



**HISTORY
AND
BACKGROUND**

**THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION
OF RESISTANCE MOVEMENTS**

BY ALEXANDER HELDRING

This book is the second study in a series on
'The East-West Confrontation and the International
Communist Front Organisations'.

I. Maanen, Gert van

**THE INTERNATIONAL STUDENT MOVEMENT --
HISTORY AND BACKGROUND**

The Hague : INTERDOC

1966

352 pp.

**International Documentation and Information Centre
(INTERDOC)**

Van Stolkweg 10, The Hague
The Netherlands

THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF RESISTANCE MOVEMENTS

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

BY ALEXANDER HELDRING

**THE HAGUE
1969**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Preface	I
<u>Chapter I, Is the FIR a Communist Front Organisation?</u>	1
A. Characteristics	2
B. The Front Organisations before the Second World War	4
C. Decline and Revival	5
D. Changed objectives?	7
<u>Chapter II, The FIAPP, forerunner of the FIR</u>	10
A. Preparations	10
B. Establishment of the FIAPP	12
C. The FIAPP takes sides in international conflicts	14
D. The Member Organisations of the FIAPP	16
<u>Chapter III, FIAPP becomes FIR</u>	22
A. The FIAPP's ties with other international front organisations	22
B. The FIAPP expels Yugoslavia from its ranks	23
C. The non-Communist Associations leave the FIAPP; the FIAPP tries to re-orientate	26
D. Foundation of the FIR	28
E. Everything remains the same	29
<u>Chapter IV, The early years of the FIR</u>	32
A. The FIR and the Soviet Union	33
B. Some of the political standpoints in the early years	33
C. The FIR restricts itself to Europe	36
<u>Chapter V, Organisation and Structure of the FIR</u>	39
A. Headquarters	39
B. Statutes	39
C. Members	39

	<u>Page</u>
D. Finance	41
E. Organs: a) The Congress	42
b) The General Council	43
c) The Bureau	43
F. Special Days	46
G. Medical Activities	47
H. Further Social Activities	48
I. History of the Resistance Movement	50
J. FIR Publications	52
<u>Chapter VI, The Attitude of the FIR on the Question of a Divided Germany</u>	56
A. The FIR and the Federal Republic	56
B. The FIR and the DDR	61
<u>Chapter VII, Some National Resistance Movements and their Relations with the FIR</u>	68
A. The VVN	69
B. The ZBOWID	71
C. The SUBNOR	75
<u>Chapter VIII, The International Camp Committees; The FIR's Striving for Unity</u>	80
A. The International Auschwitz Committee	81
B. The FIR's Striving for Unity:	86
a) the FIR and the FMAC	86
b) the FIR and the UIRD	86
<u>Chapter IX, Recent Developments within the FIR</u>	92
A. The FIR and Israel	92
B. The FIR Seeks New Areas for Activity	94
<u>Chapter X, Conclusion</u>	99
<u>Statutes</u>	102
<u>Member Organisations</u>	113

PREFACE

This study deals with an international Communist front organisation which has never been widely known, and which because of its ties with the resistance during the second World War, seems foredoomed to be on the decline. There are signs, however, of a growing significance of this federation in the network of front organisations supporting the cause of Soviet Communism.

The reason for this change is what is called in Communist terminology "the revival of Nazism" and "West German revanchism". These terms have been used for years, but they have got a new meaning through the Communist policy for "European Security". This policy is directed against the NATO, but the main target is the Federal Republic of Germany. The propaganda for support of this policy is usually very anti-German. By preference issues are used which expose the Federal Republic of Germany as an aggressive nation.

It is clear that in this situation FIR could play an important part, as its chief task is to prevent a re-emergence of Nazism or Fascism. This is, by common Communist consent, exactly what is happening in the Federal Republic of Germany. Consequently FIR developed more activity, with varying success.

After the invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968, the Federal Republic of Germany has been the target of increased Soviet attacks. FIR, however, cannot sufficiently follow this policy, because of disagreements within its own ranks. The occupation of Czechoslovakia caused dissatisfaction and confusion in several Communist front organisations, and particularly in FIR. Several of its affiliated organisations condemned in more or less strong terms the invasion. It is likely that the rift which has been created will influence the effectiveness of FIR. On the other hand, taking into

account the increasing tendency of Communist parties and front organisations to excuse the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia, FIR might be able to start new action before long.

Therefore an effective response on the part of the West is essential. As FIR action is mainly directed against the Federal Republic of Germany, trying to isolate this country from other NATO members, this effort should be met adequately. Above all it is necessary to provide objective information on the Federal Republic of Germany, in particular on the aims of its foreign policy, thus settling with the persistent myth of German aggressiveness.

Without detracting from the merits of other organisations, such as the "World Veterans Federation", there is one organisation which deserves special attention in regard to the confrontation with FIR, namely the "Union Internationale de la Résistance et de la Déportation" (UIRD). This federation unites the non-communist resistance organisations. Its monthly paper "La Voix Internationale de la Résistance" exposes the aims and activities of FIR, while it makes clear that the principles and interests of the former resistance fighters are better represented in UIRD. Making a stand against totalitarianism both from the extreme Right and the extreme Left, it contributes to the defense and continued existence of a democratic society.

The writer of this booklet is a student of international affairs. After graduating from the University of Leyden, he made this special study. Interested in the phenomenon of Communist front organisations, he wanted to study the question whether FIR is a front organisation in the usual sense of the word, namely that its purpose is to advance the cause of Soviet Communism. Defining the characteristics of a Communist front organisation; tracing the history of FIR; describing its aims, organisation,

activities and development; analysing its relations with the Soviet Union, with Communist front organisations and with non-Communist international organisations, he arrives at his conclusion.

It is to be hoped that this study will not only contribute to a better knowledge of a Communist front organisation, but also to a better understanding of the values which were defended by the resistance fighters.

The Hague, February 1969

C. C. van den Heuvel
Director of Interdoc
Vice-President of the International Union of Resistance and Deportee Movements (UIRD)

I. IS THE FIR A COMMUNIST FRONT ORGANISATION?

FIR is the abbreviation of the French name for an association of former resistance fighters in the Second World War. "La Fédération Internationale des Résistants". The federation is regarded as one of the so-called Communist international front organisations; these are (according to a somewhat outdated definition) non-governmental, international organisations, which strive to attain to world Communism independent of the countries which are already Communist or of the Communist parties in the Western and "Third" world.

Put very simply, they strive to reach their goal by uniting groups, which are receptive to their ideas, behind a professional banner or an objective which at first sight has nothing to do with Communism.

Once these groups have been caught in the "net", then they are exposed to Communist propaganda. This form of propaganda has this advantage over the activities of a Communist party, that the official objectives of a particular front organisation are usually highly respectable and non-political, so that one often does not notice the indoctrination - which is very carefully introduced - or else accepts it into the bargain. As I have already said, this is very simply expressed. In actual fact the Communist propaganda system is more complicated, front organisations differ a great deal from one another, some of them have become completely bureaucratic or have to cope with internal dissensions which paralyse their activities.

