the Chairman of the Chamber a letter in which we requested him to convene Parliament to discuss questions of peace. These are the grounds for our arrest and for our being put on trial.

The letter, just as the formation of the group itself, is permitted by the absolute immunity and inviolability decree for national represen-

tation in Article 13 of the Constitutional Law of 1875.

Consequently, when we addressed such a letter, not only were we within our absolute right, but we were also fulfilling our duty as Deputies.

More than this, the Government arbitrarily made a diplomatic act—the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact—the basis of a wide campaign of anti-Communist persecution. It wanted to compel us to disavow and condemn the Soviet side; when we refused to submit to this strange and unprecedented demand, action was taken against us.

For four months justification for persecuting us was found in our refusal to admit the Government's thesis regarding the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact. The assertion was made that we had excluded ourselves from the nation. Part of the French public has been led to believe that this is the reason for the persecution that has been let loose against us.

We assert that this version is a shameless lie. We assert that the Government itself has only just admitted this lie in its *Yellow Book*. In the document, quoted in the book under Document No. 149 and head-

ed "Note of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. Georges Bonnet, About His Conversation with the German Ambassador in Paris, Count Welczek," there is the following phrase:

"I finally told the Ambassador that he could note in France the movement of national unanimity that had taken place around the Government; elections would be suspended, public meetings banned, and attempts at foreign propaganda, whatever they may be—crushed; *we shall bring the Communists to their senses. . .*"

This document is dated July 1, 1939. At that time there was no question at all of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact, of whether the Communists would or would not approve it.

On July 1, *i.e.*, two months before the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact was signed, the French Government, which was at that time engaged in negotiations with Moscow, declared in an official note that it was its policy to crush the Communists. So let them not resort to false designs, petty tricks, miserable subterfuges! Let them not refer to a cause which was only a pretext, and what is more, a bad pretext! Let them stop accusing us of an attitude which we held at the end of August and in September, 1939.

Our persecutors, on their own admission, had decided as far back as July 1 to deal their foul blow.

True, they subsequently attempted to invent other pretexts. Against us there was launched a campaign of the foulest calumny, while we

were deprived of all means of defending ourselves. Does this not prove that what those who govern our country fear more than anything else is to let the truth of our trial be known.

Let it be so. . . . We told this truth at the preliminary examinations, and we shall tell it now. Our defenders will answer the indictment. The task we have is to indict those who are our accusers.

We were arrested and brought before the courts for being Communists, for remaining Communists despite all blandishments, threats and persecution.

We were brought before the courts for having opposed, and for now opposing, with all our energy, the imperialist war which is covering our country with blood; for calling on the people to demand the speediest ending of the war and the conclusion of a just and durable peace; for showing the French people how to make our country free and happy.

Neither the trial, the sentence, nor concentration camps will prevent the Communists doing this supremely human work.

The French rulers and the capitalists on whose behalf they are operating are attempting to persuade the people that the responsibility for the war is a one-sided one, that they themselves are in no way to blame, that the people of France are fighting for justice, liberty and the independence of the people.

It is a lie! A shameless lie, to which the warmongers resort when-

ever they lead the people to the slaughterhouse.

We were the first in this country to proclaim the danger of international fascism to world peace. We, it was, who, with the greatest zeal, exposed Hitlerism to the French public.

Although we never preached war as a means of doing away with this hated regime, although we always asserted that the liberation of the German people must be the work of the German people themselves, we stood for the policy of organizing resistance to the ambitions of fascism. For years we urged on the French Government: Either you exert all your efforts to save the peace and the independence of the country, by uniting all men of good will throughout Europe, or you will sabotage this effort and will bear the responsibility for the war that will then break out.

We shall be implacable enemies of this war which you had no desire to avert, this war which may spread over the whole world, because you placed the defense of capitalist privileges above concern for the peace and independence of nations.

It is this war that is now raging over ill-fated Europe.

The culprit is the capitalist regime, which, to use Jaures' words, "bears war within itself as the cloud bears the storm."

The instigators of the war want to adorn it with all the virtues. They mask their real war aims, for they are perfectly well aware that the people will not fight for the sordid interests of a handful of exploiters.

The present war, like the war of 1914-18, is a war of the capitalists. It is a result of the conflict between capitalist groups for markets, raw materials, for the possibility of exploiting the colonial peoples.

It is for the domination of one group of capitalist powers over another that millions of working people are fighting today.

We have said, and we repeat now, that the working class, all working people, have nothing in common with this war. All it offers is death to millions of their brothers, bitter want and ruin, and the destruction of their liberties—while the financial and industrial oligarchies will draw and are already drawing huge profits out of it.

The war culprits? We refuse to be accomplices in the monstrous deception which consists, in each country, in placing the responsibility for the war exclusively on the enemy governments.

There are war culprits in our country as well! These are, in the first instance, the Government and its head, Daladier, who rules the state against the people and in the interests of the minority, made up of the big millionaires.

We can proudly contrast our constant struggle for peace to the perfidious intrigues of the government which did not cease to pile up the causes of the present war.

Here are a few facts, beginning with the year 1935:

The Home Agreements, signed by M. Laval. When they were voted on, the Communists abstained, while the French Socialist leaders endorsed them. These agreements

gave Mussolini full freedom in throttling unfortunate Ethiopia. The Communists alone opposed these agreements which bore within them the seeds of war.

M. Blum, the leader of the French Socialist Party, by his criminal so-called "non-intervention" policy enabled the rebel General Franco, hireling of Hitler and Mussolini, enemy of France, to destroy the Spanish Republic. The Communists alone came to the defense of this friendly, democratic republic.

M. Chautemps allowed Hitler to lay his hands on Austria, a member of the League of Nations.

M. Daladier handed over to Hitler another member of the League of Nations, Czechoslovakia, with all its raw materials, its army, war materials and war plants. And Daladier, together with the Munichites, asserted: Peace is saved! The Communists alone said: The treachery at Munich means war! War and fascism!

It is now clear to everyone that the governments of London and Paris engaged in their machinations both before and after Munich: they strove to reach agreement with Hitler Germany, while urging it on to attack the Soviet Union. In pursuit of this policy they encouraged Hitler's ally of yesterday and his accomplice in carving up Czechoslovakia, the government of Warsaw, in its refusal to permit the passage of Soviet troops through Poland.

As is confirmed in the *Yellow Book*, by M. Coulondre's messages to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs,

the rejection of the Soviet proposals doomed the Moscow negotiations to failure and rendered impossible the achievement of a pact, which alone could have saved peace.

But, once the war broke out, one of the aims which our rulers do not yet dare to admit, but which they are hiding with ever diminishing success, is the organization of a crusade against the U.S.S.R. and the seizure of the oil of the Caucasus.

Hence, the campaigns of slander and provocation being multiplied everywhere, from the Far North to the Near East, campaigns with the aid of which it is hoped to prepare the minds of the working people and to win them for an anti-Soviet adventure.

But disagreeable surprises await those responsible for this policy. For the French working people will never forget that France's genius is that of liberty. Never will they join in such an adventure. As in 1919, they will rise up against criminal governments which would betray the glorious calling and the great world mission of France.

We have been dragged before the courts because we, and we alone, have been courageous enough to call for the downfall of the Daladier Government, the government upon which lies the responsibility for the war and which is introducing reaction and Hitlerite methods into our country.

How can they, who are destroying liberty at home, dare to speak of a war for liberty.

The Daladier government is guilty of perfidy towards the Com-

munist Deputies of the people, who represent one and a half million electors who are now deprived of the right freely to elect their deputies.

It has banned France's biggest political newspaper—*l'Humanité*.

It has disbanded France's biggest political party, the French Communist Party, and confiscated its property.

It is behaving in exactly the same way towards workers', peasants', cultural and educational organizations, towards organizations of handicraft workers, members of the free professions, ex-servicemen.

It is furiously attacking everything that the working people of France have created by years of persistent efforts: trade unions, co-operatives, civil and sports organizations, organizations for the protection of mother and child, summer camps, etc.

It is reviving the days of the *Lettres de Cachet* and, as M. Daladier himself has admitted in the Senate, is flinging thousands upon thousands of French citizens into jail and is establishing concentration camps in France.

In the factories it is putting an end to social legislation. It is doing away with the social achievements of civil service workers. It is removing, persecuting, prosecuting and condemning the people's representatives in Parliament, the municipalities and county councils, in arbitration commissions, and is disbanding shop stewards, etc.

The banning of newspapers and journals, the confiscation and de-

struction of books and literary masterpieces crown this catalog of valorous deeds of the Daladier government.

Wages and salaries of workers, office employees and civil servants have been cut, while 15 per cent of earnings are being held back (this does not affect the police). We do not speak of other taxes with which workers are being burdened: taxes totaling eleven and one-half billion francs are levied on the working people, while only two hundred millions come from the profits of the employers—such are the figures which came to light during the budget debates. Overtime is paid for at ridiculous rates, while the cost of living is going up with every passing day and unemployment still continues.

The small farmers have their goods requisitioned at low prices, while their products are paid for below value. The families of men called up for service in the army have constantly to put up with the non-payment of allowances. Refugees from the frontal regions have to endure the scandalously arranged evacuation.

Handicraftsmen, small traders, the infirm, the old people, all the small folk are suffering want and ruin.

Poverty for the people!

Profits for the rich!

Such a government does not represent the country. It can only maintain itself in power by dictatorship. We consider that the salvation of France demands the formation of a workers' and peasants'

government, giving direct expression to the interests of the nation.

The capitalists hope to be able for a long time to deceive the people, because they have the support of the Socialist Party, its leaders, the Blums, Paul Faures, Zyromskis, and the treacherous leaders of the General Confederation of Labor. All these people have advanced to the forefront of chauvinism and persecution of the working class.

The Blums, Paul Faures, Zyromskis and Jouhaux, who prevented the program of the Popular Front being put into operation, are now up to their ears in the "sacred alliance" for the imperialist war, are working to destroy the organizations of the proletariat and are the ones primarily responsible for the conditions of misery forced on the French working people.

They are showing their real face of enemies of the people.

They have taken up the anti-Comintern banner which Hitler had to abandon. We see the complete disintegration of the Second International, repeating and deepening its bankruptcy of 1914.

We are internationalists. We are the only internationalists. The working people of all races and all colors are our brothers. We feel a common bond with the miners and seamen of England, the metal workers of Essen, the dockers of Hamburg, the workers of Prague, the peasants of Poland, the fellahin of Arabia, and the coolies of China, as with the free workers and peasants of the Soviet Union.

Messrs. the Socialist leaders, who

are nothing but the paid lackeys of the capitalists, imagine that they are insulting us by calling us "Stalinites"!

What does that mean? We have always asserted, and we repeat now, that the solution of all the ills suffered by the French working people will not come from any foreign capital. Their emancipation will be their own work. They will draw inspiration from the glorious traditions of our people. But what is true is that for us, as for millions of men and women in all corners of the globe, Stalin is the brilliant continuator of the immortal work of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and the unyielding builder of socialist society.

Marx, who studied the capitalist regime at the height of its development, showed that it would be followed by another regime: communism! In 1848, Marx wrote in his *Communist Manifesto*: "A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of communism."

Thanks to Lenin and Stalin, communism is no longer a spectre: it has become a reality on one-sixth of the earth, and tomorrow will become a reality throughout the world.

Lenin, and the glorious Bolshevik Party which he fashioned, showed us in 1914-1918 how to put an end to imperialist war, liberating the workers, peasants, intellectuals and the colonial peoples.

Stalin has shown us how a country, ruined by imperialist war and capitalist anarchy, can be transformed in twenty years by building

socialism and advancing towards communism.

