

# WORLD PEACE OR WAR ?



**BY MIKHAIL KALININ**

PRESIDENT OF THE SOVIET UNION

FIVE CENTS

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

*This pamphlet is from a lecture delivered by President Kalinin of the U.S.S.R. to Communist Party propagandists of the Lenin District of Moscow on April 26, 1938.*



PUBLISHED BY

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS CO., INC.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

209

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

# WORLD PEACE OR WAR?

BY MIKHAIL KALININ

COMRADES, in order to give you a better understanding of political events as they are now developing in the international arena, I would remind you of a passage in the resolution adopted by the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party (1921) in connection with Comrade Stalin's report on the national question:

"The post-war period presents a gloomy picture of national enmity, inequality, oppression, conflict, war and imperialist brutality on the part of the nations of civilized countries, both toward one another and toward the non-sovereign peoples.

"On the one hand we have a few 'Great' Powers, which oppress and exploit the mass of dependent and 'independent' (but in fact wholly dependent) national states, and the struggle of these powers among themselves for the monopoly of exploiting the national states.

"On the other hand we have the struggle of the national states, dependent and 'independent,' against the intolerable oppression of the 'Great' Powers; the struggle of the national states among themselves for the extension of their national territory; the struggle of the national states, each in particular, against its own op-

pressed national minorities; and, finally, the growth of the movement for emancipation on the part of the colonies against the 'Great' Powers and the intensification of national conflicts both within these powers and within the national states, which as a rule contain a number of national minorities. Such is the 'world picture' inherited from the imperialist war." \*

Seventeen years have elapsed since this resolution was written. But has the political countenance of the capitalist world changed in this period? Yes, it has changed; it has changed in details, and for the worse.

First, the extent of the brutalities committed by the big capitalist countries toward the weaker independent countries has increased. We need only recall the enslavement of Ethiopia by Italy; the atrocities being committed by the German and Italian fascists against the Spanish people; the seizure of Austria by Germany; the unbridled conduct of the Japanese militarists in China, to which the Chinese people have responded with the organized resistance of the whole nation.

Second, we have the oppression of national minorities carried to the limit; the brutal treatment of the Jews in Germany and Poland, and of the Chinese in Manchuria; the racist theory fostering national animosity; the "mailed fist" proclaimed as the only right in international relations. The most repulsive features of decaying capitalism are represented as positive achievements of mankind.

In face of the impending conflict, each of the big capitalist powers is striving to secure a more favorable military position, and this further accentuates the antagonisms inherent in capitalist countries. They are manifested in the aggressiveness of the fascist countries and in the unstable policy of the so-called bourgeois-democratic countries.

---

\* *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, by Joseph Stalin, p. 90. International Publishers, New York.

Such are the changes which have taken place in international politics during these seventeen years.

And what is the condition of the working class?

Has it undergone any change?

In literally every capitalist country the strongest pressure is being brought to bear on the standard of living of the proletariat.

The fascist countries are employing the whole force of the state apparatus to destroy the workers' organizations; trade unions, cultural, sport and other societies are suppressed, their funds confiscated, their active members cast into prison or interned in concentration camps and forced to join the fascist organizations, which are under the control of the employers.

Fascism sets out to destroy the will of the workers, to render them impotent for the political struggle, to reduce the workers and farmers to the position of slaves, and to depress the workers' cultural level.

### *Conditions in Germany*

In Germany, for instance, the workers have been deprived not only of their legal organizations, but even of freedom of movement. The more highly skilled workers are bound to the factories, and the agricultural workers to the landowners. Yet in 1936 two-thirds of the workers and salaried employees of Germany changed their jobs. Obviously, it was not the good conditions that they fled from! Seventy per cent of the agricultural workers are unmarried. This, too, is due solely to material causes. There can be no others.

Since the fascists came to power the standard of living of the workers has fallen considerably. Even the official press cannot conceal this fact. For example, *Der Deutsche Volkswirt*, Schacht's paper, stated on May 14, 1937, that from the beginning of 1933 to the spring of 1937 the cost

of living had risen "by about 10 per cent." Actually, the fall in the standard of living of the workers amounts to about 25 to 33 per cent. At the same time the profits of the magnates of heavy industry have increased immensely. Official statistics show that the annual profits of 2,200 joint stock companies had increased from 700,000,000 marks in 1934 to 2,000,000,000 marks in 1936. As you see, fascism is not only a barbaric form of government—it is also a profitable enterprise for the capitalists.

The fascists, while idealizing the days of barbarism and making it their aim to create a barbaric system, nevertheless go in for swindling just like the speculator of most modern times. The fascists lower wages by means of sharp practices: they cut piece rates and time rates and at the same time depreciate the currency, lower the quality of food-stuffs, adulterate them and raise their price.

Side by side with this, during the rule of the fascists there has been a considerable increase in the deductions from wages, which in all amount to 20 per cent of the total pay.

As to the farmers, the fascists profess to regard them as their "favorite class of society." But how do they treat this "favorite class"? Privileges are granted to the landowners and all sorts of indulgences to the rich farmers, but the whole burden of state regulation and deliveries of agricultural produce to the state falls upon the middle and poor farmers. The farmers of Germany are passing through a severe school of political education—and not only the farmers, but the artisans, handicraftsmen and small tradesmen as well. Generally speaking, the petty bourgeoisie, the intellectuals, all these social groups are being brutally exploited and fairly rapidly ruined by the fascists. That is why the People's Front in Germany, headed by the Communist Party, is based upon a sound foundation.