Nor can one simply dismiss the FIR as a Communist front organisation; one must try to produce some evidence for this and that is not easy. I shall therefore try first to show the factors which the Communist front organisations have in common and which are a condition for this qualification. These factors lie both in the historical as well as the organisational field. If one has been able approximately to determine these factors, then one can try to compare the history and organic structure of the FIR herewith. I should like to emphasise here that I propose to proceed with a certain amount of caution, since one is all too easily inclined to interpret factors subjectively and to force the comparisons to some extent.

A. Characteristics

Someone who has made an attempt to name a number of factors which - according to him - make an organisation a Communist front organisation, is J.C. Clews in his book "Communist Propaganda Techniques" (1).

He gives certain qualifications which a front organisation must fulfil. These are framed in the interrogative and the answers are often very difficult to provide since, for example, it is not possible to discover who provides the necessary financial resources and what happens to them, or nothing is known of the curriculum vitae and the background of the people who really run the organisation (see questions 7 and 8).

Taken separately the characteristics are not conclusive, but taken together they can indicate the activities of a front organisation (2).

Clews has arrived at these factors by a comparative study of the different organisations, but he is himself cautious in the use he makes of them.

Moreover, they only constitute political and not legal evidence. I shall therefore quote the following questions, omitting a few which have no bearing on this matter, as they apply to "local" rather than international fronts:

- 1) To what extent does the organisation co-operate with the campaigns, activities and publications of the Communist party or other front organisations?
- 2) Does it share the same address as other fronts (which operate at the national or international level)?
- 3) Does the organisation receive favourable publicity in the Communist press? In itself this criterion could be misinterpreted, as the objectively independent actions of a body could be subjectively interpreted as favouring the Communist cause.
- 4) Do its publications reflect the Communist party line, does it publish articles by Communists or sympathisers, advertise Communist or other front activities? Occasional references of this nature may mean nothing, of course. Systematic publication of such material can be very significant.
- 5) Is the organisation's printing done by a Communist printing house? In countries where the publisher's and printer's imprint are legally required, this is immediately obvious, though in

itself it may mean nothing other than the economy of cost offered by the printer in question!

6) Does the organisation itself follow the Communist party line? This is not always so easy to distinguish as the criterion under question 4, as the organisation may be better judged by its actions than by its words.

7) Are the organisation's funds transferred directly or indirectly to the Communist party or to other fronts? Most of these organisations rarely, if ever, publish their accounts and it would be most difficult to answer this question from overt sources.

Clews himself does not give as a criterion that the fronts must obtain their money precisely from the Communist parties. It seems to me that in a sense this would not be necessary if the fronts are really mass organisations, sometimes even with millions of members, according to the statements of the organisations themselves. If each member were to pay only one dollar contribution, then one would already have a considerable sum, from which it would probably be possible to put something at the disposal of less fortunate parties or other fronts. The opposite could, however, be the case with money-consuming manifestations, such as World Youth Festivals, etc.

8) Does the organisation have Communists or their trusted associates in positions of power? Are its meetings regularly addressed by such people? In my opinion it is not easy for the private research worker to give an answer to this question. If one can only go by the biographies, which are published by the organisations themselves on the occasion of birthdays or as obituaries (the FIR organ "der Widerstandskämpfer" (the Resistance Fighter) often has such items), then one does not learn much about Communist backgrounds. Thus much time and research work is called for if more detailed information is to be obtained.

If we apply this method of Clews to the case under consideration, two of the above-mentioned questions can be answered in the affirmative, i. e.

2) the FIR shares its address (Castellezgasse 35, Vienna II) with the national front organisation "Der Bundesverband Osterreichischer Widerstandskämpfer und Opfer des Faschis-

mus (KZ-Verband)" (National Association of Austrian Resistance Fighters and Victims of Fascism (Association of Concentration Camp Victims)).

5) the organ of the FIR, "der Widerstandskämpfer", and other FIR publications were, up to January 1968, printed at "Globus" in Vienna, which is the official printing house of the Austrian Communist Party (KPO). This work was thereafter taken over by Polygrafické zavody, Bratislava, Czechoslovakia.

I shall go into the other criteria in more detail when dealing with the history and structure of the FIR.

In order to make the working methods of the front organisations more comprehensible it is necessary to go into more detail here on how they came into existence in the past and with what difficulties they had - and still have - to cope.

B. The Front Organisations before the Second World War.

When Lenin was seeking wider support for his socialism after the October Revolution of 1917, he began to appreciate the usefulness of the so-called mass organisations, such as trades unions, professional organisations and other organisations with various objectives. These organisations could serve as so-called "transmission belts" for the Communist machine, which would provide the connection between the "vanguard of the proletariat", i.e. the Communist Party, and the proletariat itself (3).

This idea was later taken over and worked out by Stalin (4): "The party is the only organisation capable of centralising the leadership of the struggle of the proletariat, thus transforming each and every non-party organisation of the working class into an auxiliary body and transmission belt linking the Party with the class ... The proletariat needs these transmission belts, these levers and this driving power, since without these aids the proletariat would be a weaponless army in its struggle for victory over armed and organised capital". As early as 1920 the function of a "transmission belt" was exercised by the International Veterans' Union, the International Council of Trades Unions and International Secretariat

for Women. In the same year the International Council of Trades Unions was changed into the "Red International of Labor Unions" (Profintern), and various other organisations were established, such as the "Red Sport International" (Sportintern) and in 1923 the "International Peasants' Union" (Krestintern).

As can be seen from the names of these organisations, the Communist character was too evident. The German Communist Willi Münzenberg, who had fled to Switzerland during the First World War, where he had met and worked with Lenin and Trotsky, therefore applied a different method. He became head of the "International Workers' Aid Organisation", which collected money to help combat the famine in the Soviet Union. The propaganda for this action was so successful that Münzenberg put the same methods into practice for his political activities.

In contrast to the old "transmission belts" he was able to work independent of any Communist party and of the Comintern and to have his own funds at his disposal. In this way he was able, as he cynically expressed it, to reach the "Innocents". Münzenberg's type of "transmission belt" was to be developed further after the Second World War.

In 1927 he founded the "Anti-Imperialist League", which later became known as the "Congress against War and Fascism"; this was primarily directed against Great Britain and a Germany stricken by inflation.

The common aim of all front organisations was again described metaphorically by the Finn Kuusinen during a meeting of the executive committee of the Comintern in March 1926. His word and his ideas on the "solar system" of organisations have already been quoted so often that I do not need to repeat them here (6).

C. Decline and Revival

The pre-war fronts had, however, a fairly short existence, since they could not stand up to the consternation which was caused amongst the "Innocents" by the Nazi-Soviet treaty of 23rd August 1939, the Russian attack on Finland, Russo-

German division of Poland and the annexation of the Baltic States. A few old "transmission belts" (such as the Profintern and the Krestintern) continued to exist pro forma for some time, but were disbanded at the same time as the Comintern in May 1943. However, after the German invasion of Russia in 1941 the Soviet military successes and the role played by Communists in different countries in the resistance movement brought the Soviet Union fresh prestige, which offered possibilities for the setting up of a new network of international front organisations after the war (7). And the desire to continue the wartime co-operation had indeed grown.

