

Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact Upset the Plans of the Munichers to 'Drive to the East'

By Sam Adams Darcy

There is a widespread drive to utilize the news of the now concluded Soviet-German non-aggression pact to stampede America to a "Chamberlain policy." Americans should resist that in consideration of the interest of our own people, and the peace of the world which serves that interest.

1) We must recognize that through this move, the Soviet Union has dealt the first telling blow against the anti-Comintern pact—the full impact of which will become more evident as time goes on:

It has isolated Tokio and weakened the ties of that partner to the axis. This helps the United States particularly in the Pacific enormously, because it weakens the Japanese fascist-militarist clique and Japanese aggression. Thus, as the first point, we must note that the United States stands to gain greatly from the move of the Soviet Union. The closeness of interest between the American and Soviet peoples is by this again demonstrated.

2) The issue involved should be clear in our minds. It is well-known that Chamberlain's strategy was to provoke Hitler, the mad dog of Europe, to throw his armed legions against the Soviet Union. The move for a Soviet-German non-aggression pact momentarily at least defeats Chamberlain's plan. Yesterday's New York Times reports "State Department circles in Washington" as saying that Hitler, by this proposed agreement has "shifted from his plan . . . for Eastern European conquest at the expense of Russia to a determination to break up the British Empire . . ."

3) The impression is being created that the Soviet Union is making an alliance with Hitler. This is sheer nonsense. The Soviet Union concluded with Germany a non-aggression pact. At present there is a non-aggression pact between France and Germany. Why is there no reactionary uproar over this? Why has not the Soviet Union the right to enter into a similar pact? Why is there such a hullabaloo only about the Soviet-German pact? Isn't it reasonable that the excitement really is about the unspoken thing—the fact that the

signing of the treaty is a definite end to the hope of the Anglo-French imperialists that they could provoke a "Soviet-German war? That the imperialist groups must now fight out their own battles?

4) The Soviet Union has negotiated a non-aggression pact with Germany, but the Soviet Union has been offering a mutual aid alliance in fact an alliance implemented with military cooperation to England and France against Nazi aggression. The Associated Press dispatch from Moscow, dated August 22, says: "Soviet quarters, however, were emphatic in their insistence that the non-aggression agreement with Germany was entirely independent of any alliance that might be worked out with Britain and France and that the two proposed treaties were in no way incompatible."

MUNICHERS FILIBUSTERED

If Chamberlain sincerely wants a mutual aid pact to stop aggression, all he has to do is to quit filibustering in Moscow and sign the agreement that he has delayed, quibbled and dawdled over for many months now. The delay is not due to incompetent British representatives in Moscow on the Military Mission as some journalists say but is due to a deliberate policy by Chamberlain to prevent the consummation of the alliance so that he may leave the door open to some underhand dirty deal with the Nazis. It is obvious that Chamberlain hates the U.S.S.R. and admires the Nazis. Only the great clash of interests between England and Germany, and the pressure of the British people has prevented him from going over, bag and baggage, to the Nazis. It would be naive in this circumstance to believe that the delay in coming to an agreement is due merely to petty quibbling by the British Mission in Moscow.

"INDIRECT AGGRESSION"—ISSUE

5) The nature of the difficulties, in the Moscow negotiations are known. Britain has refused to agree to aid a country which is the victim of "indirect aggression," that is a country in which the struggle for power begins by an "interior movement" of a pro-German nature. Every observer of Nazi practices knows by now

that the essential nature of Nazi tactics in Austria, in Czechia, in Slovakia, in Memel, and now in Danzig is precisely such that an "interior movement" is fostered by Nazi agents who make a pretense at seizing power and the German military forces then go to "rescue the people" engaged in this reactionary putch.

German Nazis aided the Heimwehr in Austria, Heinlein in Czechia, Franco and the army officers in Spain with such tactics, and is today preparing to go to the aid of an "interior movement" in Danzig headed by the Nazi Forster. From this it can be seen that in the Moscow military negotiations, Chamberlain has distinctly let the Soviet people know that he does not intend to help Poland in the Danzig situation. It is sheer hypocrisy therefore, for the British Cabinet to issue a vague statement, as they did yesterday, giving the world the impression that they will go to the help of Poland. They said that events "would in no way affect their obligations to Poland," omitting to say, at the same time, that these obligations do not include aid to Poland in the case of Danzig or a similar movement which the Nazis will no doubt foster in Western Poland. By arousing the opposition who are incensed at Chamberlain's duplicity, the Soviet-German negotiations may stiffen the British resistance to Fascism.

TRADE PACT DISTORTED

6) Great to-do has been made about the Soviet-German trade agreement. A few months ago Robert S. Hudson approached the German Nazis with a proposal of a British loan to Germany and the conclusion of a trade pact. This was hailed as a move to promote world peace, by Chamberlain. Now, however, the successful conclusion of a Soviet-German trade pact is being used by reactionary forces to stir fear of war. What makes a trade pact between Germany and England, a pact for peace, and the Soviet-German trade pact a pact for war? The exact opposite is true. England offered to ship war materials to Germany and to give credit for these. The Soviet Union has achieved a pact whereby she takes war materials away from Germany and gets credit on them, and returns chiefly articles of

consumption.

In 1935, when Hitler felt on the upswing he refused a trade pact agreement which would include the right of the Soviet Union to use her credits to buy war materials. Today it is a sign of the weakening of fascism that he is forced to sign an agreement so unfavorable to him, that he has to give up war materials to his enemy the Soviet Union.

BOYCOTT NOT AFFECTED

7) From some quarters in the United States comes the cry against the American Communists. "How," say these people, "can you reconcile advocacy of the boycott of Germany with this trade agreement between Germany and the U.S.S.R.?" The fact is, the U.S.S.R. at tremendous sacrifice has tried for eight years to achieve a united world boycott against Germany's unfair foreign trade. But the very people who cried out against such a boycott, and caused the Soviet Union's efforts in this direction to fail, are now attacking the Soviet Union for re-establishing her own trade with Germany. Haven't we a right to suspect such people as really serving capitalist commercial interests and really fighting for grabbing trade as any cheap trader would?

In 1931, the German-Soviet trade totalled one billion one hundred million marks. To set the example to the world while she was trying to achieve a boycott, the Soviet Union reduced her trade with Germany to a point where in 1935 it totalled only about one hundred million marks—a reduction of 91 per cent in volume of trade. Did the capitalist democracies follow this magnificent example of self-sacrifice? Not at all! These cheap, greedy tradesmen seized upon the opportunity to take over from Germany the trade which the U.S.S.R. voluntarily relinquished. And, more, when the U.S.S.R. shifted her own trade from Germany to the capitalist democracies, advantage was taken of her, unfavorable agreements were imposed upon her, and she was given an all-around dirty deal. Even the United States, for example, has forced the Soviet Union to buy three dollars worth of merchandise in this country for every dollar's worth that she has been able to sell us.