In fascist countries like Italy, Poland and Japan, the workers and poor peasants are not only being pauperized

but reduced to a state of physical inanition. I will not cite documents bearing on the subject; there are quite enough of them to be found in world and Soviet literature.

If we were asked whether during the past twenty years the standard of living of the workers and of toilers generally in capitalist countries has improved in any degree at all (and we know that the productivity of labor of the worker in the capitalist world generally has during this period increased some 60 or 70 per cent), we can quite definitely reply that *the standard of living of both the working class and the peasantry has considerably deteriorated*. This is an inescapable fact.

What Marx said about the working class growing steadily poorer with the development of capitalism and the growth of its wealth is being corroborated. Incidentally, the opportunists interpreted Marx's words to mean that the working class grows poorer only relatively. They asserted that Marx must be understood to refer to the difference between the position of the capitalist and the worker. If the wealth of the capitalists increases one hundredfold, let us say, then the standard of living of the worker would increase twofold—that is the way the opportunists tried, and are still trying, to distort Marx's theory of the absolute impoverization of the working class.

Actually, however, we find that the capitalists are growing richer at a rapid rate while the working class is becoming absolutely poorer: its condition is deteriorating not relatively, but directly.

“Accumulation of wealth at one pole is, therefore, at the same time accumulation of misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental degradation, at the opposite pole, *i.e.*, on the side of the class that produces its own product in the form of capital.” \*

---

\* Karl Marx, *Capital*, Charles H. Kerr & Co., Vol. I, p. 709.

These words, written over seventy years ago, are just as valid today as if they had been written yesterday!

But are the "rulers" of the capitalist countries easy in their minds?

### *No Country Safe From Attack*

The position today may be summed up by saying that no country in the world is in any way safe from attack. Every country is guarding its frontiers night and day against an expected eventual attack. This causes uncertainty in international commerce and in the relations between countries, acts as a brake upon credit, and so on. As collective security is being destroyed, the only factor of security is armament, which is proceeding at a feverish pace, exhausting the nations and depleting the state treasuries.

The whole economic life of capitalist countries has been subordinated to preparations for war. Here is a table showing the appropriations made by capitalist countries for armament purposes. It should, of course, be borne in mind that *actual* military expenditures are *considerably greater*, because every item in the budgets of capitalist countries conceals some expenditure for military requirements.

#### *Military Expenditures\** (in millions)

	1913	1936
Great Britain (pounds sterling) . . . . .	77	197
Germany (marks) . . . . .	1,479	10,000
Italy (lire) . . . . .	813	5,840
Japan (yen) . . . . .	192	1,300
U.S.A. (dollars) . . . . .	335	1,217

\* The figures quoted have been taken from the following sources: for all countries in 1913 from Woytiski, *Die Welt in Zahlen*; for all countries, except Germany, in 1936, from the *Annuaire Militaire* of the League of Nations for 1937; for Germany in 1936, from the *London Banker*, February, 1937.



Need we add the generally known fact that with this unlimited and steadily increasing expenditure on armaments, the expenditure of capitalist countries on economic and cultural needs is *decreasing*? For example, the principal items of expenditure in the Japanese budget for 1936-37 are as follows: army and navy, 1,826,000,000 yen; public education, 143,000,000 yen, the latter only about *one-thirteenth* of the former.

In every capitalist country a concealed war is increasingly being waged by the ruling classes against the working people.

Such is the capitalist world today.

As you know, the number of countries which "call the tune" in international affairs is small. Great Britain is one of the first among them. British policy seems to Soviet citizens strange and inconsistent, and running counter to the national interests of the country. But it is only an apparent inconsistency. We must not forget the simple fact that every capitalist country pursues a policy that is in the interest of the ruling class. Marx and Engels were right when they stated in *The Communist Manifesto* that:

"The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie."\*

The interests of the ruling classes are by no means always identical with the *national* interests. Indeed, they are often divergent; and as capitalism decays, this divergence becomes ever wider and more profound. This is borne out by countless instances of direct betrayal by the ruling and exploiting classes of the interests of their country. It was also borne out by the intervention in our country, when White-Guard bands fought hand in hand with foreign armies

---

\* Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*, p. 11. International Publishers, New York.

against the Soviet country. It is furthermore to a large extent borne out by the despicable and treacherous activities of the remnants of the vanquished classes in our country—the Rights, Trotskyites, bourgeois nationalists and the rest of the counter-revolutionary scum.

They betrayed the interests of their own country. Their policy was directed not only against the socialist state but also against the *national* interests, inasmuch as they betrayed their country and placed themselves at the complete disposal of fascist and other intelligence services. These elements have no social base in our country, and that is why they suffered such a disgraceful fiasco. They were obliged to seek support abroad, outside the Soviet Union, among the capitalists.