Thus in the course of 1945 and 1946 numerous organisations sprang up, such as the "International Organisation of Journalists"(IOJ), the "International Association of Democratic Lawyers"(IADL) and many other professional and non-governmental organisations, in which honest attempts were made to collaborate in the international field without considering political differences.

This original intention was, however, frustrated when the Communists managed to gain control of most of the key positions in the organisations by virtue of clever manoeuvres and manipulations with the large number of members which - according to them - they had in the East Bloc (8).

This resulted in a great exodus of Western organisations up to the period at about the beginning of the fifties, so that one had to be very "innocent" indeed to remain a member of these new fronts.

In the meantime the Cominform had been established in October 1947 in Belgrade, which had the advantage over the Comintern that it was more subject to the control of the CPSU, so that there was no intervention in the internal affairs of this party. Only the East European satellites, the French and Italian Communist parties and the CPSU were members.

When, however, Tito became rebellious round about 1948, this meant in a sense the collapse of the Cominform (9). A regrouping of forces (10) and a tactical change of position therefore became necessary; in other words, the actual "Agit-proparbeit" (agitation and propaganda work) was taken over by the front organisations.

This "work" was directed not only against Western policies, as, for example, the accusations that UN forces in Korea

were carrying on bacteriological warfare, but also against Yugoslavia, which was the outcast of all front organisations.

D. Changed objectives?

When most of the non-Communist organisations had left the fronts, the question arises as to what the use was of these post-war "transmission belts". The answer may lie (11) in the fact that in the last phase of Stalinism the emphasis was less on infiltration with the aim of gaining new Communist sympathisers, than on imposing a certain degree of discipline on those who were already sympathisers within the organisational framework. In other words, between 1948 and 1955 the fronts served the welfare of these sympathisers and were not concentrating on misleading the "Innocents" (this had become a marginal function).

A second function may be that, in view of the isolation of the Communist countries in the last phase of Stalinism through the lowering of the Iron Curtain, the fronts could give the impression from the psychological point of view that these Communist countries were not standing entirely on their own, but that there were groups in other countries, who thought and acted along the same lines.

As a third function one can say (12) that in countries where the Communist parties are forbidden, the front organisations can serve as cover organs, as, for instance, the VVN in Germany (13) (How difficult it is to prove this legally will be shown later in dealing with the VVN case in 1962).

With regard to the second function it may be remarked that after 1955 this task remained the same, but then in another dimension: through the pushing open of the Iron Curtain there had to be an ideological counterweight against the increasing contact with non-Communists. The fronts could offer just such a counterweight.

The importance of these organisations in general was emphasised yet again by Maurice Thorez, secretary-general of the French Communist party, during its fifteenth congress (14): "The party cannot fulfil its task exclusively with its own resources and without the support and participation of the mass

organisations ... The strengthening of the ties between Communists and non-Communists on all sectors of the political front must be the foremost and the constant care of each of us ... The strengthening of the trade unions, the women's organisations and the groups of former resistance fighters must be carried out much more systematically by the Communists".

After the twentieth party congress of the CPSU in February 1956, at which the policy of peaceful co-existence was consolidated (15), the old function of "beguiling the Innocents" found a new sphere of action in the developing countries. This brought fresh difficulties with it, however: Asiatic neutralism, Afro-Arabic nationalism and Chinese Communist ambitions were found to be considerable obstacles, which the fronts came upon in their work. The last obstacle in particular, which came to a head in the Sino-Soviet conflict, has done great harm to the effectiveness of many of the front organisations.

The FIR, on account of its special character as an organisation whose members remain the same q.q. and who come only from countries which have experienced German occupation, has not had to cope with these difficulties, or has only been indirectly involved, as we shall see in Chapter IX.

We shall, therefore, having arrived at this point, turn our attention away from the other fronts and further deal exclusively with the characteristics and the fortunes of an organisation, whose official objectives as laid down in its constitution, and the tragic past of so many of its members, should arouse the sympathy of others, but which sympathy - as we shall see - is alas mainly used for the purposes described above.

Notes

1. Published in London, 1964, p.93.
2. The same method is used by Friedrich & Brzezinski in "Totalitarian Dictatorship & Autocracy", New York, 1956, p.9, in connection with the determining factors for a totalitarian state.
3. cf. Phelps-Fetherston "Soviet International Front Organisations", New York, 1965, p.1.

4. Stalin "Problems of Leninism", Moscow, 1940, p.77 et seq.
5. For a detailed biography see Gross "Willi Münzenberg, a political biography", Stuttgart, 1967. He died on 22nd October 1944 in Caugnet, France. The actual circumstances of his death so far remain unknown.
6. cf. Phelps-Fetherston, op.cit. p.1.
van Maanen "International Student Movement", The Hague, 1966, p.13.
Bass "Communist Fronts", Problems of Communism, Washington, 1960, part. V, p.9.
7. Bass, op.cit., p.11.
8. cf. Orth "International Communist Front Organisations", Pfaffenhofen/Ilm, 1964, p.136.
9. The Headquarters were moved to Bucharest; the Cominform was not, however, officially disbanded until 1956.
10. "Ost-Probleme", Vol. 6, No. 41, October 1954.
11. cf. Bass, op.cit., p.13.
12. Orth, op.cit., p.10.
13. VVN means here: Vereinigungen der Verfolgten des Naziregimes (Associations of Victims of the Nazi Regime).
14. "L'humanité", organ of the PCF, 26th June 1959.
15. van Maanen, op.cit., p.18.

II. THE FIAPP, FORERUNNER OF THE FIR

We do not know exactly whether the idea had already been conceived during the Second World War of establishing an association of former deportees and victims of the Nazi régime, which, alongside the professional front organisations and front organisations with an idealistic objective, would use the objectives laid down in its constitution as a label behind which it could hide completely different activities.

Nevertheless, it was to be expected that after the war the opinions of those who had survived the Nazi camps would be treated with sympathy and respect. By gathering these people together into an organisation a very suitable terrain was created for propaganda activities.

If one studies the fortunes of the organisation which was to pave the way for the FIR and which may be considered as having been a "try-on" for it, then one cannot but think that the entire plan for the establishment of a front organisation was carried out along strictly defined lines.

However, when this organisation, which was to be the forerunner of the FIR, was too consistent in following Soviet propaganda tactics, the results proved to be - as we shall see - just the opposite of what had been intended.

A. Preparations

Towards the end of 1945 and beginning of 1946 great activity was exhibited by the former deportees of a number of European countries (1).