The French imperialists are the mortal enemies of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. That is to be understood. Their hatred of the U.S.S.R. is the hatred of a class that senses danger. The U.S.S.R. is a living example to the French people, showing them what a nation that has rid itself of parasites can become, and can do.

The Soviet Union disrupted the plans of the French capitalists. The efforts of the latter to push Hitler Germany against the Soviet Union have come to nothing.

After the world imperialist war broke out, the U.S.S.R. succeeded in narrowing down the limits of the world slaughter, and liberated 13,000,000 Byelo-Russians and Ukrainians oppressed by the Poland of the gentry, which we do not confuse with Poland of the people. The U.S.S.R. established with its Baltic neighbors friendly relations, whose beneficial character was admitted only a few weeks ago by the correspondent of the *Temps*. The countries of Northeastern Europe, and particularly Finland, could now be living a free and peaceful life, if the clique of adventurers, but yesterday linked up with the German generals, and today bound up with the London and Washington banks, had not taken the responsibility for letting loose in this part of the European continent events full of dramatic complications.

We are not deceived by the criminal adventure being prepared. We see perfectly well the crusade that

is being organized under our eyes. We know that although the actions of the Soviet Union in Finland do not in any way impinge on the national interests of France, the French Government is quite obviously preparing to replace the "strange" and "static" war in the West by an anti-Soviet intervention on a big scale.

It is to facilitate this adventure that it wants to condemn us, after having infamously slandered us. But let the government take care. If it thinks of putting into life its dream of aggression against the U.S.S.R., should it want to repeat the exploits of that policy of "barbed wire entanglements" which has caused so much harm to the French nation, then its own regime may collapse from such a venture.

The capitalists are resorting to the vilest calumnies so as to bespatter us; their Socialist lackeys are outdoing them in this: It is we whose actions are to the detriment of France! It is we who are on the payrolls of foreign countries!

How can it be that the capitalists who constitute a pernicious minority, who are squeezing the last drops of blood out of our country and are growing fat on the misery of the people, have the brazenness to identify themselves with France!

German agents—that was what M. Daladier called us in the Chamber of Deputies and in the Senate. And who is this man who dared to hurl such a monstrous accusation against us! The man of Munich, the man who delivered to Hitler Germany the airplanes, guns and mu-

nitions of Czechoslovakia which are slaughtering, and tomorrow will slaughter, our wives, our children, our brothers; the man who is responsible for the imprisonment of the German Communists who fled to France and who are the most implacable enemies of Hitler. We would not even have stressed this infamous slander, were it not necessary to call to mind that Jaures was assassinated in 1914, precisely as the result of such calumny.

The international profiteers and mercenaries, who receive rewards for their treachery, need to possess no small share of brazenness and cynicism to accuse the Communists of corruption.

Not a single Communist was mixed up in any of the scandals that followed one another in the years between 1920 and 1939. In our ranks there are no Staviskys, Colonel Guichets, clients of the Banque de Bale, heroes of the "Aero-Postale," paid agents of Abetz.

They are all to be found in the Right and "Left" parties, united in the "sacred alliance" for the imperialist war.

We love France; we love the French people. We are proud of its scientists, its thinkers, its writers, its artists, who bring it the love of the peoples of the whole world.

Throughout the whole of its history and its magnificent revolutionary past, the French people have risen up against tyrants. Does not this bring to mind the couplet of the *Marseillaise* that the capitalists are so afraid to teach the people?

We don't want to be the slaves of Hitler, the vassals of Chamberlain, or the servants of Mussolini.

Yes! We love the people of France and wish to deliver it from those who are leading it to the catacombs and ruin, from those who are subjecting it to the shame of dictatorship.

The masses of the people turn away with profound contempt from the handful of traitors who have betrayed them (Gitton, Capron, and Co.). These few renegades represent only themselves and their shame. We hand them over to the contempt of the people.

We Communists call on the people to fight for bread, liberty and peace.

Yes! We are Communists! We are proud to be the heirs of the Communards who, by their self-sacrifice, saved the republic and fought for the emancipation of the working people. Marx said of them that they had stormed the heavens.

Communism means peace, the development of the human personality and human dignity, the advance of science and the arts, the flowering of human civilization.

We are Frenchmen and that is why we want, from the bottom of our hearts, to see France free, strong and happy.

We are internationalists and that is why we regard every victory of the proletariat, in whatever country, as our own victory.

Yes! We consider the building of socialism in the U.S.S.R. to be the first act of the world revolution

which will rid the peoples of oppression and war!

We French Communists are at work to liberate our country!

We want to rid it of war!

We call on the people to dictate its will and to achieve peace!

We are confident in our country, in the France of 1793, 1830, 1848, in the France of the Paris Commune, in the France of February 1934, and of May 1936.

We have confidence in the people of France, and we are convinced

that it will soon, very soon, bear to its tomb the regime that is responsible for poverty and war. We salute the numberless masses of working people who are carrying on a valiant struggle for communism.

Under the banner of Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin, following the example of Karl Liebknecht and Dimitroff; under the leadership of the beloved leaders of the French people, Thorez, Cachin, Marty and Duclos—forward to Communism!

HOW ENGLAND WAGES WAR

BY F. SCHNEIDER

ENGLAND, who built up her empire by violence and has often been the instigator and organizer of great wars, who nearly always waged war with other's forces, compelling other people to shed their blood for her, has always posed before the world as the true guardian of peace and the freedom and independence of all nations.

British statesmen have remained true to this long established principle even in the present war. Again, the British imperialists proclaim to an astonished world: "We are at war for peace. There can be no peace worth having without freedom. Upon us have devolved the stern duty and the high honor of being the champions of freedom."*

"Our purpose in this struggle is to redeem the nations of Europe from the perpetual and recurring fear of German aggression, and to preserve their independence and liberties; we are looking beyond victory to laying the foundation of a better international system so that war may not be the lot of every succeeding generation," says Chamberlain,** repeating almost word for word what his predecessor Asquith had said in 1914.

This combination of Machiavellian lust for power and despicable hypocrisy is the ideological accompaniment of the present imperialist war; and its object is to deceive the broad masses of the people in the capitalist countries and world public opinion about the true character and the real aims of British imperialism.

1. *The Real Objects of the First and Second Imperialist Wars*

In the interview he granted to Roy Howard on March 1, 1936, Comrade Stalin said:

"You remember how the first World War arose. It arose out of the desire to redivide the world. Today we have the same background." (*The Stalin-Howard Interview*, p. 6, International Publishers, New York.)

The exploitation of colonies, semi-colonies and dependencies is one of the principal sources of capitalist enrichment and served as the most important premise for the development of industrial capital in many European countries, particularly, England.

It is common knowledge that after she had defeated the old colonial powers—Spain, Portugal, Hol-

* *The Contemporary Review*, November, 1939.

** *The Spectator*, November 10, 1939.

land and France—England became the premier colonial and industrial power. England was able to retain this colonial and industrial supremacy until the last decades of the last century. With the transition of capitalism to its imperialist stage and with the extraordinarily rapid development of industry in the most advanced capitalist countries, particularly in Germany and the United States, England's world supremacy entered into a stage of crisis. True, England managed to retain her colonial supremacy and even considerably to enlarge her colonial possessions; in industrial technique, however, she dropped behind Germany and the United States.

A bitter struggle ensued between the old colonial powers, whose spokesman and champion was England, who, moreover, was most particularly concerned, and the new imperialist rivals, headed by Germany, who also sought a "place in the sun." The object of the struggle on one side was to maintain the *status quo*, and on the other side it was to secure a redistribution of colonies, primarily to secure a monopoly of sources of raw materials and of the export of capital which, in accordance with Lenin's definition, is one of the principal means for the imperialist exploitation of backward countries.

By the beginning of the twentieth century the distribution of the world among the strongest imperialist powers was already completed. At the same time, however, the rivalry among them had

reached its highest intensity. In this connection Lenin wrote:

"For the first time the world is completely shared out, so that in the future *only redivision* is possible; territories can only pass from one 'owner' to another, instead of passing as unowned territory to an 'owner.'" (Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism," *Selected Works*, Vol. V, p. 69. International Publishers, New York.)

The English bourgeoisie alone "owned" over one-fourth of the globe. The colonial possessions of all the other imperialist powers put together were much less than those of England. Moreover, England possessed extensive spheres of influence in China and in the Near East (Iran, Afghanistan), in the Dutch and Portuguese colonies, in South America (Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, Chile, etc.), and in Europe (Portugal, Greece, the Northern countries).

In this phase of capitalist development, British imperialism strove to make up for the loss of its world industrial monopoly by retaining its colonial monopoly.

The law of uneven development of capitalism as between different countries, discovered and brilliantly formulated by Lenin, naturally and inevitably led to far-reaching changes in the alignment of economic and political forces of the various imperialist rivals. The alignment of forces between the imperialist powers that thus arose at the turn of the century stood in profound contradiction to the old

distribution of colonies. This fundamental contradiction could not be solved by peaceful means.

The rivalry between British imperialism, which was surfeited with colonies but was relatively backward in industrial technique, and German imperialism, highly developed economically, was, at the turn of the century, the most acute point in imperialist antagonisms and subsequently led to the first imperialist war. These fundamental antagonisms between German and British imperialism were interwoven in the period immediately preceding the first imperialist war with the antagonism between German and French imperialism (after the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71), as well as between combined German and Austria-Hungarian imperialism on the one hand, and Russian imperialism on the other, for supremacy in the Balkans and the Near East. The primary and supreme antagonism, however, which subsequently led to the first imperialist war, was that between British and German imperialism.

2. *England, the Classical Teacher of Colonial Imperialism*

The British Empire, which because its possessions are scattered over all continents appears everywhere as a great power, inevitably became the hub of all imperialist struggles and wars for the redivision of the world. The British Empire is still one of the main pillars of the imperialist world sys-

tem, the backbone of world reaction. This does not mean, however, that England's principal rivals are less reactionary, or more "moral." Our purpose is more to show the nature of colonial imperialism and its corresponding political methods in a historically specific case, namely, that of the British Empire; for in relation to American, German, French, Italian and Japanese imperialism, British imperialism serves as a teacher, whose classical methods are not only faithfully copied and applied by her rivals, but are being more and more employed against the teacher herself.

To pose before the world as the guardian of justice, morality, and of the loftiest human ideals, and to conceal with unctuous rhetoric, the real objects of the war that is being waged, but at the same time persistently, unscrupulously and unerringly to pursue its own selfish objects—these tactics of British imperialism have been for ages the favorite and sanctified principles of British statecraft. Marx and Engels pointed to this specific feature of British politics and diplomacy and of the ethics of the British ruling class. In his preface to the first edition of *Capital* Marx says:

"The English Established Church, e.g., will more readily pardon an attack on 38 of its 39 articles than on one-thirty-ninth of its income." (Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. XIX. International Publishers, New York.)

And in a similar connection Lenin quotes the characteristic

English proverb: "Promises are like piecrust, they are made to break."

Indeed, the history of the British Empire is an uninterrupted chain of bloody deeds and perfidy, unscrupulous piracy and naked robbery, of subtle diplomatic machinations and the deliberate instigation of white and colored peoples against each other in the interests

everywhere, particularly in America and in India. While England, whose insular position protected her from foreign invasion, was enabled to concentrate all her forces on the pursuit of her economic and overseas aims, France was repeatedly involved in European conflicts, which gradually bled her white. These wars were:

<i>Date</i>		<i>Cost</i>
1688-97	Ireland Against France.....	£32,600,000
1701-14	Spanish War of Succession.....	50,700,000
1718-21	War Against Spain.....	4,500,000
1739-48	War of the Austrian Succession.....	43,700,000
1756-63	Seven Years' War.....	82,600,000
1776-83	American War of Independence.....	97,600,000
1793-1815	The Napoleonic Wars.....	831,400,000
Total.....		£1,143,100,000

of the English exploiters; a history of wars and expeditions conducted with foreign troops on foreign soil and, on many occasions, at foreign expense; a history of shameless conquest and plunder of colonial peoples; a history of conspiracy and surreptitious murder; a history of numberless acts of treachery and corruption, brutal violence and unscrupulous intrigue.