“It would be a mistake,” Comrade Stalin warned us, “to think that the sphere of the class struggle is confined within the frontiers of the U.S.S.R. While one end of the class struggle operates within the U.S.S.R., its other end stretches into the confines of the bourgeois states surrounding us.”

In capitalist countries the exploiting class is the ruling class, and its interests, however inimical they may be to the interests of the people as a whole, to the interests of the nation, are regarded by all the henchmen of capital as the national interests. Only if we bear this in mind will the present policy of Great Britain be clear to us in all its manifestations.

#### *Tory Policies Encourage Fascist Aggressors*

As an example, let us take the attitude of the British ruling clique to the events in Spain. Every infant knows that the fascist aggressors are treading hard on British corns. One need only mention the number of British ves-

sels that have been sunk. It has been reported in many newspapers.

You will recall how haughtily General Franco replied to the protests of the British government. What haughtiness! Actually, it was a case of the gnat challenging the elephant; yet for some reason the gnat acted as if it were strong.

Nevertheless, the sympathies of the British government are definitely on the side of Franco. And they are not platonic sympathies. When the Parliamentary opposition and the workers began to exert strong pressure and to demand the restoration of the right of the Spanish people's government to purchase munitions in the British markets, Chamberlain, playing on the abhorrence of the workers for imperialist wars, declared: "We have no interests in Spain, we will observe strict neutrality, we want to preserve peace in Europe."

The reactionary British Conservative circles are deceiving the workers when they say that they want to preserve peace in Europe. On the quiet, the British government has exchanged diplomatic representatives with Franco. We may be quite sure that the British capitalists are supplying arms to Franco.

I think that if the British government were to permit Republican Spain to purchase arms in Great Britain, a considerable number of the capitalists would refuse to sell them. Why? Because the British capitalists do not want a people's government in Spain. A victory for the Spanish people's government would have a tremendous influence on the struggle of other countries against fascist reaction and war; it would strengthen the People's Front in France; it would give a tremendous impetus to the formation of a People's Front in Great Britain; it would reinforce the struggle of the people and the growth of the Communist Parties in the fascist countries.

The very thought that a victory of the People's Front in

Spain would have such consequences is abhorrent to the British capitalists. There you have the basis of British policy on the Spanish question.

Even more threatening to British interests is the development of events in the Far East. A more aggressive, rapacious, hypocritical and persistent country than Japan is scarcely to be found anywhere in the world. The long-range aim of her ruling classes is to seize the whole Asiatic continent, especially its southern part, and primarily China. The seizure of China's resources, the Japanese military think, will enable them to drive the British out of India, and the French out of Indo-China, to seize our Maritime Region, and so on. All this is set forth quite in detail in the memorandum which Tanaka, former Japanese Prime Minister, submitted to Emperor Esihito on July 25, 1927.

I will quote a few passages from this memorandum:

"In order to win real rights in Manchuria and Mongolia, we must use this district as a base, and penetrate into the rest of China under the pretext of developing our trade. . . . With all the resources of China at our disposal, we shall pass forward to the conquest of India, the Archipelago, Asia Minor, Central Asia, and even Europe. But the first step must be the seizure of control over Manchuria and Mongolia, if the Yamato race wishes to surpass itself in continental Asia. . . ."\*

As you see, the danger to the "pearl in the British crown" (as the English call their Indian possessions) is quite obvious.

Nevertheless, British policy cannot be called anything but a policy of incitation which constantly encourages Japan to commit acts of aggression. The British government alone defended in the League of Nations Japanese aggression in Manchuria in 1931. The British government count-

---

\* *Japanese Imperialism Stripped*, p. 12. Workers Library Publishers, New York.

ed upon Japanese stupidity—hoping that Japan would attack the U.S.S.R. But after seizing Manchuria, Japan began to lay its hands on North China, to the detriment of the interests of the European and American capitalists, especially the British.

In 1932, Japan tried to entrench herself in Shanghai—the citadel of British interests in China—but she failed in this owing to the exceptionally heroic fight put up by the Chinese Nineteenth Army. Japan temporarily withdrew. But in 1937, using an incident provoked by Japan herself in Liukouchiao, near Peiping, as a pretext, she launched war on China with the object of swallowing her completely.

This is a severe blow to British interests. Some of the most important British possessions are being jeopardized. But how does the British press react to it—the press which “calls the tune,” the press with which Ministers reckon and in which they express their most cherished thoughts?

The London *Times*, which fully reflects the views of the present British government, and the views of Chamberlain in particular, in an editorial on April 12, 1938, spoke of the Sino-Japanese war as follows:

“. . . Now there can be no doubt that Suchow is for the moment safe and that the Japanese attack has miscarried. After making every allowance for arithmetical exaggeration of an enemy’s losses it may be accepted as substantially true that the Chinese have won a handsome victory at Taierhchwang, that one Japanese division, perhaps a larger force, has been mauled and has lost most of its material; and that Chinese attacks on the Japanese lines of communication are causing their opponents no end of trouble. . . .

“Japanese statesmen and such of their soldiers as can look ahead may well ask themselves where their country will stand militarily, politically, and financially

at the end of another six months of warfare. The Chinese armies are fighting bravely and with more skill and cohesion than they showed in the earlier encounters of this undeclared war. . . . The present military situation in the Far East cannot therefore be regarded as favorable to Japanese aspirations. . . .