The central committee of the Czech "Association of Former Political Prisoners and Families of Nazi Victims" had sent out invitations to other countries to attend an international congress, which was to be held in May 1946 in Prague. With a view to preparing for this congress a meeting took place in Paris on 29th January 1946 attended by three Belgians, a Spaniard (in exile) and an observer from the Norwegian Embassy in Paris. This gathering was organised by a French association, the FNDIRP. This association was first known as the FNDIP: "La Fédération Nationale des Déportés et

Internés Patriotes" (The National Federation of Patriotic Deportees and Internees). Thus the 'R' which stood for "Résistants" had not yet been added; these resistance fighters belonged to a rival association with an almost identical name, "La Fédération Nationale des Déportés et Internés de la Résistance", the FNDIR.

The FNDIP were anxious to link up with the FNDIR, but the executive of the latter organisation had serious objections to such a link-up on account of the dominant Communist influence in the FNDIP (this association was in fact controlled by the French Communist Party, the PCF).

During a meeting which took place on 10th and 11th January 1946 the national committee of the FNDIP therefore passed a resolution (2) whereby the membership of the Federation was opened to the resistance fighters and the name of the organisation was altered to "Fédération Nationale des Déportés et Internés Résistants et Patriotes" (FNDIRP) (National Federation of Patriotic Deportees and Internees and Resistance Fighters); the qualitative difference between the two associations thereby appeared to have been removed (which seemed to render the FNDIR superfluous).

The FNDIR voiced its protest in a press communiqué, in which it was stated that "the FNDIP, which is established at 10 rue Leroux, Paris (3), and which has decided in future to call itself FNDIRP, cannot in any respect claim to have the sole right of uniting the French resistance fighters behind its colours". The president of the FNDIRP, Frédéric Manhès (of whom we shall hear more in the course of this study) reacted with an article (4) in which he accused his opponent of the same "monopolism".

Thus on the national level the trends were already becoming manifest which were later to become evident in the international sphere.

Thus the FNDIRP had organised the preparatory meeting for the Prague Congress, but in the meantime an initiative had been taken by the Polish government in Warsaw, which had via its Minister of Foreign Affairs, Rzymowski, sent invitations to the governments of various countries asking them to send delegations of former political prisoners of the Nazi régime to an international congress, which was to be held in Warsaw from 3rd - 5th February 1946. The countries in-

vited were: the Soviet Union, Ukraine, White Russia, Bulgaria, France, Spain (Spaniards in exile), the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, Denmark and Norway, and the Central Committee for the Jews. As soon as the Czech association heard of this plan, they at once cancelled their invitations in favour of the Polish initiative.

One must, however, bear in mind what was going on in Poland at this time. The country was occupied by the Red Army, which was preparing for the advent of the "People's Dictatorship" (5). There remained but few of the Non-Communist resistance fighters, since their leaders had been captured by the Russians and deported to Moscow directly after the war. On 27th June 1945 a "provisional government of national unity" was constituted, in which - in fact - the Stalinist Bierut played the leading part. It was this government which took the initiative to organise the first International Congress of Former Political Prisoners and Victims of Nazism. At the same time the first National Congress of former Political Prisoners took place in Poland under the leadership of Joseph Cyrankiewicz, who later became prime minister (some years later he was to become the president of the ZBOWID, which on 10th September 1949 superseded all Polish associations of resistance fighters, political prisoners, etc.).

B. Establishment of the FIAPP

At the congress which was held in Warsaw from 3rd-5th February 1946 the proposal of the Polish Foreign Office official, Dr. Tadeusz Chromecki, was adopted that an association be founded, which should bear the name "La Fédération Internationale des Anciens Prisonniers Politiques des Camps de Concentration allemands (FIAPP)" (International Federation of Former Political Prisoners of German Concentration Camps). It was agreed that in the spring of 1947 an international meeting should be organised in Brussels, at which this decision should be sanctioned. The Congress also adopted a motion for the establishment in Warsaw of the seat of the new Federation. (This was significant because the activities of the FIAPP were thereby to come under the constant control of a Communist government).

Brussels, however, did not appear to be the right place to hold the international meeting. At a gathering in Warsaw from 20th - 22nd July 1946 (Albania (6), Italy, Yugoslavia and Poland herself joined the company) the FNDIRP representative, Charles Désirat, announced that he was unable to agree with the choice of Brussels. He proposed that the congress should be held in Paris and was supported in this by the delegates of the Soviet Union.

Protests from the Belgians, who foresaw that this would mean that the FNDIRP would set its stamp too heavily on the congress, were of little avail and Paris thereby became the choice for the 1947 congress.

It was evident from the composition of the provisional executive committee that the Communists already occupied key positions in the new Federation: the President was Maurice Lampe (France), whose functions included that of secretary-general of the FNDIRP and who was a member of the PCF. The Vice-Presidents were Kuzma Dubyna (Soviet Union), Marian Vivoda (Yugoslavia) and Alois Neumann (Czechoslovakia). Dubyna and Vivoda were not representatives of national organisations but of their governments (see note 6); Neumann was to become a Minister after the Communist coup d'état in Czechoslovakia in 1948. Joseph Cyrankiewicz became the secretary-general. When the provisional government of national unity was replaced by a wholly Communist one in February 1948 Cyrankiewicz relinquished his FIAPP post and became premier in the new Polish government. The Polish deputy prime-minister, Zygmunt Balicki, became his successor. The "official" foundation congress of the FIAPP took place from 29th March to 6th April 1947 in Paris. Eighteen countries took part in the congress, namely Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Spain (Spaniards in exile), France, Greece, Italy, Yugoslavia, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, the Ukraine, Poland, Rumania, the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia and White Russia. The representatives of the Central Committee for the Jews, which organisation had taken part in the discussions in Warsaw in February 1946, were integrated into the national delegations.

A definitive Executive Committee was elected on the spot, which resulted in the same members as had been in the pro-

visional committee (7).

One can say that of the 18 countries which participated in the foundation congress only Belgium, Denmark, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Norway were not represented by exclusively Communist delegations.

C. The FIAPP takes sides in international conflicts

On 5th June 1947, during a speech delivered on the campus of Harvard University, the American Secretary of State, George Marshall, launched the famous Marshall Plan, which was aimed at getting Europe onto its feet again economically. This plan was not, however, well received by the Executive Committee of the FIAPP, which held its first meeting in Warsaw from 31st July to 4th August 1947. The FIAPP leaders received a warm welcome from the President of the Polish Republic, Bierut (a fervent Stalinist), who shared the Soviet Union's dislike of the Marshall Plan. He had no cause for complaint about the political standpoints of the FIAPP, for the Executive Committee adopted a resolution ("Appeal by the FIAPP to the peace-loving peoples and to democratic governments"), in which the policy of the "Anglo-Saxons" was condemned and, in particular, the Marshall Plan, "which would lead to the revival of militarism in Germany and would infringe the sovereignty of the countries of Europe (8)". The Marshall Plan was later repeatedly attacked by the FIAPP. For instance, in March 1948 (9) the secretary-general, Balicki, wrote that the generosity of the United States had but one goal: "The expansion of American trusts" and "The Truman-Marshall doctrine enunciates the colonisation of all the countries of Western Europe." The fact that the FIAPP was not in agreement with the Truman doctrine of 12th March 1947 was also apparent from the appeal which they directed to the "peace-loving countries" at the meeting of the Executive Committee in Warsaw. The Greek civil war had started in September 1946, which was to last until October 1949. The support given by the British and, after the Truman doctrine, by the Americans to the "Greek monarchist criminals" was severely criticised.