3. *England's Wars in the Early Period of Capitalism*

Seven great wars helped to create the British Empire, wars waged directly or indirectly against France in the course of nearly one and a half centuries. All these wars were nothing more nor less than uninterrupted "trade wars," waged by the newly-risen English capitalism against a rival whom England met

The ruling classes of England regarded these sums, spent mainly on subsidies for allies, as capital investments in their world enterprise known as the British Empire. Just as is the case today, England's allies of those times had to pledge themselves not to conclude a separate peace. England's method of fighting to the last man—of their allies—goes back to the Napoleonic wars, in which she harnessed Germans, Dutch, Belgians, Spaniards, Portuguese, Austrians and Russians to serve her interests; just as in the last World War she harnessed Frenchmen, Russians and Hindus, and in this war, she has harnessed Hindus, Canadians, Australians and other peoples that she threatens to draw into the war. It is noteworthy that in the Napoleonic Wars,

which lasted nearly a quarter of a century, from 1793 to 1815, and in which millions were killed, only 20,000 Englishmen were killed.

During the Napoleonic wars, England, in retaliation to Napoleon's continental blockade, systematically destroyed all enemy and also neutral fleets, not sparing even those of allied states, thus committing heinous and unprecedented crimes. From 1793 to 1807 England destroyed or captured two French, two Danish, two Dutch fleets, one Spanish and one Neapolitan fleet, and at Trafalgar the Franco-Spanish fleet. It is to England's despotism on the seas and to the lawlessness that prevailed on the high seas at that time, that Mephistopheles in Goethe's *Faust* refers when he says:

*Who hath the power, has still the right;
The What is asked for, not the How.
Else know I not the seaman's art:
War, commerce, piracy, I trow,
A trinity, we may not part.*

But all these acts of tyranny and crime committed by the ruling classes of England on the sea pale before the cold-blooded and deliberate attacks on the Danish fleet in peace-time, started by the atrocious bombardment of Copenhagen on April 2, 1801. England's unbridled tyranny on the sea, from which the neutral countries suffered most, resulted in the formation in 1801 of the League of Neutrals headed by the tsar, Paul I. At that time Denmark was England's principal rival on the sea. In his report to the British Government, Nelson char-

acteristically said in reference to this: "I regard the Nordic League as a tree, of which Paul is the trunk and Sweden and Denmark are the branches."* This allegorical report was soon followed up with by no means allegorical action. The "trunk" was felled, that is to say, Paul I was assassinated. The close connection of the British Ambassador, Lord Withworth, with the conspirators Zubov and Count Panin was hinted by Napoleon in the Paris *Moniteur*, where he wrote:

"The Emperor Paul I died on the night of March 24. On March 31 the English squadron passed the Sund. History will reveal what connection there is between these two events."**

But Napoleon, too, was to have been assassinated by England's orders, and for this purpose, on August 21, 1803, a group of men arrived in France from England, among whom were two Frenchmen, Colonel Cadoudal and a certain Comte du Polignac, who, however, were betrayed and executed. How England dealt with the "branches" of the Nordic League, particularly with Denmark, is seen from the following: On April 2, 1801, the English fleet, commanded by Nelson, in the midst of peace, bombarded Copenhagen and the Danish fleet. Still more atrocious was the second bombardment of Copenhagen by Wellesley (later Lord Wellington) on September 2-6, 1807, during

* Quoted in Peetz-Dehn, *Englands Vorherrschaft (England's Supremacy)*, p. 79, Duncker & Humboldt, Leipzig, 1912.

** *Ibid.*, p. 79.

which over 2,000 people were killed, and churches, hospitals and whole quarters of the city were set on fire. After this the English captured the whole of the Danish fleet and what they could not take to England they destroyed.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, England's naval supremacy was unchallenged. In the sixteenth century, the world was divided between Spain and Portugal; in the seventeenth century it was divided between Holland and France, and at the turn of the eighteenth century England came to the forefront.

4. *England's Wars in the Period of Imperialism*

While England's wars in the first period were really piratical raids on the gaps and weak points in the Spanish, Dutch and French colonial empires, the wars in the second period (to the Crimean war) and the third period (to the World War) were wars for rounding off, consolidating and making secure the British colonial empire. The imperialist keynote now became: closed land and maritime communications through the Cairo-Calcutta and Cape to Cairo lines to the utter exclusion of the influence of the rival Great Powers. The representatives of this policy were Palmerston, Disraeli, Gladstone, Joseph Chamberlain, Cecil Rhodes and Kitchener.

In the nineteenth century, England conquered, occupied, plundered, repressed or purchased

Aden, Hongkong, North Borneo, Natal, Lagos, the whole of Australia and New Zealand and a large part of the Polynesian Islands. After the 'seventies, spent mainly in conquering Africa, England occupied Egypt in 1882 and the Sudan and a large part of Central Africa in 1898, South Africa in the Boer war, and then territory in the Gulf of Persia and a large part of the Malacca Peninsula.

The realization of the imperialist slogan: Cairo-Calcutta, Cape to Cairo was accompanied by incredible crimes.

In the Opium War of 1840-42, England, in the interests of the English opium smugglers, compelled unarmed China to remove the ban on that deadly drug opium which was ruining the health of the Chinese people. China was compelled to cede Hongkong, to "open" a number of ports and pay an indemnity of £6,000,000. This game was repeated in 1857 in a war in which invading troops captured Canton and sacked it and compelled China to open another five ports and to pay an indemnity of 4,000,000 taels. Against China, England waged a total of five wars, which cost a total of £23,200,000, all of which, however, was covered by indemnities.

England acted in the same style against Japan in 1862, ostensibly in retaliation for "the murder of an English consular official." Here, too, open towns were bombarded, ports were opened and indemnities levied. The same method was adopted against Afghanistan, Persia, Egypt, Sudan and Arabia, the only original

point being that in these cases "divine providence" always arranged the necessary murder to provide England with the pretext for intervention.

The British colonial robbers displayed the same "chivalry" that they had displayed in their wars, in the suppression of the Negro rebellion in Jamaica in 1865. The same England which in 1856 went to war against Persia over Herat and the right to put down the slave trade and piracy (!) in the Gulf of Persia, enslaved and frightfully exploited Negroes on her own plantations in spite of the fact that she had ostensibly "freed" them. The Negro rebellion in 1865, to which the Negroes resorted in sheer desperation, was suppressed with the utmost cruelty: 400 Negroes with their leader, the Negro priest named Gordon, were hanged, 600 Negro men and women were publicly shot and 1,000 houses were burned down. This disgraceful conduct of the British imperialists did not, however, prevent the well-known English moralists and esthetes, Carlyle, Ruskin and Tennyson, from coming out in defense of the Governor of Jamaica against John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer, who demanded that he be impeached.

The Abyssinian expeditions in 1868, the capture and destruction of the capital, Magdala, as well as the usual massacre and the levying of indemnities were also undertaken on the pretext of the inevitable "consular official" who, on each occasion, was murdered, or only "fatally assaulted." And it is sur-

prising how the "divine providence," called in the imperialist jargon the "Intelligence Service," always provided a minor official as a victim for the sacrifice. Sometimes an "insult to the British flag" was a sufficient pretext, especially when the victim was weak and public opinion was remote.

Such, for example, was the "glorious" Ashanti War in 1873. The Ashantees refused to surrender their territory to the British colonial robbers and so tens of thousands were shot down with artillery. Their capital, Kumasi, was razed to the ground and their tribal chief had to pay an indemnity of 50,000 ounces of gold. This war marked the opening of a new era in the British conquest of the "black" continent.

In 1876, the Transvaal War broke out and soon after the brutal war against the Zulus. Then followed the conquest of Matabele, Mashona, Nyassaland and Bechuanaland, Egypt, Sudan and the Boer Republics by the same method; and the slogan of an enclosed land communication between Cairo and Capetown was realized. In carrying out this program, England, from 1871 to the World War, waged 34 wars and military expeditions.

Among the universally known deeds of British imperialism are the atrocities perpetrated in the wars in India, Egypt, the Boer Republics and Ireland.

The atrocities of British imperialism in suppressing the Sepoy Mutiny in India in 1857 shocked the whole civilized world.

"No discrimination of either age or sex was made by the British troops in their revenge. The burning of villages (with their inhabitants), the blowing of men from the cannon's mouth, mass hangings, floggings, all the forms of vile sadism of which empire builders seem more capable than anyone else were employed in the repression." (Ralph Fox, *The Colonial Policy of British Imperialism*, p. 24, International Publishers, New York.)

The chain of horrible suffering which drove the people of India to rebellion has not come to an end.

In an article in the *New York Daily Tribune* of June 25, 1853, Marx called India "the Ireland of the Orient." The combination of traditional Asiatic despotism with unrestricted profit-making of modern capitalism, a parasitic combination which exists to this day, has utterly crushed the people of India. India, this most precious jewel in the British colonial empire, is held tight in the iron clutches of British imperialism to this day. In this connection the words Marx wrote in an article dated July 22, 1853, entitled "The Future Results of British Rule in India," were prophetic. He wrote:

"The Indians will not reap the fruits of the new elements of society scattered among them by the British bourgeoisie, till in Great Britain itself the now ruling classes shall have been supplanted by the industrial proletariat, or till the Hindus themselves shall have grown strong enough to throw off the English yoke altogether." (Karl Marx, Se-

lected Works, Vol. II, p. 662, International Publishers, New York.)

The second victim of the disgraceful British colonial robbery was Egypt, this bridge between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, between North Africa and Asia. England exerted every effort to entrench herself in this country and on the Suez Canal. By a disgraceful act of perfidy and a sordid financial coup Disraeli reduced this country, which was already almost ruined by English and French finance capital, to utter bankruptcy. On the pretext of "protecting foreigners," British warships bombarded Alexandria in 1882. Although, formally, Egypt was a Turkish protectorate, Gladstone, strangely enough, felt "compelled" to intervene against a mutiny in the Egyptian army. In the same stride the Sudan, nominally an Egyptian province, was seized. On July 23, 1884, Gladstone solemnly declared: "We pledge ourselves not to remain in occupation longer than January 1, 1888." (Ernst Reinhard: *Kampf um Suez* [*The Fight for the Suez*], Verlag Kader & Co., Dresden, 1930.)

From that time onward, leading English statesmen made no less than sixty-two solemn declarations to withdraw from Egypt and fifty years have passed since that country was occupied, but England is still in control. And England imposed on Egypt the cost of the occupation and administration of Egypt and Sudan, the latter being conquered with the aid of Egyptian

soldiers and Egyptian money. To ensure the regular payment of the money, English "advisers" were appointed to the Egyptian government, while Egypt was allowed to parade as an "independent" country. Although Anglo-Egyptian Sudan no longer exists since 1924 as a consequence of the sanctions imposed by England for the assassination (!) of Sir Lee Stacks, Egypt, nevertheless, is graciously permitted to continue to enjoy the right to pay up.

The true features of British imperialism are again displayed in the Sudan war (1896-98). The same England who in 1896 protested against the Turkish massacre of the Armenians behaved far more cruelly than the Turks in their mass slaughter of Dervishes at the battle of Omdurman. The English "victors" scoured the battlefield, finishing off the wounded, howling like Berserkers, the while.