“Had their ambitions been less grandiose . . . they might have enormously strengthened the political and economic position of their island empire, and established a powerful barrier against the further advance of Russian bayonets and ideas in Eastern Asia [Russian ideas—so there is the rub!—*M.K.*]. So far from effecting this they have first spurred the Soviet Union to improve its own military position in the Far East and they have now given it the chance of playing the role of *tertius gaudens*.

“They have made China their enemy for many a year; they have alarmed their German associates in the anti-Comintern Pact, whose efforts at mediation were dashed by the Japanese government’s manifesto refusing to deal with the Chinese Central Government.”

This is a frank statement, as you see. Are these not essentially the cherished thoughts of the British government?

What a feeling of brotherly sympathy for the aggressor who is tormenting China, trampling on the British flag and causing considerable damage to British interests in the Far East! And it is a fact that Japan is trampling on the British flag (recall the incident with the British Ambassador) and has wrecked Shanghai, where Great Britain has investments of no less than a billion dollars. It is clear that the interests of British capitalists have suffered heavy losses there.

But the old, inveterate imperialist admonishes the young imperialist: “You have bitten off more than you can chew. You have made a mess of your adventure. You had better listen to us, who are experienced in such matters:

you should do your grabbing with us, piecemeal, not so greedily, and in a more civilized way."

But the chief and principal thing with which the British imperialists are dissatisfied is the fact that Japan's position with regard to the U.S.S.R. has been weakened and, as a result, her military weight as an ally of the fascist aggressors in Europe has declined. The British Conservatives reproach Japan for not husbanding her forces for an attack on the Soviet Union. That is the crux of the matter. The British capitalists are looking for dupes to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them. But it won't work; dupes have become scarce, and the Japanese imperialists can hardly be reckoned among their number.

I shall mention another factor which is influencing the policy of the British government. Douglas Jay, writing in the issue of April 16, 1938, of the *Daily Herald*, organ of the British Labor Party, states:

"... Total profits of thirty important iron and steel companies with big armament interests were shown here a year ago to have risen from £3,803,040 in 1934 (before rearmament began) to £8,941,169 in 1936—a rise of 135 per cent.

"In the past year they have jumped again to £11,747,074. This is a rise of £7,944,034, or 209 per cent, on 1934, and £2,805,905, or 31 per cent, on 1936."

That is another factor which exerts pressure on the British government. As the increase in the earnings of the munitions firms shows, the feverish growth in armaments is indubitably profitable to a large section of the capitalist class—it is bringing them untold wealth. However, the British Conservatives are also obliged to reckon with the pressure of the working class and of the petty and middle bourgeoisie. They therefore mask their profoundly reactionary and hostile policy, directed in the final analysis against the Soviet Union.

The British Conservative leaders often organize and direct hostile forces against the Soviet Union. But all this is carefully camouflaged in order not to alarm the British working class.

However, the political situation has become so acute that they have had to define their position. After Eden's resignation the British Conservatives came out openly in support of the fascist aggressors. In the light of these factors, the policy of the British ruling class becomes clear.

In spite of the fact that the English business men are most thorough exploiters of colonial nations, their quixotic idea of harmonizing the interests of the world pirates in China, of creating an entente cordiale with the fascist countries, and of leading them in a crusade against the land of socialism is doomed to failure. I am not making a general analysis. It will suffice to say that I characterize the endeavors of the British imperialists as quixotic because the antagonisms within the capitalist world are so profound. Do what it will, British imperialism cannot escape a war with fascist Germany. And the British people will have to pay dearly for the provocative and treacherous policy of their ruling classes.

The policy of the ruling classes of the other "Great Powers" essentially differs very little from the policy of the British ruling classes. For example, the press and the leading men of the United States would seem to be pursuing a more determined policy toward the aggressors; but that is only in words. Actually it is, to a considerable extent, the same policy of concessions and indulgences.

However, the United States does not instigate the aggressor to new adventures—and that in our days is something to be grateful for. But the Japanese are provocatively sinking American warships with impunity. I think that the Japanese would not even have paid compensation for the gunboat *Panay* which they sank near Nanking, if it had



not been for the Chinese victories and for the military mishaps of the Japanese generally.

But, on the other hand, there are ardent defenders of Japanese interests in the U.S.A. too. Japan enjoys the sympathy of the reactionaries, the financial magnates, who are associated with Japanese capital, for example, Morgan and Ford, who have assembly plants in Japan; Morgans supplies them with credits. Thousands of Japanese secret agents are active in various spheres of American life. Finally, it should be said that Japan is receiving larger quantities of arms and credits from America than China, despite the fact that the majority of the American people sympathize with China.

The chief reason for the caution displayed by the American politicians in Far Eastern affairs is their distrust of Great Britain, despite the reciprocal compliments the statesmen of both countries shower upon each other. The U.S.A. would have adopted a firmer attitude toward Japan if it trusted England. For example, an article in the *Daily News* of April 18 argues the necessity for a pact of mutual assistance between Canada and the U.S.A. for the protection of the latter from attack by fascist countries. This was reported by Tass and was published in our newspapers; the majority of our readers most likely paid no attention to it, but it probably caused a heightened state of nervousness among the English. And that is quite natural; after all, Canada is one of Great Britain's largest dominions. Yet here we have a part of the British Empire which considers it possible to form a bloc with another country. This small fact is a reflection of the contradictory relations of these two great capitalist countries.