Balicki also wrote about this conflict and demanded the "withdrawal of the British and American forces from Greece" (10). During the civil war several thousand Greek children were taken by the Communists (mainly) from families and deported to countries such as Czechoslovakia, Albania, Poland, Bulgaria and Rumania, where these children would be brought up according to Communist ideas.

Though there was - to put it mildly - but little enthusiasm in Western circles for this method of upbringing, the FIAPP thought differently (11):

"The Greek people may consider themselves fortunate that at least some of the youth of Greece will, thanks to the hospitality extended by various countries, be brought up in safety, without having to suffer hunger and far removed from the atrocities which the monarcho-fascists and their foreign masters have perpetrated."

It was quite clear that the FIAPP was somewhat prejudiced. As, for example, its pronouncement on the occupation of Germany (12): "A comparison between the constitutions of the zones occupied by the Western powers and that of the Soviet zone shows us that it is only in the latter that denazification has taken on the nature of a constitutional law (13)."

This same bias was exhibited in statements about the armaments race. Thus in February 1949, under the heading (14) "Where are the warmongers?", it wrote: "Admiral Zacharias of the United States has said: 'We have at our disposal a weapon with which we can destroy human, vegetable and animal life anywhere in the world.'" However, when several months later (September) the U.S.S.R. appeared to have the same weapon at its disposal, no such comments were made. According to its name the FIAPP was an organisation which concerned itself with the interests of individuals, and in particular with those who had suffered under the Nazi régime. However, contact with organisations whose aims were to guarantee political freedom and to exterminate racialism, was not always found to be in keeping with the propagandistic line followed by the FIAPP. At a sitting of the FIAPP propaganda committee in February 1948 in Prague it was decided not to become a member of the International League for the Rights of Man and to refuse to co-operate in any way with this organisation (15). The League was founded in 1941 in New York

and later turned its attention entirely to the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was accepted by the General Assembly of the UN on 10th December 1948. Although the FIAPP had but little enthusiasm for the above-mentioned objectives of the UN, they were nevertheless keen to have contact with this world-wide organisation.

They made an attempt to attain consultative status (as a non-governmental body) on the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) of the UN. The Soviet representative with ECOSOC, Morozov, had filed a request to this end on 16th February 1949, but there was no place for the FIAPP in the consultative ranks of this economic and social organ. As the British delegate Corley-Smith pointed out: "the reasons for the existence of the FIAPP are neither social nor economic but wholly political". The request was rejected by nine votes to three (Soviet Union, Poland and White Russia) with six absentions.

The FIAPP propaganda committee, which had refused contact and collaboration with the International League for the Rights of Man was led by the Czech Jan Vodicka (16). He had played an active part in the Communist coup d'état in Prague in February 1948 and there after became Minister of Posts, Telegraphs and Telephones. One of the results of the coup had been that the Association of Former Political Prisoners, which had taken the actual initiative for the foundation of such an organisation as the FIAPP, was dissolved in May 1948 and replaced by a "Federation of Fighters for Freedom" (which embraced all categories).

The secretary-general of this new organisation was Jan Vodicka. As has already been mentioned above, a similar streamlining amongst these organisations was to take place a year later in Poland.

D. The Member Organisation of the FIAPP

We have seen that the FIAPP was officially constituted on 6th April 1947 at a meeting in which 18 countries participated.

In August 1947 the FIAPP consisted of organisations from 16 countries (17); White Russia and the Ukraine, who had atten-

ded the Foundation Congress, were not represented by a delegation of their own.

Of these organisations I will only mention: the FNDIRP (France), the ANPPIA (Associazione Nazionale Perseguitati Politici Italiani Antifascisti), the Polish Association of Former Political Prisoners (18) and an identical Czech association. Both the latter associations were dissolved (see above) in 1949 and May 1948 respectively and replaced by so-called "unity associations".

Both in Germany and in Austria there were organisations which had the same objectives as the FIAPP, but were not included as members (19).

In Germany there was the "Vereinigung der Verfolgten des Naziregimes (VVN)" (Association of Victims of the Nazi Regime), which was also in the Soviet zone, where a branch was established in East Berlin on 23rd February 1947 (20). In Austria there existed the "Verband Osterreichischer KZ-ler und politisch Verfolgten (KZ-Verband)" (Association of Austrian Concentration Camp Prisoners and Victims of Political Persecution), which consisted exclusively of Communists after an attempt on 24th May 1945 to arrive at a Union of all political victims had failed owing to the exodus of the Catholics and the Socialists, who formed an association of their own.

The question of the admission of both these organisations to the FIAPP was brought up at the beginning of August 1947 in Warsaw during a meeting of the Executive and International Committees of the Federation. The FIAPP decided unanimously that there was at that time no question of its taking up contact with these two organisations, particularly in view of the fact that according to the statutes such admission was only possible as the result of a decision taken by the highest organ in the Federation, the Congress. A year later, from 29th-31st May 1948, the Executive Committee met in Warsaw and Katowice in the company of Franz Dahlem, the representative of the German VVN (he was a militant Communist and was later to occupy a ministerial post in the DDR) and Dr. Dürmayer of the "KZ-Verband" from Austria.

At this meeting the Executive Committee decided, under pressure from the Russian delegate Nicolai Poukhlov, the

successor of Kuzma Dubyna, to admit the VVN and the KZ-Verband to the FIAPP, though this was contrary to the provisions of the statutes (21).

The secretary-general of the FIAPP, Balicki, later wrote: "This meeting was the most important event in the existence of the FIAPP since its foundation." (22). Why did the FIAPP attach so much weight to the admission of these two associations? It is fairly safe to say that, as the FIAPP had gradually turned completely into a front organisation, Germany and Austria offered a very suitable terrain for propaganda purposes, since in these two very countries the cold war was being carried on. As was to appear later, the VVN and the KZ-Verband did not remain impartial in this respect.

At this same meeting the Yugoslav vice-president of the FIAPP, Vivoda, had proposed the admission of the Association of Former Political Prisoners of the Free City of Trieste. This organisation consisted of some 10,000 members (out of a population of 450,000).

The Russian Poukhlov had, however, objections to this (23): the fight for freedom which the inhabitants of Trieste had been carrying on since 1922 against the Italian fascists and after the Italian armistice in 1943 against the German occupiers did not interest the FIAPP.

Nevertheless the Yugoslav succeeded as the result of great persistence in getting the Trieste Association admitted as a member.

The background to the Russian objections was clearly their dislike of Yugoslavia (and certainly of the proposals put forward by this country), which was to find expression a month later, on 28th June, in the expulsion of Yugoslavia from the Cominform. These were the first signs that Yugoslavia would not be able to maintain its membership of the FIAPP for long. The decisions taken at Warsaw and Katowice were not received very enthusiastically, particularly by the Belgian and Dutch associations. This found expression at the meeting of the International Committee in Brussels from 27th-30th November 1948.