England's next victims were the Boers. In 1795 England occupied the Dutch Cape Colony "to protect it for the legitimate Dutch occupants against Napoleon," never to leave it, of course, and drove the Dutch into the interior. The Dutch population founded three new settlements, Natal, Orange Free State and the Transvaal, engaged in agriculture and stock raising and lived peacefully until 1870—until the discovery of gold and diamonds in South Africa led to a tremendous gold and diamond rush from all parts of the world. England at once laid a hand on the Kimberley

diamond field. Goldseekers, adventurers and speculators poured in from every country, very often the scum of society, but good enough to be taken into England's service against the Boers, who were resisting the flooding of their country with elements of this kind. This provided Cecil Rhodes, then Premier of Cape Colony and also President of the Chartered Company of South Africa, with the pretext to take up the "patriotic" duty of protecting the foreigners from the "tyranny" of the President of the Boer Republic, Krueger. Armed gangs were organized. In Johannesburg, the center of the gold-fields, a brother of Cecil Rhodes staged a rebellion which synchronized with a raid on the city by the notorious Dr. Jameson.

In the war cynically provoked by Joseph Chamberlain on October 11, 1899, the Boers put up a desperate resistance to the English troops and not only succeeded in holding out for three years but in inflicting defeat after defeat on the English. Towards the end, however, 60,000 Boers were confronted by 450,000 British troops, a force eight times larger than their own. Although during the war England had solemnly declared that she desired "neither territory nor gold" and that she was waging the war only for the purpose of protecting the foreigners in South Africa, she, of course, grabbed the "territory and the gold" and today tens of thousands of Chinese and Indian coolies are digging the gold out of the Transvaal gold mines, which are

held in the grip of the English more strongly than ever.

Perhaps the blackest pages in England's history are those recording their conduct in Ireland, where the whole weight of English power politics was felt. In a letter to Marx dated May 23, 1856, on his return from Ireland, Engels wrote the following:

"Whole villages are devastated, and there among them lie the splendid parks of the lesser landlords, who are almost the only people still living there, mostly lawyers. Famine, emigration and clearances together have accomplished this. There are not even cattle to be seen in the fields. The land is an utter desert which nobody wants. . . . The country has been completely ruined by the English wars of conquest from 1100 to 1850 (for in reality both the wars and the state of siege lasted as long as that). . . . How often have the Irish started to try to achieve something, and every time they have been crushed politically and industrially." (*The Correspondence of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels*, p. 95, International Publishers, New York.)

And indeed while in 1841 Ireland had a population of 8,200,000, in 1913, as a result of chronic bad harvests, famine, the sadistic oppression and enforced mass emigration, the population was only 4,200,000. In his investigation of the Irish question, Lenin wrote:

"England 'flourished.' Ireland declined and has remained an undeveloped, half-wild, purely agrar-

ian country." (V. I. Lenin, "The English Liberals in Ireland," *Collected Works*, Vol. XVII.)

England's wars of extermination against Ireland, started far back in the Middle Ages; religious hatred engendered by the Reformation (which failed in Ireland) added to national hatred; the plunder of the Irish estates by Elizabeth and the bloody suppression of rebellions provoked by England; the annihilation of the population of Drogheda and Wexford by Cromwell, who drove them into the marshes and settled his soldiers on the lands of the defeated "Papists"; the draconic Penal Laws and land confiscations of William III, which reduced the Irish to the position of pariahs; the brutal suppression of the United Irish League by Pitt and the increased oppression of the Irish peasants since then; the policy of extermination of the English parliament, which systematically suppressed Irish industry, commerce and navigation and looked on indifferently while the Irish people starved; the deliberate diversion of world commerce from Ireland, in spite of the fact that she has the best natural landing places and harbors, in order to protect the English monopoly; the hermetic isolation of the "Green Isle" to protect her from "political contagion"; the permanent plundering of the land by means of rent and taxes and the cruel suppression of every movement for freedom by an army of police and gendarmes—such, in brief, is the tragic story of the suf-

ferings of the freedom-loving Irish people.

Karl Marx, who studied the Irish question for many years and who on November 16, 1869, even raised this question at a meeting of the General Council of the First International, wrote in a letter to Meyer and Vogt, dated April 9, 1870 the following:

“After occupying myself with the Irish question for many years I have come to the conclusion that the decisive blow against the English ruling classes (and it will be decisive for the workers’ movement all over the world) cannot be delivered *in England but only in Ireland.*” (*The Correspondence of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels*, p. 228.)

* * *

The characteristic feature of England’s wars is that they were never wars of defense, but always wars of aggression, distinctly predatory wars. England’s wars of the twentieth century are the worthy continuation, even the culmination, of all her preceding wars.

The balance sheet of all these wars, annexations and occupations of British imperialism expressed in territory and political power is seen from the following:

Year	Territory Acquired (mill. sq. kms.)	Inhabitants (millions)
1750	1	8
1780	10	50
1815	13	80
1880	22.5	250.9
1914	33.8	440.5
1925	37.2	500

The “motherland,” the United Kingdom itself, has an area of only 313,150 square kilometers and a population of 47,000,000.

If to this we add Iraq and Arabia as well as the Antarctic territory, the greater part of which England has annexed, we get a total of 40,000,000 square kilometers out of a total of 136,000,000 for the globe, i.e., more than one-fourth, and a total population of 500,000,000, ruled by England. Thus, for every inhabitant of the United Kingdom there are over ten colonial slaves, and for every square kilometer of the “motherland” there are over 100 square kilometers of colonial possessions.

5. Some Principles of British World Policy

England regards every competitor in the world market and on the seas, every rival that can endanger her communications with her colonies, as an enemy who must be crushed by every means. As the motto of the Navy League puts it:

“The seas can have only *one* mistress, and that the far-flung British Empire, whose navy must command every sea route to every place in which the empire has interests.”*

Since the decisive victories over Napoleon at Abourkir and Trafalgar it has been an axiom of British policy that English ships may fly the English flag on all seas and in all harbors, but that foreign war-

* Quoted from Felix Solomon: *Der Britische Imperialismus (British Imperialism)*, p. 215, Leipzig-Berlin, 1916.

ships and merchantmen must allow themselves to be seen only when England permits them.

Although the British navy no longer enjoys an absolute monopoly and is meeting with the strong competition of the navies of other imperialist powers, nevertheless, with a tonnage of over 21,000,000 it is still by far the most powerful navy in the world. Still more important than this superiority in naval strength is Britain's control of nearly all the important sea routes and therefore her control of the navigation and shipping of all other nations.

Another principle of English policy is that the smaller rivals are spared, even favored, in order that the whole weight of attack may be hurled against the biggest rival. Then, in most cases, the struggle is waged with the aid of the troops of allies or with native troops and continued until the enemy is laid low. If England is unable to crush a rival, she strives to nullify his competition by diverting his expansion in a direction where British interests are unaffected or affected only to a small degree, a policy which England has pursued with some success towards Japan, but totally without success against Germany.

Another axiom of British world policy is that applied since the reign of Henry VIII, the policy of establishing a European balance of power, a situation in which the rival powers mutually hold each other in check while England holds the balance. This policy was even

expressed in England in the following motto on a commemoration medal: "*Cui adhaereo praeest*" ("Whom I support prospers"). In fact, England's "hereditary enemy," France, was held in check on the Continent of Europe for centuries by the Hapsburgs and Prussians, while England not only robbed France of her American and Indian possessions but also played the role of arbiter in Europe; and this became the guiding line of England's continental policy.

Closely connected with this principle of the European balance of power is the principle of England's oriental policy, according to which the Dardanelles and Egypt must never fall into the hands of a rival power. The question of the freedom of the Straits was the cause of the Crimean War and England's intervention in the Russo-Turkish conflict of 1878 for the purpose of keeping Russia out of the Balkans and the Mediterranean. In the struggle for maintaining and securing the British Empire an important role falls to the lot of England's allies and above all her vassals and so-called "friends." British imperialism has prescribed for them the traditional task of pulling the chestnuts out of the fire for it.

Notwithstanding the enormous power which British imperialism still exercises and the fact that England has been able to retain her enormous colonial possessions to this day, the centrifugal forces of the British Empire and the internal and external contradictions

are so strong that they threaten to break this strongest of all colonial empires.

6. *Shadow Over England*

British supremacy in the dominions and colonies rests mainly on England's enormous investments and her sea power and on the fact that England has been able until very recently to retain her position as the most important market for colonial produce. On the other hand, the latent antagonisms between the motherland and the colonies have been steadily becoming more acute, particularly since the first imperialist war. It is not only that the dominions have undergone a considerable process of industrialization since the last World War and are protecting themselves against British manufactures by means of high tariffs, but England's financial domination in some of the dominions is being shaken, for example, in Canada and Australia, and also in New Zealand and in the Union of South Africa.

The most important factor here is the rivalry of American imperialism, which affects England most. Canada and Australia are gravitating towards the United States not only economically; during the last few years they have been looking more to Washington than to London also in regard to politics. The new orientation is most strongly marked in Australia and New Zealand, which are seeking the protection of the United States against Japanese imperialism, which is only waiting

for the first opportunity presented by England's embarrassment to pounce upon these rich prizes. Already British imperialism is feeling the effects of American competition in Latin America, as she is feeling the effects of Japanese competition in the Eastern Asiatic markets.

England's greatest concern, however, is India, "the brightest jewel in the British crown," whose 350,000,000 population are more and more persistently demanding freedom and independence. England is striving with all the means in her power to retain possession of this vast hothouse with its enormous natural resources, this inexhaustible treasure house with its immense reserves of materials and men. Lord Curzon once said:

"India provides us with her masses of workers with whom we can exploit the territories that we possess all over the globe. Only very few of us at home are fully aware of the immensity and variety of the services thus rendered us." (*Zeitschrift fuer Kolonialpolitik*, p. 236, April, 1910.)

In addition, India is the central barracks of the British Empire and provides its mobile reserves for Asia and Africa. Indian troops are spread over all England's possessions in Asia and Africa, and from 1859 to 1900 alone they participated in about 110 major and minor expeditions to conquer and "liberate" Africa and India. Particularly noteworthy is the employment of Indian troops at the Dardanelles in 1878 and in the Boer War in 1899, where they saved Cape Colony, and

in the Boxer Rebellion in China in 1900 where they played a prominent role.

The well-known economist, J. A. Hobson, wrote in this connection the following:

“Most of the fighting by which we have won our Indian Empire has been done by natives; in India, as more recently in Egypt, great standing armies are placed under British commanders; almost all the fighting associated with our African dominions, except in the southern part, has been done for us by natives.”*

In the last World War about 1,500,000 Indian troops fought on all fronts, and in the present war Indian troops are already in France, Egypt and the Near East, notwithstanding England's solemn promise to the Indian people not to employ Indian native troops outside of India.

In order to retain India, this “precious jewel,” in its iron clutches England tolerates no competitor in any part of the Indian Ocean. While this ocean is hermetically sealed to her rivals, England keeps her communications with India open in four directions: through the so-called “water” route around Africa and through the Suez Canal and the “dry land” route over Asia Minor—Bagdad—Persian Gulf and over the Balkan-Asia Minor-Mesopotamia route to the Bay of Bengal, already known in ancient times and the Middle Ages. And all the important

subsidiary routes, strongholds, naval and air bases that might threaten these communications are also in England's hands. Lord Castlereagh's motto in the wars against Napoleon was: “Every position on the route to India must belong to us.” British imperialism has fulfilled this political bequest to the letter.