### *French Reactionaries Sabotage Franco-Soviet Pact*

Let us return to Europe. A few words about France. The Soviet Union concluded a pact of mutual assistance with

France on May 2, 1935, the second article of which runs as follows:

“If, under the conditions provided for in Article 15, Par. 7, of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and in spite of the sincere desire for peace of both countries, either the U.S.S.R. or France should become the object or an unprovoked attack on the part of any European state, France and the U.S.S.R. shall immediately come to each other’s assistance and support.”

As you see, the mutual obligations are pretty clearly defined.

But this article contains a small proviso which indicates how this pact is to be applied. When the moment arrives for placing the second article of the pact into operation, the party concerned must first apply to the Council of the League of Nations for assistance against the aggressor. If the Council should refuse to come to the assistance of the party attacked, France and the U.S.S.R. are entitled to assist each other independently. For the sake of clarity, I have set forth Article 15, Paragraph 7, of the Covenant of the League of Nations in my own words.

The operation of the pact of mutual assistance in practice involves a very intricate procedure.

The pact we have concluded with the Czechoslovakian Republic differs only in the fact that, as indicated in the protocol signed when the Soviet-Czechoslovakian pact was concluded, “at the same time both governments confirm that the obligation of mutual assistance shall come into operation only insofar as, under the conditions provided for in the present pact, France shall come to the assistance of the party attacked.” In other words our pact with Czechoslovakia is analogous to the French pact. But it contains a proviso that we are to assist Czechoslovakia only if she is assisted by France, and, conversely, Czechoslovakia is to

assist us only if France assists us. Naturally, the pact does not forbid either of the parties coming to the assistance of the other without waiting for France.

One would have thought that the Franco-Soviet pact is advantageous not only to us but to France as well. But from the very first it has been subjected to the most violent attacks by reactionary elements in France.

Actually, probably none of the great powers has suffered such political damage from the fascist aggressors as France. German guns, under General Franco's trade mark, have been trained on French territory. German fascism counts on catching France unawares, by a surprise attack. However, the masters of destiny—or if not of destiny, at least of Cabinet crises—are more afraid of the People's Front in their own country than of Hitler's hordes. In no other country is the big bourgeoisie so scared of the spectre of Communism as in France. The big capitalists yearn for fascism, from a naive belief in its almighty power, and because they regard it as a faithful watchdog of their profits. It will not be long before history destroys this naive belief in the might of fascism. For the French proletariat the struggle for the general national interests implies a desperate struggle against the agents of Hitler within their own country.

I think that not only the so-called bourgeois-democratic countries, but even the fascist countries, including Germany, are today nearer to Communism than they were yesterday. Who would have thought that tsarist Russia was nearer to the dictatorship of the proletariat than, let us say, industrial Germany, with its powerful proletariat, its organization and high cultural level?

Despite itself, fascism is creating, fashioning devoted champions of the cause of Communism. The Communist Party of Germany is alive, and under its leadership the victory of the German proletariat is assured.

Ninety years ago Marx and Engels wrote: "A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism." Today it is no longer a spectre but a reality in the shape of the U.S.S.R. The whole capitalist class literally stands in mortal fear of Communism. This fear tinges the whole policy of the European countries. Reactionary bourgeois circles in Great Britain, and not only the German fascists, would like to be the leaders of this struggle against Communism. They seek to harmonize the interests of the imperialists and to unite all the aggressors, all the reactionaries, all the forces that are hostile to progress—even to progress!

It will soon be two years since the Spanish people, abandoned by the bourgeois-democratic governments, have been staunchly and stubbornly fighting for their freedom against a coalition of fascist states, which are tacitly supported by reactionary Tory circles in Great Britain.

In defending their own independence, the Spanish people are defending the cause of the whole of advanced and progressive humanity.

The working class of Europe has manifested its solidarity with the Spanish people in the most diverse forms. German, Italian, French, British and other workers are fighting in the ranks of the heroic Republican army of Spain, and the working people are making collections in aid of the Spanish fighters. The workers of nearly all countries are demanding that their governments grant the republican government of Spain the right to purchase arms.

It is not enough to say that the policy of the reactionary circles of the most powerful countries in the capitalist world—U.S.A., England, and France—is a policy of connivance at the acts of the aggressors. No, it is a policy of encouraging the aggressors. We can see its fruits in the fact that the world is already burning in the flames of war at two opposite ends.

And so, what Comrade Stalin said in the interview he

gave to Roy Howard regarding the two seats of the war danger has been fully vindicated.

### *The War in China*

In 1931, with the connivance and even at the instigation of the British Conservatives, Japan seized Manchuria, provoking an incident during a railway accident as a pretext. The Japanese murdered the Manchurian satrap, Chang Hsueh-liang, and since then they have steadily continued to encroach upon North China. Everybody is familiar with this. There was a long chain of endless provocations on the part of the Japanese military on our eastern frontiers as well, and it was only due to the supreme firmness and high defensive power of our glorious Red Army that the insolent bandits were decisively repulsed.

