



The Stalin Society

BM Box 2521
London WC1N 3XX

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE SO-CALLED
"HITLER - STALIN PACT" OF 1939

Translated from "Roter Morgen" No. 9
September 1989.

"Roter Morgen" is the organ of the K.P.D.
(Communist Party of Germany)

Attacks upon the German-Soviet non-aggression pact of 23rd August 1939 are noticeably on the increase. The government of West Germany together with all of the monopoly capitalist parties and a string of "left-wing" hangers-on are striving to present Stalin as an imperialist and an aggressor who along with Hitler attacked and divided up Poland. This paves the way to relieve German imperialism of its responsibility for the second world war. Are those very people who up till now have refused to recognize the sovereignty of Poland within its post-war frontiers now to be the appointed defenders of Polish national independence?

The guilt of British imperialism.

The attack upon Poland was made possible not by the Soviet Union but above all by Great Britain. As Early as 1933 Great Britain and France signed an agreement for "peace and cooperation" with Italy and Hitler Germany. From the beginning they opposed any treaties for collective security with the Soviet Union against fascist aggression in Europe. They in fact wanted an agreement with Hitler fascism against the U.S.S.R. in order to unleash Germany against the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union on the other hand asked Britain and France to enter into a pact for mutual assistance if there were aggression against one of the signatories and in addition for the three states to guarantee all countries of central and eastern Europe against a fascist attack. But Britain and France were not prepared even early in 1939 to promise military assistance if the U.S.S.R. were attacked. They further declined any guarantees for states dependent on the Soviet Union like the Baltic states.

Neither Britain nor France wanted a treaty with the U.S.S.R. , while by the end of 1938 both had signed bilateral treaties with Nazi Germany which were in fact declarations of mutual non-aggression. This was an invitation to Hitler to attack the U.S.S.R. while Britain and France remained "neutral". They did not wish to wage war on two fronts against Germany together with the U.S.S.R. On June 1st 1939 French ambassador Coulondre reported to his foreign minister Bonnet:

" Hitler's decision (regarding a declaration of war - R.M.) depended

...

*** (Translated from "Roter Morgen" Nr. 9, September 1989)
Organ of the Communist Party of Germany.)

... on whether a British - Soviet pact was signed. One can assume that he was prepared to risk war if Russia did not form part of a front against him. If however Hitler knew that he would also have to fight against Russia, then he would prefer to back off from Poland rather than plunge his country, his party and himself into defeat and destruction." (History of Diplomacy Volume 3, Part 2, Berlin 1948, page 344)

Only because Britain and France blocked a mutual assistance pact with the U.S.S.R. against Hitler fascism did German imperialism dare to start the war.

Britain and France had already handed over Austria, Czechoslovakia and Memel to the Nazis and they were also ready to sacrifice Poland in order to whet Germany's appetite for an attack on the U.S.S.R.

The handing over of Poland.

In 1939 Britain was negotiating with the Nazis to conclude an official non-aggression pact.

"Sir Horace Wilson (the closest adviser of Prime Minister Chamberlain -R.M.) said quite specifically to Herr Wohltat (Hitler's representative for the four year plan - R.M.) that the conclusion of a non-aggression pact would enable Britain to get out of its obligations to Poland." (Dirksen, German ambassador in London on June 21st 1939 in: U.S.S.R. evidence and documents relating to the history of the second world war, Volume 2, Dirksen archive (1938-39) page 69)

When finally Hitler's armies attacked Poland, Britain and France did declare war but didn't fire a shot. Their "guarantees" were worthless. The Polish government had rejected a mutual assistance pact with the U.S.S.R. because in the event of war, they did not want the Red Army to cross their eastern border in order to counter aggression in the west.

Non-aggression pact with fascism ?

In this situation the Hitler government proposed a non-aggression pact to the Soviet Union. The Nazis did not want to fight on two fronts. The U.S.S.R., whose plans for a mutual assistance pact with Britain and France had failed, was forced to accept this offer. Thanks to the

...

aggressive attitude of Britain and France they could not prevent the outbreak of war.

The pact allowed the Soviet Union to postpone the beginning of the war for a year and ten months. They were able to use this time to make extensive preparations for the threatening attack. They were able to move the "eastern front" a hundred kilometres west, from the old line of Leningrad, Narva, Minsk, Kiev to a new line running from Viborg, Kaunas, Bialystok, Brest to Lvov. This prevented the capture of Moscow, took the pressure off the western allies and shortened the war by at least two years. The non-aggression pact played a decisive role in the outcome of the war and weakened Hitler fascism.