The importance of India for England is best seen from what Lord Curzon, formerly Viceroy of India, said: “If we lose a dominion we shall survive, but if we lose India, the sun of our Empire will set.”*

7. *British Imperialism in the First and Second Imperialist Wars*

England's world industrial supremacy came to a close when capitalism passed to the stage of imperialism. At the turn of the century England's gigantic colonial empire built up in the period of her industrial, financial and maritime supremacy, built up by means of war and plunder, no longer corresponded to the new alignment of forces of the powers that had arisen as a result of the rapid technical and organizational advance of Germany and the United States. In this phase of the beginning of England's decline, when England was converted from an industrial state into a “usurer and rentier state,” war was still the only weapon she could use against her most dangerous rivals, the only means of retain-

* Quoted by Lenin in “Imperialism—the Highest Stage of Capitalism,” *Selected Works*, Vol. V, p. 94.

* Quoted by Witwer in *Wirtschaftsgeographie der kapitalistische Länder (The Economic Geography of Capitalist Countries)*, p. 428, Deutsche Staatsverlag, Engels, U.S.S.R., 1929.

ing her monopoly as a colonial power. That British imperialism regarded this war as a war of life and death is seen from the fact that it allowed the cost of the first imperialist war to run to the immense sum of £11,267,000,000, a sum exceeding her total state expenditure in war and peace for the previous 225 years (from 1688 to 1914—a total of £10,940,000,000), that is to say, almost for the whole capitalist period.*

Although the first imperialist war ended in a victory for England and her allies, this was a pyrrhic victory and from the standpoint of British imperialism—although not from the standpoint of the owners of the war industries—a “bad deal”; for it utterly failed to remove the fundamental antagonisms between British and German imperialism. The first imperialist war, which shook the foundations of capitalism, also dealt a severe blow to the British Empire. It was quite unlike what had happened a hundred years previously when England, after having defeated France in sanguinary struggles, opened the way for her world supremacy. The defeat of Germany in the first imperialist war did not restore to England her former omnipotence, although she acquired an additional 2,600,000 square kilometers of colo-

nial territory. On the contrary, the difficulties of British imperialism grew after the first imperialist war. Not only was England, in spite of her victory, unable to catch up with Germany—let alone the United States—in industrial and technical development, but as a result of the war she lost her hitherto financial supremacy.

The partial annulment of the Nine Power Treaty by Japan and the latter's attack on China mainly affected England's Far Eastern interests. Italy's attack on Ethiopia and the entrenchment of Italian imperialism in Spain and the Balearic Islands create a serious menace to England's communications with India and the Far East, and also to her positions in the Near East and Africa. The national liberation movement in India, which bloody terror and perfidious compromise with the national bourgeoisie have kept down for the time being, is growing enormously. Lastly, Germany, who was crushed in the first imperialist war, recuperated and again became England's rival. Thus, British imperialism is finding it a very severe task to hold on to the Empire it built up by violence in the course of centuries.

The extreme intensification of the general crisis of world capitalism as a result of the great socialist October Revolution and the world historical victory of socialism in the Soviet Union have not failed to have their effects upon the British Empire which stretches over all five continents.

* O. Schwarz, *Die Finanzsysteme der Grossmächte (The Financial Systems of the Great Powers)*, Leipzig, 1909, and *Die Staatsausgaben von Grossbritannien, Frankreich, Belgien und Italien in der Vorund Nachkriegszeit (The State Expenditure of Great Britain, France, Belgium and Italy Before and After the War)*, Berlin, 1927.

"The October Revolution has shaken imperialism not only in the centers of its domination, not only in the 'mother countries.' It also dealt blows at the rear of imperialism its periphery, by having undermined the domination of imperialism in the colonial and dependent countries." (J. V. Stalin, "The International Character of the October Revolution," *The October Revolution*, p. 159.)

In the period of the second imperialist war the parasitic and disintegrating British imperialism made another attempt to save its enormous colonial possessions and its supremacy by means of war. It tried to turn the appetite of its immediate imperialist rival against the Soviet Union. These plans, however, collapsed one after another. The powerful socialist state has been able by its keen and wise peace policy to thwart all imperialist designs and to increase its security on all sides.

Lastly, British imperialism has made the reckless attempt by

means of a European war to extricate itself from its difficulties, to crush its rival Germany and to maintain its supremacy.

It is striving to involve all nations in this war in order to protect its empire by shedding the blood of other people. This cynical policy of British imperialism was lately once again demonstrated when England instigated squire-ridden Poland to go to war against Germany and particularly when she made the attempt by striving to extend the Finnish conflict to involve the Scandinavian countries in war against the Soviet Union.

But the peoples who have already experienced one world war are reluctant to sell their skins either for the British or for any other imperialism. In the course of this war the popular movement against the imperialist warmongers, against the imperialist world system and for the liberation of hundreds of millions of colonial slaves will grow and become stronger.

A BOLSHEVIK STATESMAN

BY A. LOZOVSKY

"The main slogan of Soviet foreign policy was and still is the slogan of strengthening peace. The Soviet Union was born with this slogan, it will continue to fight staunchly for this slogan in the future. . . . The struggle for peace in the present conditions directly implies struggle against the advancing preparations for anti-Soviet intervention and its imperialist instigators." (From the report of V. M. Molotov at the Sixth Congress of Soviets, March, 1931.)

THE foreign policy of any state is a continuation of its home policy. The class in power, the character of the state determine the foreign policy of the state. The foreign policy of large capitalist states is an expansionist policy, aimed at asserting the authority and will of the ruling classes of the given country abroad. Completely to subjugate and exploit small and weak states—that is the foreign policy of a large capitalist state.

The great October Socialist Revolution erased capitalist and landlord Russia from the ledger of history. The new class in power began to build socialist society under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party and drastically put an end to the old foreign policy of tsarist Russia.

Events took a turn unparalleled in world history. A great power voluntarily renounced the inequitable treaties which tsarist Russia had concluded with China, Afghanistan and Persia and granted independence to Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Esthonia and Finland. A great power, instead of oppressing the small and weak nations within its frontiers, emancipated them politically and economically and set free the creative energy of all the national minorities.

Although the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, new in principle, assumed the traditional diplomatic forms and was conducted, as it still is today, with a meticulous observance of century-old diplomatic conventions, all the world knows that the foreign policy of the Soviet Union has nothing in common with the policy of the great capitalist powers; that it is the specific, independent policy of a state governed by workers and peasants, a policy which always has in view the interests of the working people and these interests only. It is natural that this new foreign policy, the foreign policy of the Soviet state, entirely different in principle from the old foreign policy, could be pursued only by a new type of party, the

Bolshevik Party, the party created by Lenin and Stalin.

Our Party repeatedly emphasized that the authors of the Versailles Treaty had created all the conditions for a new imperialist war. This has been pointed out many times in the writings and speeches of Lenin and the speeches of Stalin. This warning was repeated by Comrade Molotov who at the Sixteenth Party Congress in 1930 declared:

“The attempt of the victor countries to saddle the working people of Germany with reparations beyond their power to pay cannot end well.”

In January, 1931, Comrade Molotov commented on the anti-Soviet intrigues of the Finnish “Lapualian Yahoos” on our border, then, in subsequent speeches, declared that the British and French imperialists were preparing war against the U.S.S.R. and that the danger of an imperialist war for repartition of the world was impending inexorably.

With the acute aggravation of European antagonisms in 1939 and the clouds of a second imperialist war looming ominously on the horizon, the Soviet Government and our Party decided to place the foreign policy of the U.S.S.R. under the guidance of a leader of Party and state who in the course of many years' practical work had proved himself supremely devoted to the cause of Communism, true to the Bolshevik Party, able to carry out a line of policy firmly and consistently, a man who admirably combined Russian revolutionary vision with

American efficiency. This man was Comrade V. M. Molotov.

V. M. Molotov belongs to the generation of Bolsheviks which was drawn into the movement by the Revolution of 1905. Although he was only fifteen years old at that time he has every right to date back the beginning of his revolutionary career to the year 1905, the “dress rehearsal” of the victorious October Revolution.

For over thirty years, at every stage in his career, in the stress and strain of illegality under the tsarist regime, in prison and in exile, on the editorial board of the *Pravda* before the war, underground again during the war; in the period from February to October, 1917; during the October Revolution, in the civil war, during the signing of the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty, as chairman of the Economic Council of the Northern Region, as chairman of the Nizhni Novgorod Executive Committee, as Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, as Secretary of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.), in the periods of economic restoration and reconstruction, in the work of drafting and applying the Stalin Five-Year Plans, as Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs, Comrade Molotov has held fast to the banner of Lenin and Stalin's Party, his whole being fired with the one purpose—to carry to its conclusion the struggle against the exploiters, against the enemies of the Party and of the working class and ensure the victory of commu-

nism. And this fiery purpose guides every step in his life, in his activity as head of the gigantic Soviet state.

The most characteristic feature of V. M. Molotov as a statesman and as People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs is his profound Party spirit. What is this Party spirit? It consists above all in supreme devotion to the cause of Communism and the Party of Lenin and Stalin, a conscientious, serious, honest attitude to one's responsibilities. It consists in being ever mindful of the interests of the people, feeling keenly for the interests of the Soviet state and the cause of socialism, having the most careful consideration for human beings as the builders of our socialist society, fighting against bureaucracy and passivity, fighting against the slightest departure from Marxism-Leninism, fighting for the purity of Bolshevik principles, against oppositions and groupings of every kind whatever colors they parade under.

The Party spirit as applied to statesmanship means subordinating private interests to the general interests of the people and the state as a whole; being able to distinguish major problems from their minor aspects, to focus one's attention and concentrate all one's energy and will power where they are needed at a given moment to strike at the heart of the problems confronting the state.

Lenin has said that the art of politics consists in being able at each given moment to grasp the key link whereby to disentangle the whole chain.

To single out the main thing, the essential thing, from a multiplicity of facts and events, to direct attention to the thing that matters most is a faculty which Lenin had and Stalin has to perfection. This faculty of separating the primary from the secondary, grasping the main idea, directing attention to the main point, leaving out unessentials V. M. Molotov acquired from Lenin, under whose leadership he worked for many years, a faculty he has acquired from Comrade Stalin under whose leadership he works from day to day.

Party spirit in statesmanship means ability to organize work, to marshal forces and put them in the right place according to their knowledge and capabilities, ability to overcome inertia and routine, to break down all obstacles, to penetrate into a mass of details without getting lost in them, ability to approach every small question from the point of view of the general state interest.

Lenin bequeathed us a great Party; he enriched Marxist theory, he gave us unsurpassed models of proletarian strategy, policy and tactics, *he taught us how to fight for the cause of Communism, he taught us how to win.*

In an address to constituents on the eve of the elections to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. Comrade Stalin specified the ideal that every Bolshevik should aim for:

"The electors, the people, must demand of their deputies that they remain equal to their tasks, that in their work they should not descend

to the level of political philistines, that they should remain at their posts as public men of the type of Lenin, that they stand out as clear and definite public men as Lenin, that they be just as fearless in battle and as merciless towards the enemies of the people as was Lenin, that they be free from all panic, of all semblance of panic, when things become complicated and when some danger appears on the horizon, that they be just as free of any semblance of panic as Lenin was free, that they be just as sagacious and deliberate in deciding difficult questions which require an all-round orientation and all-round consideration of all pros and cons, as was Lenin, that they be just as truthful and honest as was Lenin, that they love their people as Lenin loved them."

Supreme devotion to the cause, self-sacrifice, singleness of purpose, love for one's people, ready at any moment to give all one's energy, all one's life, all one's blood drop by drop for the cause of the people, the cause of Communism—these are the traits of the true Bolshevik, who, as Comrade Stalin says, is a man of a special mold.