In accordance with their usual procedure, the Japanese military staged an "incident" on the night of July 7, 1937. Japanese troops were conducting maneuvers in the district of Peiping in the vicinity of the city of Liukouchiao. On the pretext that shots had been fired from the town, the Japanese command demanded the right to enter the city to search for the culprits. The Chinese command refused. The Japanese opened fire. Thus the war between Japan and China began.

Was this incident fortuitous, as regards the time or place of its occurrence, for instance? Not in the least!

The Japanese military always act according to time table, in conformity with a previously mapped plan. If the Chinese command had met the demand of the Japanese military clique it would have made no difference; sooner or later a conflict would have occurred. Evidently, the higher command considered that the time had arrived for the seizure of China. The only question was whether China would submit to Japan quietly, without a struggle, or whether she would fight for her independence.

The Japanese command had made up its mind that it would subjugate China under any circumstances. Generally speaking, the international situation favored Japanese aggression; acts of aggression committed by Japan against British and American interests had enabled the aggressor to satisfy himself that neither England nor America would go to war. That meant that Japan's hands were free, and that she could easily dispose of China.

Nevertheless, this time the Japanese military miscalculated. The Chinese people are putting up a far more stubborn resistance than the plans of the Japanese military staff anticipated. In the first place, it hoped to capture Shanghai at a single blow and to put an end to China's independence in two, three, or at the most, four months. But what happened? Japan required three months for the capture of Shanghai alone, and it was accompanied by a considerable loss of man-power and especially of munitions.

The chief effect was that the fighting at Shanghai weakened the Japanese front in North China and thus enabled China to organize her army better. The Chinese troops underwent a good military training at Shanghai. The Chinese government gained three months for the organization of resistance on other fronts and for the mustering of men and supplies.

On the other hand, the fight for Shanghai caused considerable injury to British imperialist interests, which is also a point in China's favor under the circumstances. In a word, as the Japanese themselves admit, instead of being a promenade of Japanese troops through Chinese territory, as they had expected, Japanese intervention in China has assumed the form of a major, prolonged, and exhausting war.

The war has already lasted nine months. China is stubbornly fighting against the Japanese aggression and its resistance is growing stronger every day. The tactics of the

Chinese army are to resist to the very last on fortified lines and not to allow itself to be surrounded; to retreat without accepting a general engagement and to preserve its fighting efficiency. All the information at our disposal goes to show that the Chinese command is consistently adhering to these tactics. In fact, they are dictated by the very positions of the belligerent parties.

There can be no doubt that the Japanese army is better equipped. The Japanese army has a good air force and artillery, and possesses a large number of mechanized units. The commanders of the Japanese army are more highly trained than those of the Chinese army. Japanese espionage in China is excellently organized. The provinces of China have been flooded with Japanese agents for scores of years.

In contrast to the Japanese army, the Chinese army is heterogeneous in composition. A small part of the army—the troops of the central government—is somewhat better armed, but the commanders even of these regiments do not answer to modern military requirements. The local governments have their own military forces, which are poorly armed and poorly disciplined; traitors in the pay of the Japanese have been discovered among the higher commanding staff. All these circumstances compel the Chinese command to pursue a war of attrition against the enemy, to retreat and to hold back the enemy on positions favorable to the Chinese.

The central government and the organizations of the anti-Japanese People's Front are striving to create a highly efficient and homogeneous modern Chinese army, and in this respect have already achieved a certain amount of success.

The retreat of the Chinese troops results in lengthening the lines of communication of the Japanese troops, compels them to throw out large flanking forces for the protection of their communications, thus weakening their main forces

by creating an excessively wide front. It does not require a military expert to understand that the more drawn-out the front, especially in a country whose people are filled with hatred for the aggressor, the weaker relatively its army becomes.

In view of the lengthy lines of communication, the partisan movement in China assumes great military importance. The army of the enemy is finding it increasingly difficult to arrange for the transport of reinforcements, munitions, provisions, and so on. Considerable forces are required to protect the lines of communication, absorbing tens of thousands of men. Constant alertness and vigilance are demanded. The slightest slip, and a munitions or troop train will go hurtling over the embankment. The partisans destroy the enemy's men, capture his arms, and turn his own guns against him. This is precisely the kind of war that is now going on in China. It is a savage war, a ruthless war.

Essentially, the Japanese are advancing in a narrow front along the railways and highways, mostly along the railways, of course. The widespread partisan movement prevents the Japanese from penetrating any great distance from the railways; the partisans destroy small military detachments, while the peasants desert the villages, first hiding or even destroying all foodstuffs. That means that the Japanese have to transport their army and provisions over long distances.

The partisan movement is becoming more and more widespread, and its blows at the Japanese army more and more effective.

I need only recall that the Eighth People's Revolutionary Army destroyed the Japanese mechanized Seventh Division and captured over a thousand prisoners and a number of tanks. The road from Shanghai to Nanking, which the Japanese covered at a relatively high speed, almost in a week, is now practically out of commission—it is systematically torn up by the partisans, whose raids extend as far as Shang-



hai. All this goes to show that the partisan movement in China is widely developed. It not only causes losses to the Japanese army, but frays, exhausts, and demoralizes its forces.