The FIAPP there announced that after the admission of Germany, Austria and Trieste there were now 21 member organisations. In fact, however, the Norwegian, Danish and Luxem-

bourg associations had broken off almost all contact with the FIAPP.

At this meeting the Netherlands delegation, led by Messrs. Stomps and van Lanschot, accused the Executive Committee of having presented the affiliated organisations with a "fait accompli" by allowing the VVN and the KZ-Verband to become members. Moreover, the Dutchmen were opposed to the frequent use by so many of the FIAPP leaders of the word "fascists", which was used to indicate everyone who had a different viewpoint to that of the Communists. The Rumanian delegate, Mrs. Comnacu, was, however, of the opinion that the world was divided between those who brought about the resurgence of fascism in various forms and were preparing for a new war to serve their own interests, and the democratic forces which were striving for peace and democracy. At the head of these latter forces stood the Soviet Union and further all peoples who were fighting for disarmament and the atomic bomb (24). The FIAPP's task must be to strive for the attainment of these objectives.

The Rumanian's views were shared by everyone except the Belgians and the Dutch. In order not to offend these countries too greatly and thus bring about their withdrawal, they were both informed that the FIAPP would not seek contact with other front organisations if this contact was the subject of protest by the non-Communists in the FIAPP. How far this promise was to be kept, we shall see in the next chapter.

Notes

1. Facts which are directly related to the history of the FIAPP and for which no individual source is quoted are based upon documentary material belonging to Mr. H. Halin of Brussels, who kindly made it available to the author of this article.
2. Le Patriot Résistant, organ of the FNDIRP, 15th February 1946.
3. This is still the address of the FNDIRP and also the "French" address of the FIR.

4. Le Patriot Résistant, same issue. (Many years later, the foundation of the UIRD, the FNDIR became a member of this organisation).
5. cf., for example, Brzezinski "The Soviet Bloc", Cambridge 1960, p.71 et seq., how preparations are made for people's democracy (not only in Poland but also in the other East European states).
6. At that time there were no organisations of this kind whatsoever in the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and Albania. These countries were, however, represented in the FIAPP by delegates of their respective governments. As far as Bulgaria is concerned, the association there was open not only to former deportees, but also to all "fighters against fascism". A similar streamlining was later to take place in Czechoslovakia and Poland.
7. cf. Argumente Dokumente Zitate, Bonn, 24th February 1966.
8. ibid.
9. FIAPP Bulletin, Warsaw, March 1948.
10. ibid.
11. FIAPP Bulletin, Prague, December 1948.
12. see note 9.
13. How this worked out in practice can be read in the following (amongst others):
A Ulbricht "Les SS au parlement", Brussels 1961
"Ehemalige Nazis in Pankows Diensten", Berlin 1965
"Les Nazis parmi nous", Lausanne 1967, p.67 et seq.
14. FIAPP Bulletin, Prague, February 1949.
15. see note 9.
16. cf. "Contre la Résistance", Brussels 1960, p.8.
17. KZ-Journal, Zürich August 1947 (with separate FIAPP column).
18. Official name: Polski Związek byłych Więźniów Politycznych.
The Czech association: Svaz osvobozených politických vězňů a pozůstalých po obětech nacistů.
19. In the beginning it is probable that everyone was averse to the countries which were represented by these organisations. Later on the non-Communist mem-

- bers of the FIAPP objected to the too blatantly Communist character of the VVN and the KZ-Verband.
20. Appell, East Berlin February/March 1947.
21. ibid, June 1948.
22. FIAPP Bulletin, Prague, July 1948.
23. Marian Vivoda in the Krvena Zvezda (French: l'Etoile Rouge- Red Star), Belgrade 1950, No. 5.
24. As has been said, it would be seen that the Soviet Union did not possess the atomic bomb until a year later.

III. FIAPP BECOMES FIR

A. The FIAPP's ties with other international front organisations

Shortly after the war two non-governmental international organisations were set up, namely the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) on 3rd October 1945 with its seat in Paris (from 1956 in Prague), and the Women's international Democratic Federation (WIDF) on 1st December 1945 with its seat in East Berlin. These are classified as Communist fronts in literature on this subject (1) and the FIAPP soon sought contact with them with a view to achieving some form of collaboration.

At the meeting of the Executive Committee in Warsaw and Katowice in June 1948 (mentioned in the previous chapter) the Soviet delegate Puchlow declared that it was only by means of such co-operation with international mass organisations that the FIAPP could hope to meet with response in the world and would be able to achieve positive results.

The Executive Committee therefore decided to establish contact with the WFTU and the WIDF; a resolution ("passed unanimously") gave the secretary-general the task of implementing the decision. "If one considers the moral authority, the world-wide influence and the material strength, which are embodied in these three great international organisations, viz. the WFTU, the WIDF and the FIAPP, whose members number more than 150 million, then one can understand that effective co-operation between them can provide decisive support for the forces which are fighting against war (2)".

However, in spite of this, as has already been mentioned, several months later in Brussels the decision to collaborate was temporarily reversed. It was only a temporary measure for in the spring of 1949 there was great activity in the "front" lines.

In December 1948 at a WIDF meeting the wish was expressed to hold a so-called World Congress of Partisans of Peace. Not long after this it appeared that such a congress was to be held in Paris from 20th - 25th April 1949. One of the organisers was ... the secretariat-general of the

FIAPP, which meant that the decisions taken in Brussels had been ignored.

Moreover, in Brussels several of the national organisations had plainly let it be seen that they were not in favour of ties with other fronts. At that time it was decided that the views of all national organisations should be taken into consideration.

The congress in Paris was in fact a joint project of the WFTU, the WIDF and the FIAPP (more than a year later, on 21st April 1949, it would be seen that this had led to the birth of a new front - the World Council of Peace (WCP). In order to legalise at least to some extent the FIAPP's participation in this congress, the Executive Committee announced that it had been "unanimously" decided "in the name of the 10 million members of the FIAPP to attend the World Congress of Partisans of Peace, which Congress had the same ideals as those which formed the basis of existence of the FIAPP." This decision was supported to justify the FIAPP's participation but this justification took on a curious complexion when it was realised that the Executive Committee - and furthermore only its Communist members - had not met until 27th April in Warsaw, thus four days after the conclusion of the World Congress of Partisans of Peace.

B. The FIAPP expels Yugoslavia from its ranks

At the meeting of the Executive Committee in Warsaw and Katowice in June 1948 there had been the first signs that also in the FIAPP Yugoslavia would be subject to the antipathy which Stalin harboured for that country. The difficulties with which Yugoslavia subsequently had to deal in the FIAPP may be summed up in chronological order (3): in June 1948 Yugoslavia was expelled from the Cominform. On 12th April 1948, during an international commemoration in Berlin for the victims of fascism - the commemoration was organised by the VVN and the FIAPP - the Russian delegates publicly invited the Yugoslavs to declare that they wished to disassociate themselves from their own government and party. At the same time the secretariat-general of the FIAPP broke off all contact with the Yugoslav organisation.