V. M. Molotov is a Bolshevik of the Lenin-Stalin stamp, a Bolshevik who has learned personally from Lenin and Stalin how to fight for the triumph of communism and who is teaching this wonderful Bolshevik art to others. Of the fifty years of his life he has devoted over two-thirds to the working class, the class with which he has traversed a long road of adversity and joy.

In his position of high authority as Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars Comrade Molotov has repeatedly warned covetors of Soviet territory to do their imperialist poaching on other preserves.

In his speech on the twenty-first anniversary of the October Revolution, Comrade Molotov said:

"Only a strong Soviet state, strong in the correctness of its foreign policy and in its readiness to meet any test from without is capable of pursuing a consistent and undeviating policy of peace, an unshakable policy of defense of its frontiers and the interests of socialism.

"And if anybody wants practical proof of the strength and might of these forces—well, let him try it!"

The events at Lake Khasan and the subsequent hostilities on the River Khalkhin-Gol proved that the Soviet state is able to combine a policy of peace and fulfilment of obligations with twofold and threefold retaliations against over-adventurous aggressors.

In the same speech Comrade Molotov emphasized that special vigilance was required from Soviet people in view of complications in the international situation and the secret schemes of our enemies to afflict the U.S.S.R. with the calamities of war.

"We must remember that as long as the capitalist encirclement exists, the struggle of capitalism against the first Soviet state in the world will not diminish in intensity, will not subside, but, on the contrary, will gain in intensity and acuteness

and will resort to ever more drastic and extreme methods. We must therefore work with even greater persistence to strengthen the defensive power of our state, to develop the ability, the art, so to speak, of combating the class enemy, the hostile capitalist encirclement and to eliminate all and every defect in our state apparatus that may hinder the accomplishment of this task.

"If we understand and give effect to what Comrade Stalin said about our attitude to the capitalist encirclement, we shall strengthen our position in the fight against the class enemy in all his guises, and shall be working for the complete victory of socialism."

The present situation created by the second imperialist war demands special vigilance from the Soviet state, it demands a farsighted and firm maintenance of the interests and independent policy of the Soviet state. The plans of the British and French imperialists to make the U.S.S.R. a supplier of cannon fodder, to set the U.S.S.R. and Germany at strife, have ended in a fiasco. Instead of going to war with Germany the Soviet Government concluded a non-aggression pact with Germany followed by a treaty of amity. Instead of going to war for imperialist Poland the Soviet people delivered their Ukrainian and Byelo-Russian kindred on Polish territory from the power of the Polish barons and capitalists. Instead of the Baltic countries becoming a vantage-ground for war against the U.S.S.R., mutual assistance pacts were concluded with Esthonia, Latvia and Lithuania. All

the plans of the British and French imperialists were upset and frustrated. And when the leaders of Finland, instigated by the British and French, made feverish preparations for war against the U.S.S.R. and provocatively commenced hostilities, the Soviet Government took steps to protect the Soviet border and safeguard Leningrad.

Comrade Molotov takes a direct and leading part in all events of vital importance in the sphere of foreign relations, both as Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and as People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs. To him has fallen the immense task of putting into operation the line of policy which the Party and the Government have laid down for the security of the Soviet state and, thanks to his firmness and pertinacity, he has accomplished it with brilliant success.

"The art of politics in the sphere of foreign relations," said Comrade Molotov at a meeting of the Supreme Soviet on August 31, 1939, "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 these enemies and to make the enemies of yesterday good neighbors, maintaining peaceable relations one with the other."

When the braves of the Second International, who are bolstering up the imperialist war with an "ideological basis" for the deception of the masses, vociferously demanded that the Soviet Union take up arms to defend the money-bags of the

City in London and the Bourse, Comrade Molotov made the following biting retort in his speech on the ratification of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact:

"These people positively demand that the U.S.S.R. get herself involved in war against Germany on the side of Great Britain. Have not these rabid warmongers taken leave of their senses? 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 on those interests?"

Even now this elementary truth has not been understood by the gentlemen who call themselves Socialists and democrats and on these flimsy grounds demand that the peoples of the U.S.S.R. should shed their blood for alien interests. No, gentlemen, pull your own chestnuts out of the fire, there is no cannon-fodder for you in the U.S.S.R. and never will be—that is the answer of the Soviet people voiced by their leaders.

What is the foreign policy of our Party and the Soviet Government? It has been defined with the utmost clarity in the following four points formulated by Comrade Stalin at the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union:

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

As Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, as People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, as a Bolshevik, a true son of his Party, Comrade Molotov is working to put this program of action in foreign policy into practice.

The new type of state created by our Party has, in its turn, created new statesmen, men who think only of their people's welfare, whose one concern is to extirpate outright the survivals of the old order, to create conditions for the development and consummation of a new culture and a new, Soviet, socialist type of man.

A statesman of this type, the Lenin-Stalin type, is V. M. Molotov—the true comrade-in-arms of Lenin and Stalin, the leader of the Soviet Government—whose fiftieth birthday we are celebrating today.

We wish Comrade Molotov many more years to work with the same firmness and Bolshevik zest as heretofore for the welfare of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., for the welfare of all laboring mankind.

THE WAR AND THE WORKING CLASS

BY M. LODE

THE present war in Europe, like the first imperialist World War of 1914-18, was being prepared for in the course of many years. While people everywhere expatiated on the need for disarmament, the imperialists engaged in an armament race such as the world had never seen before. And now that the war has actually begun the production of armaments in all the capitalist countries is mounting at a really furious rate. Great Britain is spending £7,500,000 daily on the war; France is spending 1,000,000,000 francs daily. Germany's war expenditure reaches 36,000,000,000 marks a year, according to estimates in the American press; British press estimates place the figure at 50,000,000,000. According to the *Voelkische Beobachter* of January 10, 1940, "armaments amounting in value to 90,000,000,000 marks were produced" in Germany since the advent of the National-Socialists to power.

Nor are the so-called neutral states lagging behind in the armament race. The United States—according to figures published in *The New Republic* of January 22, 1940—has increased its expenditure on

armaments from \$540,000,000 in 1933-34 to \$2,116,000,000 for the year 1940-41. Switzerland is spending approximately £250,000 on its mobilized forces alone. (Cf. *Daily Herald*, January 20, 1940.) Turkey, the *Frankfurter Zeitung* of January 21 reports, has passed a law providing for an additional appropriation of 25,000,000 Turkish pounds for national defense. In Italy, according to the *Pester Lloyd* of January 21, the 1940-41 budget provides for an expenditure on defense totaling 10,841,000,000 lire, or an increase of 2,568,000,000 lire as compared with the year 1939-40. These examples may be multiplied.

In order to gain a proper idea of what these vast sums of expenditure really mean, it may not be amiss to review briefly the economic situation that obtained before and after the World War of 1914-18.

The World War was preceded by a rather long period of "peace." The leading imperialist powers had fairly balanced budgets, disposed of large gold reserves and vast supplies of raw materials and food products, and there was nothing in the internal situation of the various

countries to raise particular apprehensions among the ruling classes. The prosecution of war was not so expensive as it is today. The production of aircraft, poison gases and tanks began to develop on a large scale only when the World War was already in full swing. The war was financed mostly by foreign and internal loans. Prior to the World War the workers were less destitute and less undernourished than they are today. Unemployment was not so chronic and widespread. The war did not immediately lead to drastic wage reductions, and, at least during the first two years, there was no marked shortage of food and clothing.

Agriculture had been plentifully supplied with labor power prior to the outbreak of the World War, it had stocks of food and seed to fall back upon, was in a position to raise its monetary income by selling its produce in the free market, and suffered much less from requisitions of horses and conveyances than it does today. It was therefore possible for farms to keep going for some time without particular difficulty even under the war conditions. It was not until the end of 1916 or the beginning of 1917 that a real shortage of food products, textile goods, coal, etc., made itself felt.

The present war in Europe was not preceded by a period of "peaceful" development, so to speak. After the World War, economic crises followed one another in the various capitalist countries at much shorter intervals than before, and

industrial crises were aggravated by simultaneous agricultural crises. In all the capitalist countries great economic and political battles were fought between capital and labor during these twenty years.

Even the so-called "victor countries," Great Britain and France, had to contend with grave difficulties after the World War. During the war Great Britain and France had piled up debts amounting to 50 per cent of their total national wealth, while Italy's debt amounted to 60-70 per cent of her national wealth. The readjustment of production to a peace footing and the re-establishment of international commercial relations presented extremely serious difficulties. Currency had depreciated—in Great Britain by one-third, in France and Italy by two-thirds. No country knew how it was going to pay off the huge debts it had incurred. The United States was the only country which, from a debtor nation, became a creditor nation as a result of the World War. But in spite of this the condition of the American working class also grew worse.

As for the vanquished countries, the war, "by means of the Versailles Treaty, . . . imposed upon these countries such terms that advanced peoples find themselves in a position of colonial dependence, poverty, starvation, ruin, and without rights . . . and have been put in conditions that no civilized nation has ever lived in." (V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 182.) In addition to the war debts they had to pay reparations to the "victors."

Both Austria and Germany further went through a period of inflation which brought the laboring population to the very brink of the abyss.

In a number of countries the war led to armed conflicts between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. In Russia, Germany and Austria-Hungary the monarchs were deposed. However, only the workers and peasants of Russia did not stop half way and succeeded, under the leadership of the Bolsheviks, in attaining final victory over the capitalists and landlords and in taking power into their own hands. Thereby they dealt another serious blow to the world system of imperialism whose foundation had already been shaken.

But even after the first period of the post-war era was over and the capitalist countries recuperated from the debacle, when the period of the relative stabilization of capitalism was ushered in and the bourgeoisie and its henchmen in the ranks of the Second International believed that they were seeing the "silver lining" on the horizon, even then only a few of the capitalist powers—the United States, Germany and France—exceeded the level of their pre-war production. In Great Britain industrial production never once fully reached the pre-war level. After 1929, however, when the world economic crisis broke out, industrial production in all the big capitalist countries receded again and until recently has been hovering around the pre-war level.

How does the present imperialist war in Europe, which began under economic and political conditions entirely different from those at the time of the World War of 1914-18, affect the working class in the capitalist countries?

In France, the outbreak of the war disorganized the entire economic life of the country. Of the men who had been called up for the army, several contingents had to be demobilized again in order to keep the war industries going. In order to ensure the further uninterrupted output of war materials, the overwhelming majority of the workers have been "conscripted" to perform "service" in the war industries, without permission to find work to suit their own wishes or to change their job. The working week has been lengthened from 40 hours at the time of the People's Front to 60 and 72 hours. The existing collective agreements have been annulled. The wage rates that obtained on September 1, 1939, have been declared to be the maximum workers may be paid. Wage rates and working conditions are no longer regulated by agreement between the trade unions and the manufacturers, but by the government. Far from receiving an additional 50 per cent for overtime work as was the case before the war, the workers have 40 per cent deducted from the regular wages they are paid for working more than 40 hours a week.

According to a report in *Le Populaire* of March 15, of the 430,000 railway employees on September 1, 1939, 91,000 have been called to the

colors, as compared to 37,000 in 1914. To make up the shortage of labor power, it is planned to draft 25,000 railway workers who have been retired on pensions, 18,000 women and young people, 8,000 workers from Algiers and 6,000 railway workers who are to be recalled from the army, but of whom so far only 900 have actually returned. A 54-hour working week has been introduced for the locomotive and car personnel, and a 60-hour week for all the other categories of railway workers. According to *Le Populaire*, there is a shortage of 30,000 workers in the coal mines, notwithstanding the fact that labor productivity has risen by 24 per cent.