One might think that the swift advance of the Japanese troops is fraught with destructive consequences to the Chinese army. But as a matter of fact this advance, which was fairly rapid at first, is becoming more and more retarded every month; every new position is taken by the Japanese troops at the cost of increasing sacrifices and as the result of increasingly stubborn fighting.

We are continually receiving news of the recapture by the Chinese of towns and villages that were long held by the Japanese troops. The Japanese army is situated, as it were, in the midst of Chinese forces.

Fighting is proceeding both along the line of immediate advance of the Japanese troops and deep in the rear, near Kiangsi and Peiping and, as I have already said, along the whole two-thousand-kilometer stretch of communications of the long-drawn-out Japanese front. We may have a repetition in real life of Krylov's fable about the wolf who, intending to raid the sheep-pen, found himself in the dog kennel.

### *Chinese People Face Great Difficulties*

But it would be a mistake to conclude from the picture of the alignment of Japanese and Chinese forces I have just drawn that the victory of China is assured.

We must remember the tremendous difficulties China is laboring under. China has a poorly developed munitions industry. She has to import all her principal armaments.

It goes without saying that this involves not only financial difficulties but also difficulties in the acquiring and transportation of munitions. Japan is already endeavoring to isolate China's southern frontier from British posses-

sions, and chiefly to cut communications between the British port of Hong Kong—through which largely pass supplies for the Chinese army—and Canton. The Japanese command is dispatching squadron after squadron of planes with the sole purpose of destroying the railway line between Canton and Hong Kong.

However, the Chinese government and the organizations of the anti-Japanese People's Front are exerting tremendous effort to create their own base of military supplies, China's own munitions industry. And in this respect they can already record considerable success.

Regarded from the purely military standpoint, there can be no doubt that Japan is still much stronger than China. But the political attitude of the Chinese people toward the war is quite different from that of the Japanese people. The Japanese people regard the war as a cause absolutely alien to them, as a misfortune brought upon them by the Japanese ruling classes. This, of course, engenders in the masses a hatred for the ruling clique, a disgust with the war, and a desire at all costs to evade all part in it. All this tends to lower the efficiency of the army as a fighting force, and the more protracted and stubborn the war becomes, the more rapidly will the demoralization of the Japanese army proceed.

The very opposite is the case in China. The population of China, which has suffered heavily in the past from the tyranny of Japanese military men, merchants, opium dealers, profiteers and similar scum, now regard the Japanese as responsible for all their misfortunes, even for the constant penury of their lives, their arduous and exhausting toil, and China's unparalleled impoverishment.

The people are burning with a fierce hatred for the alien brigands. The Chinese people are now united as never before, united into a single state. The anti-Japanese People's Front is becoming a mighty public force which is attracting

all social strata. And the aim of the struggle is very simple and understandable to the masses, namely, to drive the foreign despoilers out of China. The principal concern of the Chinese government is to obtain arms. As to men who are thirsting for arms and anxious to use them against the enemy with the greatest effect, they can be counted by the million.

As you see, the contending sides are fighting with different weapons. Japan relies directly upon military means—that is her chief and principal weapon. Naturally, she is also trying to turn political factors to account. Her diplomats are working at top speed to this end. We have only to mention, for instance, the pilgrimages of countless Japanese “good-will” delegations to the U.S.A., England, and other countries, the formation of puppet governments on Chinese territory, the bribery of personages in political authority, the bribery of commanders of the Chinese army, and the engineering of provocative incidents in the provinces of China, in the Canton province. However numerous and varied these methods of political action may be in their sum total, they are narrow and petty in face of the wide development of events in the Far East.

Far from weakening the hatred of the Chinese people for the aggressor, this policy only intensifies it; and it does not weld and organize the Japanese people or fire them with a belligerent spirit.

And so Japanese strategy in China is based upon military force and is carried into effect by military means. That is the basic factor. Her political measures are only supplementary and auxiliary, and are of no great significance in this war.

#### *United National Salvation Front*

In contrast to this, China has developed a broad public movement under the banner of a united anti-Japanese front

and under the watchword of combating the enslavers and of fighting for China's independence. With ordinary, purely military means, the Chinese government would stand slight chance of victory. In the course of evolving the means of defense against the enemy in China, the masses have developed tremendous political activity. Every peasant, worker, intellectual and artisan, and every more or less honest and uncorrupted bourgeois is faced with the imperative alternative: either to wage a struggle for the freedom of his country, a savage and brutal struggle demanding tremendous sacrifices of blood and intense effort on the part of the masses of the people, or to be enslaved by the enemy, to be subjugated by the aggressor, the brigand, the oppressor.

The Chinese people have chosen the former alternative—they have chosen to fight.

The enlistment of the masses of the people in the fight against the aggressor is a factor of the greatest importance and an essential component of the military forces which the Chinese government is directing against the better armed forces of Japan.

Tens of millions of people have been enlisted in the active defense of the country. What forms does this activity assume? (To us, who have been through a victorious national struggle against foreign interventionists, this hardly needs explanation; to us it is quite obvious.) It takes the form, for example, that millions of young people are joining the army as volunteers, and not simply as volunteers, but as people who have made up their minds to achieve national freedom at all costs.