Poland

On the 17th of September 1939, 17 days after Hitler's armies had attacked Poland, 4 days after the Polish government had fled to London, the Red Army occupied territories settled by Ukrainians and Belorussiyans, areas which had been taken from the Soviet Union in 1920 by Polish aggression backed by Britain and France. The overwhelming majority of the population of these areas voted on the 22nd of October 1939 for assemblies which decided a few days later on union with the socialist Soviet Republics of Ukraine and Belorussia. Does anyone seriously believe that the Soviet Union should have relinquished its lost territories so that Hitler could have moved his front line east and been able to slaughter even more Poles?

Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania.

After Hitler's victory over Poland and in order to prevent the Nazi armies from invading the Baltic countries, the U.S.S.R. concluded mutual assistance pacts with the governments of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. These pacts granted military bases to the Soviet Union. In the middle of 1940 under the terms of these pacts Soviet troops moved into the Baltic states. This was after the occupation by the Nazis of Denmark and Norway and shortly after the capitulation of France on the 22nd of June 1940. In the Baltic states, encouraged by the victories of Hitler fascism, pro-fascist regimes had been formed, which wanted to turn their countries into

...

bastions for an attack on the Soviet Union in contravention of the agreements signed. They were overthrown however by the workers' movement and by democratic forces and a short time later by their own choice the Baltic states joined the U.S.S.R. as autonomous republics. This was confirmed by elections. The fascist forces and their present day supporters were and are of course bitter opponents of this correct step. They falsely describe the voluntary integration into the Soviet Union as annexation by the Soviet Union.

Rumania

In 1940 the Soviet Union demanded from Rumania the return of the territories of Bessarabia and Bukovina, which Rumania had annexed in 1918. After the Rumanian government agreed, the Red Army marched in on the 27th June 1940. A year later Rumanian troops side by side with the Nazis attacked the U.S.S.R. Should the U.S.S.R. have left its stolen territories to the pro-fascist regime of King Carol, so that it could attack the Soviet Union under more favourable conditions?

Obvious intentions

The reasons why the non-aggression pact is being viciously criticised today are obvious. There is a large-scale attack underway on the present frontiers of the Soviet Union. In particular the so-called "secret additional protocol" which allegedly deals with "the question of mutual spheres of interest in settling eastern European frontiers" is relevant here. The original document does not exist. Foreign minister Ribbentrop is supposed to have given instructions to burn it. Before this however the text was allegedly photographed and today is in the political archives of the foreign ministry in Bonn. (Spiegel 7.8.1989, page 85) In the Soviet Union there are no such "documents". The Hitler fascists had previously organised the Reichstag fire, they had faked the attack on the Gleiwitz transmitter, they had pushed the blame for Katyn on to the Soviets. Would it not have been in their interests before their collapse to strike one last blow at the Soviet Union? The Soviet government is submitting to pressure from western imperialism and is preparing the annulment of this "document" and also of the non-aggression pact. Thereby they are putting their frontiers up for grabs. The Baltic states especially whose incorporation into the U.S.S.R. has not been recognized till this

...

day in the U.S.A., would thereby become "independent" again and provide a further deployment zone for western imperialism against the Soviet Union.

Poland too is being encouraged to make territorial demands on the Soviet Union, since Eastern Poland allegedly became part of the Soviet Union under the terms of the pact.

The attacks upon the non-aggression pact have an aggressive and imperialistic character. They serve to promote the alteration of eastern European frontiers in favour of western imperialism and in particular of west German imperialism, which wants to regain the spheres of interest it had before the outbreak of war.

The rejection of the German-Soviet non-aggression pact gives expression also to the present standpoint of west German imperialism, that Hitler might have done better in 1939 to attack the Soviet Union - in a common arrangement with Britain and France. The rejection of the pact and the lack of criticism of the pro-Nazi and anti-Soviet policies of both these countries clearly shows their anger at the outcome of the war and at the alliance of Britain, France and the Soviet Union, which broke the neck of Hitler fascism.

Defending the German-Soviet non-aggression pact is a touchstone which shows whether one is genuinely striving to weaken one's own imperialism or whether - despite leftist or peace phrases - one is in reality providing grist for the mill for the warmongers then and now.