There is already a considerable rise in prices for the most important food products and consumers' goods in France. As a result of the requisitioning of cattle for war purposes, meat prices have risen 60 to 80 per cent. The price of coffee has risen about 35 per cent, of tobacco 28 per cent, of soap 50 per cent, etc. The condition of the unemployed, whose number is officially placed at between 200,000 and 300,000, is quite intolerable. The families of the enlisted men have been reduced to utter misery. The wives of enlisted men are paid an allowance of twelve francs a day in Paris and seven to eight francs in the provinces. This allowance is not sufficient to buy milk for the children, let alone pay rent, etc.

As to the condition of the women who have been evacuated, even the *Oeuvre*, a government news-

paper, was obliged to report in its issue of March 2 that the women who have been settled in the small towns of Touraine often walk seven or eight kilometers to their place of work, because they are not in a position to pay the fare out of the seven francs they receive for a day's work.

The French press is full of reports showing the catastrophic condition of French agriculture. The following passage from the *Petit Parisien* of February 3 will be sufficient to characterize the situation:

"What would have happened to our industries if their labor force had been depleted to the extent of 80 per cent in the very first days of the mobilization, and if their machines, raw materials, etc., had been requisitioned for unknown purposes? That is what has happened to our agriculture. All our peasant farms—these enterprises that supply our bread and cattle and ensure our very lives—have been devastated. In the countryside, old men, who fought in the first World War, as well as young men, have been conscripted. The commissariat has requisitioned—one may say without exaggeration—everything it could lay hands on."

* * *

In England the readjustment of economic life to suit the needs of the war has also caused a great deal of disturbance. The 70-hour week has become the rule. In the first months of the war the number of unemployed increased by 130,000. According to the figures of the Min-

istry of Labor, it reached 1,361,000 on December 11, 1939. Chamberlain, however, declared in his speech on January 9 that the number of unemployed would decline as the number of firms engaged in the production of munitions increased. Churchill, in a speech delivered at the end of January, sounded the warning that it would be necessary to draft women into the war industries in order to insure a sufficient supply of labor power for the duration of the war.

The London *Daily Worker* writes that Churchill's speech heralds the introduction of compulsory labor service which may involve about 4,000,000 women. The present average wage of women workers is approximately 33 shillings per week. Churchill, however, indicated that in all probability women will have to work under conditions and at wages that would not correspond to trade union agreements; in other words, that their wage would be still lower and their working hours practically unlimited.

The condition of the families of the mobilized men is really appalling. In the course of a full half year many of the dependents received no allowance whatsoever. The effect of this was not only to cause discontent among the women but also to further "depress the spirits" of the men in the British Expeditionary Force in France, as testified to by a special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* who admitted that some of the complaints of the men were justified and that the confusion and delays in the pay-

ment of dependents' allowances were a matter of general knowledge.

Food prices have already risen by 25 per cent in Great Britain. But in order to dispel any illusions that the workers might entertain with regard to a rise in wages, Chamberlain, speaking in the beginning of January, referred to the "sacrifices" made by the French workers and declared that it would be impossible in the future to adjust wages to the price index.

A vital factor affecting the condition of the working people both in England and in France is the numerous new direct and indirect taxes and various other deductions.

The evacuation of women and children from the frontier districts and from the big cities of England and France also contributed to make life harder for the population. The removal of important government departments to various obscure places in the provinces has added to the difficulties of transacting government business and is causing further discontent among the population.

For the purpose of preventing the working class of England and France from offering resistance to the general onslaught of the capitalists and war profiteers who are determined to place the burdens of the war entirely upon the shoulders of the workers, the financial potentates avail themselves of the services of the reactionary leaders of the Social-Democratic Parties. The latter are there to explain to the masses that "henceforth there can

no longer be any question of class struggle, but only of class collaboration," as Pierre Vigne, General Secretary of the French Miners' Union, declared in so many words, and the whole warmongering pack of the Second International and of the International Trade Union Federation has been reiterating in substance. On September 13, ten days after the declaration of war, the *Daily Telegraph and Morning Post* was in a position to report that never had there been such close cooperation between the government and the representatives of labor as in the last months, and that no step affecting the conditions of the workers had been taken without preliminary consultation with Citrine and his colleagues.

It is therefore obvious beyond any doubt that in their spoliation of the working people the capitalists are acting with the unqualified sanction of the reformist trade union leaders. But, on the other hand, one of the important consequences of this fact is that large sections of the working class in England and France refuse to be taken in by the chauvinist and warmongering phrases of the bourgeoisie and its Social-Democratic lackeys.

* * *

In Germany, which placed its economy on a war footing long before the outbreak of the present war, no such dislocation of economic life ensued as in England and France; still the war has

brought about a further deterioration in the condition of the working people. The workers work from ten to twelve hours a day. Wages and salaries are regulated by state organs. The workers cannot change their jobs without permission from the labor departments. We find a fairly clear picture of the condition of the German laboring people in a speech delivered by Goering to the German peasantry, in which he said in part:

"You are not the only ones of whom your country demands the utmost diligence and effort. Look at the German industrial districts, think of the places where the German miner . . . spends his day of hard work, of the din of the great industrial plants where men, straining every nerve and muscle, work and produce day and night without interruption, two and three shifts at a stretch. . . . The men who have not been called up must work two and three times as much. . . . I have seen myself how hard it has been on the peasant woman during these months of the war. Often left entirely alone, without any help, she has had to look after the cattle, after the barns, the house and everything else, often working till she nearly dropped. . . . Help can be mobilized: It is the German youth. . . . Many an hour is much better spent in this work . . . than in dead learning. . . . From March 11, 1940, an additional two pfennigs will be paid per liter of whole milk . . . delivered to the dairies. Accordingly the price of butter will be raised 20 pfennigs per pound."

By way of compensation for the higher price the peasants are ex-

pected to cut their own consumption of whole milk by two billion liters. Should the peasants fail to effect this economy, the rise will be rescinded. Food products have been rationed in Germany since the beginning of the war. Clothing and linen can also be obtained only on presentation of ration cards. In spite of the rise in prices no increase in wages has been permitted. To quote the *Voelkische Beobachter* of February 17, "since everybody can evade the higher prices for himself, there is really no rise in the cost of living." There was a shortage of fuel in the very first winter of the war. This, as well as the difficulties attending the supply of food products, is ascribed to transport difficulties.

According to the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* of March 7, taxes and imposts, including the war taxes introduced so far, should yield 24,000,000,000 marks in 1939-40. The *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* is of the opinion that this estimate of Secretary of State Reinhardt is correct, and adds that from the very beginning the National-Socialist policy has been to finance the war primarily by taxation, particularly by raising the income tax, and that the single tariff envisages a gradual progressive increase in the tax rates.

* * *

From the very beginning the bourgeoisie of all the belligerent countries has been barefacedly pursuing the policy of making the

working people directly pay the costs of the war. The same principle governs the policy of the capitalists of the neutral countries who are also bent on covering the costs of armament by an intensified exploitation of the working people, by the introduction of new taxes, etc.

The capitalists of the United States are again the ones who reap the greatest profits in the present war in Europe. The American war industries are working full blast. In the third quarter of 1939, 320 of the leading industrial corporations showed a profit of \$201,000,000, or twice as much as in the same quarter of 1938. Profits reaching up to 24.7 per cent were netted by some of the aircraft companies. In the last nine months of 1939 the family of du Pont, the chemical and dynamite king, raked in a profit of \$40,298,244, as against \$23,977,244 for the same period in 1938, or an increase of 72 per cent. These profits were derived primarily from the inhuman exploitation of the workers.

According to a recent report of the National Industrial Conference Board, the amount of wages paid in the manufacturing industries of the United States in relation to the value of production dropped by 11 per cent in September, 1939, alone. The index of industrial production in the United States rose from 103 before the outbreak of the war to 111 in September, to 120 in October and 125 in November, 1939. By the beginning of December industrial production, according to data published by the National City Bank of New York, had increased

by 25 per cent as compared with the summer of 1939. In spite of this enormous increase in production, however, unemployment has not decreased. In fact it rose by 14 per cent from December, 1939, to January, 1940, when the number of unemployed reached approximately 12,000,000. The lot of the unemployed has been constantly getting worse, many of them actually starving. In Cleveland, for instance, 16,000 families have been entirely stricken off the relief rolls, and 40,000 families have had their relief allowances cut by the City Council.

The picture is essentially the same in the neutral countries of Europe which feel the effects of the present imperialist war at close quarters.

In Denmark the number of unemployed members of trade unions rose from 9.5 per cent in August, 1939, to 32.5 per cent by the end of December, 1939. According to figures of the Central Statistical Bureau, the number of registered unemployed members of trade unions increased from 105,000 in November to 158,000 in December, 1939. Data published in January, 1940, showed that the wholesale price index had risen from 110 in December, 1938, to 143 in December, 1939. The price of margarine had risen 50 per cent since the outbreak of the war. At the beginning of 1940 it was as high as the price of butter a year ago. Agreements between the Danish trade union federation and bosses' associations provide for an adjustment of wages to the official price index. In November, 1939, however, the so-called adjustment

of wages amounted to an increase of 4 per cent, whereas prices had increased at least 20 per cent.

The Central Statistical Board of Sweden reported that at the turn of the year the index of the cost of living had risen from 109 to 114. If we take the index of the cost of living in 1914 to represent 100, the index today is at least 178. In addition, a number of new taxes have been imposed, such as a new defense tax amounting to 50 per cent of the ordinary taxes, and a new entertainment tax of 10 per cent. The tobacco tax is expected to yield an additional revenue of 20,000,000 kronor; the wine tax has been raised 50 per cent. There has been a rise of 3 oere per bottle in the price of beer, and of 60 to 80 oere per kilo in the price of coffee. Bread prices have risen twice in a short period, the second time by 5 to 10 per cent.

The following table shows the rise of the index figures of wholesale prices in Holland:

	<i>August</i> 1939	<i>January</i> 1940
	(1936-38 = 100)	
Vegetable food products	92.9	111.7
Animal food products	101.3	124.1
All food products	97.3	118.2
Raw materials..	96.8	140.7
Manufactured products	101.8	119.9
General index..	98.8	122.8

In less than five months of the war the cost of living of the working people of Holland thus rose by about 25 per cent. In addition,

there has been an increase in unemployment. On November 30, 1939, there were 211,634 unemployed, on December 31—271,025, or an increase of nearly sixty thousand in one month. The dockers have been most hard hit by unemployment. In 1938, 15,360 sea-going vessels entered the port of Rotterdam. In 1939 only 12,026. This despite the fact that by August 23, 1939, ten thousand vessels had already called at the port of Rotterdam. The amount of wages paid by only one navigation company, the *Scheepvaart Vereniging Zuid*, dropped from 1,500,000 guilders in the middle of September, 1939 to 900,000 guilders in the middle of November, 1939, thus showing a decline of 40 per cent in two months. On top of all this, new indirect taxes have been imposed on sugar, coffee and gasoline, and the inheritance tax has been raised. This is expected to yield a further 18,000,000 guilders in 1940 to cover the expenditure on mobilization, according to the *Het Volksdagblatt* of February 12 and 13.