A year later the VVN organised a meeting in East Berlin for women who had been in Ravensbrück concentration camp. Invitations for this meeting were also sent to the Yugoslavs, but it was made impossible for them to attend since the Soviet authorities in East Berlin refused to issue a visa to the Yugoslavs.

After this the anti-Yugoslav agitation got into full swing. On 18th March 1950 the Central Committee of the Czech association passed a resolution demanding that the "representatives of the Tito clique" should be expelled from the FIAPP. A few days later, on 23rd March, the Central Committee of the Polish ZBOWID expressed itself in the same terms. The KZ-Verband in Austria sent out invitations for a commemoration in Linz on 6th and 7th May of the liberation of Mauthausen concentration camp. An invitation was also sent to Belgrade, but when the Yugoslavs answered in the affirmative, they were immediately informed that they had received an invitation by mistake and that they should consider the invitation as having been rescinded.

In the meantime changes had taken place in the membership of the FIAPP executive - changes in which the FNDIRP had played a considerable part.

Thus Maurice Lampe had had to stand down as President of the FIAPP because he was too well-known as a Communist. Henceforth attention would be diverted through the office of an honorary chairman, which function was carried out by Colonel Frédéric Manhès, who was not so generally known as a Communist. Manhès was also President of the FNDIRP, and this French organisation appointed on its own initiative another Frenchman in Lampe's place, namely the up to then unknown André Leroy. But this Leroy was no less a Communist than Lampe; he was a substitute member of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party, the PCF. The FNDIRP had yet another representative on the Executive Committee, one Marcel Paul, a former French Minister and also a member of the CC of the PCF.

This Marcel Paul had been specially brought into the Executive Committee at the meeting (mentioned above) from 27th-29th April 1949 in Warsaw, where he had pleaded for the FIAPP's support for the World Congress of Partisans of Peace.

This was the situation on the eve of the meeting of the FIAPP's International Committee, planned to be held in Florence on 26th and 27th April 1950.

Invitations for this meeting were sent out containing the following items for the agenda (4):

- 1) The activities of the FIAPP and the tasks which have to be fulfilled by the former fighters against fascism - Report by the honorary chairman, Col. Manhès, with explanatory comments by the director of the FIAPP, E. Kowalski.
- 2) Amendment of the FIAPP statutes - Report by the secretary-general of the FIAPP, Z. Balicki.
- 3) Determination of date, place and agenda etc. for the next international congress of the FIAPP.
- 4) Any other business.

In other words, nothing on this agenda pointed to what was to turn out to be the real motive for this meeting.

The invitations for this meeting were not sent to the Yugoslavs, except for the Yugoslavs "in exile". They were also Communists, but they followed the Stalinist line and not that of Tito. Their leader was a certain Goloubovitch, former Yugoslav ambassador. The headquarters of these Yugoslavs was in Prague. The official Yugoslav delegates protested via telegrams sent not only to the secretariat-general of the FIAPP, but also to other member organisations. The only positive results were that the Dutch and the Belgian immediately demanded the participation of the Yugoslavs. The reaction of the FIAPP executive to these events was to change the venue of the meeting to Prague from 28th-30th April, thereby rendering it impossible for the Yugoslav delegation and other "undesirable" delegates to attend, since they could not obtain a visa.

At this meeting, which was presided over by the Soviet general Aleksandr Goundorov, the new chairman of the FIAPP, André Leroy, was given the task of agitating against the Yugoslavs by means of all sorts of accusations (5).

He carried out his task so well that the meeting thereupon decided to expel the Yugoslav association and to take up contact with "the good Yugoslavs who are fighting for peace on the same side as the Soviet Union."

The International Committee had hereby exercised powers, which, according to the statutes, were expressly reserved for the Congress.

The East European organisations had manoeuvred this expulsion, assisted by the FNDIRP, VVN, ANPPIA(6), the KZ-Verband and a few Communist Belgians, Dutchmen and Norwegians, who had been admitted to the meeting, but had no mandate from their respective organisations.

Thus the decision taken by the Cominform on 28th June 1948 was followed by the FIAPP and also by the other fronts, such as the WFTU, the WIDF, the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY) and the International Organisation of Journalists (IOJ).

C. The non-Communist Associations leave the FIAPP; the FIAPP tries to re-orientate

The expulsion of Yugoslavia from the FIAPP had only been possible because of the action of the very numerous Communists in this Federation and by means of the application of measures which were not in accordance with the statutes. This, and the fact that the Cominform line was so strictly followed, aroused the dissatisfaction of the non-Communists in the FIAPP to such an extent that they decided to leave the Federation (Norway, Denmark and Luxembourg had already formally or informally broken their ties with the Federation.) This withdrawal also took place at national level: in February 1950 there had already been a split in the FNDIRP, which had led to certain of the members, who did not agree with the leaders, leaving the organisation and setting up a new association, the UNADIF (7).

Similar developments took place in Belgium, Italy, Austria, Greece and the Netherlands.

Many of the new organisations for former victims from these countries became members of the non-Communist "Fédération Internationale Libre de Déportés et Internés de la Résistance (FLDIR)" (International (Free) Federation of Deportees and Resistance Internees), which was founded in 1950.

By too closely following the Cominform line the FIAPP had damaged its own image as a front organisation. Now that the non-Communists had left its ranks, there was all the more reason to create another sphere of activity in which to try to realise their original aims.

The FIAPP had already previously had the idea of also uni-

ting the former resistance fighters behind its banner, thus not concentrating exclusively on the resistance members who had been in the concentration camps. On 28th April 1950 in Prague the International Committee had decided to extend the FIAPP to include associations of former partisans, underground workers, "maquisards", etc. (8).

The FIAPP must become one great organisation embracing "all participants of the resistance movements during the Second World War." The fact that a considerable number of these participants would be expelled (e.g. Yugoslavia) was not considered to be at variance with this decision. Now that the desire to extend its capacity was seen to have become a necessity, the FIAPP started preparations for carrying it out.

On 4th April 1951, during a meeting of the Executive Committee in Warsaw (9), it was decided that the third FIAPP Congress should be held from 30th June - 2nd July 1951. One of the agenda points for this congress would be: the establishment of a single international organisation of victims of fascism and former resistance fighters (this would, needless to say, mean that the statutes would have to be amended).

The congress met at the end of June with 271 delegates from 18 countries in the Soviet Sector of Vienna, which was then still an occupied city. In order better to understand the events which took place at the meeting, the following points should be noted. (10).

Seven of these countries were Communist: Hungary (1), Yugoslavia (3 Stalinists), East Germany (16), Poland (14), Rumania (4), Czechoslovakia (5), and the Soviet Union (5). There was thus a total of 48 delegates from Communist countries. The non-Communist countries were in the main represented by Communist delegations. The largest delegations were the Italian (53) and France (67); of the French delegates 46 were members of the FNDIRP.