It is now generally recognized that war demands the harnessing of the forces of the whole nation, that victory is determined not only at the front, but by the condition of the rear. And it should be said that the attitude of the Chinese rear to the war is entirely different from that of the Japanese rear; it sometimes displays its attitude toward

the Japanese oppressors in the most unexpected forms. I shall give you an example.

A certain Chinese village was occupied by the Japanese. The Japanese general, Igosuki, and his staff took up their quarters for the night in the house of the village elder, who had gone off with the national forces. That same evening a young peasant was brought before the general. He warned the Japanese that the house had been mined. He was greeted with mistrust. However, a search was made and several bombs were found.

General Igosuki's curiosity was aroused. "Why did you report this to us?" he asked. "Don't you want your own people to win?"

"To us peasants it is all the same who wins," replied the young man, who pretended that he did not understand Japanese. "It can't be worse than it is now. And what is more, I was afraid that if this house was blown up your soldiers would kill all of us who have remained without mercy."

As, according to the peasant, many other houses had been mined, the general and his staff took up their quarters in the house of the young peasant himself.

The Japanese sat discussing their brandy and drinking toasts. Lieutenant-Colonel Ishia made a speech: "We shall soon be in Tokio, after our victory, drinking real French champagne, not this wretched Chinese brandy. These miserable dogs have no idea of duty, country or patriotism. Yet they dare to fight us." His speech was interrupted by the scarcely audible chuckle of the Chinese, Tan Chi. He stood in the doorway.

Suddenly, he flung his arm high above his head, and a bomb landed at the very feet of Colonel Ishia, who was standing with a glass in his hand. Orderlies and sentries dashed into the hut. Over the hearth, in the front partition, crouched the peasant's wife. With a sudden movement

she upset a clay pitcher standing on the edge of the stove into the fire. There was a report like a thunderclap and lightning shafts burst from the hearth. The walls of the hut receded and collapsed. The roof went up in clouds of blue smoke and ruddy tongues of flame. Crushed and mutilated men lay groaning in their death agony.

Together with the Japanese perished the Young Communist Leaguers Tan Chi and his wife Tsi Lin-yu.

Chinese scouts reported that nineteen staff and higher officers and one general perished in the explosion, and that thirty-eight men were killed or wounded.

A couple of days later the chief of the Corps Political Department of the Chinese People's Revolutionary Army said at a meeting at Feshani: "The names of the heroic Young Communist Leaguers, Tan Chi and Tsi Lin-yu, who voluntarily went to their death in order to decapitate and retard the advance of the Japanese division, will never be forgotten by the Chinese people."

We are witnessing a war in which each of the belligerents has his own strategy.

Military experts consider that the defeat of the enemy is assured when he is compelled to abandon his own line of strategy and to adapt his military operations to the strategy of his antagonist. The Japanese command expected with the help of its mechanized units, tanks, artillery, aircraft and heavy naval guns to stun the people by a lightning blow, to destroy the will-power of the Chinese command, and to wreck the country's cities and means of communication. These are the favorite and much-advertised tactics of the fascist leaders!

Now, after ten months of savage warfare, it is quite clear that in this the Japanese command have failed. The Chinese millions have risen to wage a sacred war for the independence of their country and for the defeat of the aggressors. They have forced their line of strategy upon the enemy and

thus considerably enhanced their own chances of complete victory.

The war in the Far East is an important factor in European affairs.

Comrades, we must not close our eyes to the capitalist encirclement and to all the consequences thereof. I have spoken about them in my lecture. And, therefore, what Comrade Stalin said about the necessity of strengthening the defensive power of our country to the utmost should be an *immutable law* for every honest citizen of the U.S.S.R.

Price 5 cents

THE HISTORY OF THE  
COMMUNIST MANIFESTO  
OF MARX AND ENGELS

BY V. ADORATSKY

Director, Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute

An invaluable summary and study by a Marxist authority on the scientific masterpiece, The Communist Manifesto.

Price 10 cents

WOMEN AND SOCIETY

BY V. I. LENIN

A collection of speeches by Lenin on the role of women in the revolutionary movement with an introduction by the great educator and champion of the oppressed in all lands—N. KRUPSKAYA—Lenin's widow and co-worker.

Price 10 cents

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS  
381 Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y.

A PAMPHLET OF INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

## IN PRAISE OF LEARNING

BY

JOSEPH STALIN AND V. M. MOLOTOV

Two recent speeches delivered by Stalin and Molotov at a reception in honor of Soviet scientists and members of university and college staffs in the Kremlin. The difference in the aims, work and lives of scientists in the Soviet Union and those of the capitalist countries are clearly portrayed.

Price 5 cents

•

## THE HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO OF MARX AND ENGELS

BY V. ADORATSKY

Director, Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute

An invaluable summary and study by a Marxian authority on the scientific masterpiece, The Communist Manifesto.

Price 10 cents

•

## WOMEN AND SOCIETY

BY V. I. LENIN

A collection of speeches by Lenin on the role of women in the revolutionary movement with an introduction by the great educator and champion of the oppressed in all lands—N. KRUPSKAYA—Lenin's widow and co-worker.

Price 10 cents

•

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS  
381 Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y.