In Belgium, where the wage agreements are based on a sliding scale, providing for the adjustment of wages to the price index, the Minister of Economy, Sap, has come out with a proposal to draw up a "war-price index," and the "Socialist" Paul Spaak has demanded new collective agreements for the period of the war. In a speech delivered at Chapella, Spaak said the following with regard to the role that is to be assigned to the working class during the war:

"I shall not speak of your rights but of your duties. . . . Our financial difficulties are tremendous. We are now spending daily twenty millions on mobilization. This is apart from the emergency budget for the army, and we need an additional seven billions for cannon, concrete and barbed wire. These seven billions must be raised in Belgium itself. But we have 600,000 mobilized men and 230,000 unemployed. . . . The working class must work more, as much as possible and even more than possible. . . . I hope that the working class will realize the role it has to play."

The working class of Belgium is thus expected to produce—over and above the present war costs—another "seven billions for cannon, concrete and barbed wire" by working longer hours and accepting smaller wages. Messrs. the "Socialists," on the other hand, think that a laconic statement to the effect that "one-third of the workers have been mobilized or are unemployed," as the one made by Bondas, Secretary of the Confederation General de Travail, is sufficient to arrive at the conclusion that class collaboration is now imperative in the interests of preserving the trade union movement.

As regards the situation in Italy, no definite figures are available. From the articles in the press, however, one may gather that the Italian workers are being cheated by the capitalists out of even those slight benefits that have been conceded to them by the state authorities. Prices have risen to such a degree that it has been necessary,

for the second time already, to set up a special "Price Commission." In the last four and a half months, this "Price Commission," according to a report in the *Gazeta del Popolo* has carried out 23,096 "operations" in the fight against the rising cost of living in Turin alone. Even the official press admits that the price of clothing has risen by 300 per cent as compared with 1936 when, in the words of the Turin *Stampa*, prices had reached a record peak.

* * *

These reports, covering but a few countries, are sufficient to show how the condition of the working people of all countries has been steadily deteriorating since the beginning of the second imperialist war. The bourgeoisie and the ruling circles of all the capitalist countries are determined to shift the burden of the costs of the war, as well as of armament and mobilizations, directly onto the shoulders of the working people. The leaders of the Social-Democratic parties and of the trade unions have betrayed every interest of the workers in this war. Jouhaux, Belin, Citrine, Spaak, Hoeglund and their ilk hobnob with the directors of the big industrial corporations and banks and confer with them on measures for further attacks on the working people, and how to prevent the working class from fighting for its most vital interests.

But the offensive of capital is meeting with ever increasing resis-

tance on the part of the working people. Movements of various proportions for higher wages and strikes have taken place in a number of countries since the beginning of the war, despite the efforts of the reformist trade union leaders to prevent them. Particularly noteworthy are the struggles that are being waged by the dockers and sailors, the struggles of the miners and the anti-war movement in the colonial and dependent countries. Moreover, the nature and significance of these struggles is no longer that of normal economic struggles. They are beginning to assume a political character. Thus, for instance, the demands put up by the Dutch sailors with regard to trips to ports of belligerent countries are in effect not only directed against the greedy capitalists who have no scruples about sending the sailors on hazardous trips to danger zones on the seas, but they contain the embryo of a struggle against the war as a whole. This applies to an even greater degree to the attitude of the sailors—particularly in America—who refuse to sail on ships carrying arms to Japan. This is further proved by the opposition of the American seamen to any material or financial assistance for any of the belligerent European countries, as expressed at a membership meeting of the American National Maritime Union on January 25 and at a membership meeting of the Longshore Union in New York in the middle of February.

The struggles which the miners are now waging are also of a nature

that takes them beyond the bounds of a mere economic struggle between workers and bosses. This was demonstrated with particular force during the struggles of the Belgian miners in December, 1939, and January, 1940. True, the Belgian Government did enforce a longer working day for the miners in the end, but to this day it has not succeeded, despite all the efforts of the reformist trade union leaders, in silencing the protests of the workers against this ordinance. The struggles of the miners in Great Britain are viewed by the bourgeoisie with grave apprehension, not only as constituting a menace to their profits but also as endangering the further prosecution of the war. This incidentally, explains why the English miners have succeeded in wresting certain concessions from the mine-owners. Viewed from this angle, it is also clear that the bourgeoisie of the belligerent countries granted the workers in the munitions industries certain privileges in the beginning of the war because they hoped that they would thereby keep them back from the struggle.

At the beginning of the World War of 1914-18 the toilers of the colonies and dependent countries blindly submitted to the orders of their imperialist oppressors. Today things are different. On October 2, only one month after the outbreak of the war, 90,000 workers took part in a protest strike against the war in Bombay, India. In February, 1940, a textile workers' strike broke out in Bombay, which soon

spread to the entire industry and embraced approximately 200,000 Bombay textile workers. The strike was called for higher wages. Yet it was not a purely economic fight, for the strike was directed also against the British imperialists and their oppression and exploitation of the Indian people. It was also directed against India's participation in the war, for the Indian people refuse to serve as cannon fodder for the interests of British imperialism, as was the case in the World War. The struggle of the Indian workers for higher wages and the wave of protests against the war are closely bound up with the struggle of the Indian people for their independence from British imperialism.

The working class of the capitalist countries and of the colonies is not the same today as it was in 1914. It has learned to fight for its interests to the last. It has learned from the example which the peoples of the Soviet Union have given the working people of the whole world.

The ruling circles of the capitalist countries are, naturally, aware of this, and that is why they have now, particularly after the outbreak of the war, set their entire machinery of coercion into motion to deal with the revolutionary proletariat, primarily the Communists.

In France, thousands of the finest and most devoted militants have been thrown into prisons and concentration camps, many of them directly betrayed and denounced by the "Socialists." The Communist

press was banned several days before the outbreak of the war. The Communist Party has been outlawed. On February 20 the Chamber of Deputies annulled the mandates of the Communists. Thousands of mandates of municipal councilors have likewise been annulled. Many organizations of the working people of France have been dissolved as "suspected of defeatist propaganda." Maurice Thorez and André Marty, the French people's tribunes who are the personification of working class France, of the France of peace and freedom, have been deprived of their citizenship by a clique that is leading France towards ruin. Anyone who raises his voice against the war is branded a "traitor" and is court-martialed. Nor should it be forgotten for a moment that there are so-called "Socialists" who are encouraging the government in its reactionary measures against the Communists and all who oppose the war.

Not everywhere is the campaign against the Communist Parties, the campaign against all the opponents of the war and against the economic and cultural organizations of the proletariat conducted so openly as it is in France today. But everywhere the reaction, supported by the traitors of the Second International, is pursuing the same aim, namely:

"... to disunite the workers and fool them with nationalism, to exterminate their vanguard in order to weaken the revolutionary movement of the proletariat." (V. I.

Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. V, p. 123.)

That was one of the aims the ruling classes set themselves in the World War of 1914-18, and it is one of the aims they have set themselves in the present war.

* * *

The working class, however, which in 1914 still yielded to the influence of nationalist propaganda and allowed itself to be taken in tow by the bourgeoisie of "its own" country, has drawn its lessons from the experience of the World War and the post-war period. After the war Communist Parties were formed in all the capitalist countries, and the masses in ever-increasing numbers began to turn their backs on the parties of the Second International. Today, after the outbreak of the second imperialist war, this process of enlightenment and regroupment is proceeding in every capitalist country at a much faster pace and is extending to much larger masses than at the time of the first World War.

Take Switzerland, for instance, where Lenin lived and worked at the time of the first imperialist war and from where he carried on his sharp struggle against all the opportunists and "defensists" in the ranks of the Second International. Here new forces came to the fore in the Socialist Party shortly after the outbreak of the present war, forces that are opposed to the imperialist war and the treacher-

ous policy of the Social-Democratic leaders. The Socialist Leon Nicole, who is carrying on a courageous fight against the imperialist war and all its advocates, and is defending the Soviet Union from the slander and vilification of the reactionary leaders of the Second International, has been expelled from the Socialist Party of Switzerland for his revolutionary stand. But Leon Nicole is not alone in his fight. He is backed up, according to his own testimony, by 98 per cent of the membership of the Geneva organization of the party and by 75 per cent of the membership of the organization in the Canton of Waadt. These two organizations of the Swiss Socialist Party have been likewise expelled by the Executive Committee of the party and have now formed the "Swiss Socialist Federation" headed by Leon Nicole. Nicole has expressed his conviction that "soon all the Swiss Socialists who do not want to be partners to the policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie and betrayal of socialism will rally around" this Socialist Federation. The expulsion of Leon Nicole and of the Geneva and Waadt organizations did not, however, signify the end of the work of "purging" the Swiss Socialist Party of revolutionary elements. It was soon followed by the expulsion of the Socialist Working Class Youth of Switzerland.

In Belgium the Socialist deputy Fernand Brunfaut has been expelled from the Socialist Party for upholding the Soviet Union. In his speeches in Parliament and in his

articles in the press, directed against the warmongers and against anti-Communist laws that are supported by the leading Belgian Socialists, he expresses the sentiments of the revolutionary section of the Belgian Socialist Party. Further, a conference of the Unitary Youth Organizations of Belgium held as early as November, 1939, on the initiative of the United Young Guard of Belgium, came out against the imperialist war, against the warmongers in the ranks of the Social-Democratic Party, against the attitude of the Socialist Youth International, and for the Soviet Union.

A serious process of differentiation is going on in the labor organizations of England as well. Ever larger sections of the Labor Party, of the trade unions and of the cooperative societies are condemning the war, demanding its speedy termination.

The crisis in the Socialist Party of France is a matter of open discussion. In the words of Gaillard, in *Le Populaire* of December 5, 1939, the Socialist Party has "split into two practically equal factions," is "vacillating," and is unable to rally the working people around itself.

It may be mentioned in this connection that Blum and his friends had hoped that the Socialist Party and its press would gain in numbers and influence as a result of the suppression of the Communist Party and *l'Humanité*. To be sure, the Communist Party of France has been outlawed, but its press con-

tinues to appear; some of its leaders have been imprisoned, but the Party is alive. The Party has shown its ability in the present war to rally the working people and to give them leadership in their struggle against the reaction and its Socialist lackeys. That is why the entire reactionary press, including the "Socialist" newspapers, is already raising a howl about the unflagging activities of the Communists and the "danger of their contagious example." But even the fact that the French Communists are accused of "high treason" will not deter the French working people from rallying around the Communist Party and from intensifying their struggle against the warmongers.

In the United States, where the main concern of the bourgeoisie is to coin out of the present war even greater profits than in the first World War, the capitalists have set out to split the American working class, to smash the revolutionary movement and, primarily, the Communist Party, and to discredit the leaders of the Communist Party in the eyes of the masses. Since the industrial magnates stand only to gain from the war, they are doing everything to drive the American people into the war. But the American people do not want to become involved in the war. Their slogan is: "The Yanks are not coming!" The American youth is particularly active in the campaign against the war. The American Youth Congress held in February sent a peace message to the youth of fifty-two countries that had sent delegates to

the Second World Youth Congress held in 1938. In this message to the youth of the world, the American Youth Congress declares that Young America will not walk into the trap of war and will fight against the extension of the present war. It appeals to the young people in the neutral countries to unite in the common effort to prevent the present war from spreading, to help their brothers come out of the trenches and not to permit themselves to be driven into the trenches.

The few examples cited above are sufficient to show that the international revolutionary movement is growing and developing: It is the task of the Communists to explain to the working people, and to convince them, that only the united struggle of all the working people can stop the attacks of the capitalists upon the economic, political and cultural interests of the working class.

It is the task of the Communists to make it clear to the masses that the struggle for peace, for the speedy ending of the present imperialist war in Europe, can be crowned with success only if the working people are firmly united in the struggle, if they combine all their forces in the fight against national and international reaction, against the warmongers and war profiteers, against the imperialist robbers and oppressors, in order to put an end to the war and to remove the causes of all imperialist wars.