The Netherlands delegation comprised 16 members, almost all members of the CPN. The previous year the Amsterdam branch of the Netherlands Association of Former Political Prisoners (EXPOGE) had seceded after a conflict between Communist and non-Communist members of the Association. Out of the Amsterdam branch arose - with the co-operation of CPN mem-

bers throughout the Netherlands - a new - Communist organisation with the name "Verenigd Verzet 1940-1945 (United Resistance), which was to become a member of the new international federation.

There were three reasons for the EXPOGE wishing to distance itself from the activities of the Dutch Communists:

- 1) The Communist coup d'état in Czechoslovakia;
- 2) The Dutch Communist Paul de Groot had declared that in the event of armed conflict between East and West the Communist Party of the Netherlands (CPN) would choose the side of the Soviet Union;
- 3) At an EXPOGE congress it had been decided that membership of the CPN was incompatible with membership of EXPOGE (11).

D. Foundation of the FIR

The congress opened with a speech by the honorary chairman of the FIAPP, Frédéric Manhès. He extended a special welcome to the delegates from the Austrian Communist Party (KPO) and to the Yugoslavs who "are compelled to dwell far from their fatherland". (12)

The spokesman of the latter group, the Stalinist Goloubovitch, spoke in his reply "on behalf of the delegation of emigré Yugoslavs, who are engaged in a struggle against the fascist régime of Tito and Rankovic" (13). He also said that "those who have been freed from slavery by the Soviet Union are fighting on the side of the freedom-loving peoples to prevent a repetition of the horrors and to maintain peace."

The President of the FIAPP, André Leroy, also brought up the subject of Yugoslavia during his more than an hour long speech: "The tortures which are carried out by Tito's lackeys are no different to the methods which were employed by Hitler's executioners ... People who live in Yugoslavia ... and who were liberated by the Soviet Union ... are now experiencing the blackest period in their history." Nor were the UNO and the USA spared: "The war in Korea is an appalling experimental war which is being fought by the American armies according to Hitler's methods." And of the UNO in general: "It is a facade which serves to camouflage the criminal plans of the warmongers Truman, Acheson and Churchill."

Almost all the speeches were in the same vein. There were descriptions of how wonderful life was in their own (Communist) countries and the Western Communists described the bad conditions which prevailed in their (Western) countries. After the speeches the new federation was founded, which was to be called "La Fédération Internationale des Résistants, des Victimes et des Prisonniers de Fascisme" (FIR) (International Federation of Resistance Movements).

The motivation for the creation of the FIR can best be expressed in the words of Aleksandr Goundorov, head of the Soviet delegation (14): "The International federation of victims of Nazi persecution was founded in the spring of 1947. In the initial period its activities were directed towards the amelioration of the material circumstances in which the former political prisoners and the hundreds of thousands of widows and orphans found themselves. But, as it became increasingly clear that the American and British imperialists were out to revive fascism and speedily instigate another war, the federation turned its attention to political questions. Its national organisations and members began to participate actively in the peace movement. The threat of another war and the revival of fascism also brought about unity of purpose amongst other categories of anti-fascist fighters, especially amongst the former resistance members, who have national organisations in many countries. The aim of our Congress in Vienna was to bring all these anti-fascist forces together." Pierre Villon, a Communist delegate from France, also outlined in his speech to the congress what the future activities of the FIR should be. His views differed little from those of Goundorov (15): "The real reason for the existence of the FIR is not to support the dues and rights of former resistance fighters but to carry on a necessary struggle according to the decisions and initiative of the WCP."

E. Everything remains the same

The sphere of activity had thus been extended to include the important group of former resistance fighters. But had much changed in the methods of work and the propaganda aims and objectives? In other words, was the FIR a completely new

organisation which had nothing to do with the - somewhat dubious - past of the FIAPP, or had nothing really changed, except that there had been an alteration to the name?

On the last day of the congress the Bureau was elected - in fact the most important organ of the FIR. The members were:

President	1) Frédéric Manhès	(France)
Vice-Presidents	2) Aleksandr Goundorov	(Soviet Union)
	3) Umberto Terracini	(Italy)
	4) Jan Vodicka	(Czechoslovakia)
	5) Fritz Beyling	(DDR)
	6) André Leroy	(France)
Secretary General	7) Edward Kowalski	(Poland)
Secretaries	8) Otto Horn	(Austria)
	9) Luc Somerhausen	(Belgium)
	10) André Duzoulias	(France)

In how far did the composition of this body differ from that of the FIAPP organ, the Executive Committee?

The functionaries 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 had also sat on the FIAPP committee. There was similar one-sidedness in the composition of the rest of the Bureau members. Terracini had been one of the founders of the Cominform and was now a senator in the Italian government for the Italian Communist Party (PCI); Beyling was a Communist delegate from the DDR; Horn was a member of the Politbureau of the KPO; Somerhausen was a member of the Belgian Communist Party and Ouzoulias was a mandatar of the PCF.

In order to remove any doubt about the relationship between the FIAPP and the FIR mention may be made of a passage in the speech made by the Austrian, Dr. Steiner, during a FIR Bureau meeting in Rome in October 1956 (16):

"Our organisation, the FIR, is a product of the first organisation, the FIAPP.

It may be maintained that it is a different organisation, that it is a successor of the first organisation, that its name has been changed, one can say what one likes, but one cannot maintain that the spirit which inspires this movement has undergone a change."

Notes

1. cf. Phelps-Fetherston, op. cit. p.35 and 107.
2. FIAPP Bulletin, Prague, July 1948.
3. cf. Marian Vivoda, op.cit.
4. Letter no. 1653/50 sent by the secretariat-general of the FIAPP to the Belgian "Confédération Nationale des Anciens Prisonniers Politiques" (National Confederation of Former Political Prisoners).
5. cf. Marian Vivoda, op.cit.
6. In Italy there are two organisations with very similar abbreviations, namely the ANPPIA and the ANPI. The latter is not a member of the FIAPP/FIR but has close contacts with it. See subsequent chapters.
7. Later member of the UIRD.
8. cf. Marian Vivoda, op.cit.
9. cf. "Study of the International Federation of Resistance Fighters, Victims and Prisoners of Fascism" (pamphlet), 1954.
10. cf. "Congrès international des Résistants, des Victimes et des Prisonniers du fascisme", Vienna 1951 (FIR pamphlet).
11. SOEV study documentation, "Netherlands Communist Resistance Movement", The Hague 1965.
12. "Congrès International" etc. op.cit.
13. ibid, also the subsequent quotations.
14. Quoted by "Study of the International Federation of Resistance Fighters etc." op. cit.
15. cf. "Congrès international" etc. op.cit.
16. Report of the meeting, Vienna 1956.

IV. THE EARLY YEARS OF THE FIR

At the Foundation Congress of the FIR Franz Dahlem, then a member of the Politbureau of the East German SED, had said: "Now the resistance fighters of all countries are joining together in the FIR to fight shoulder to shoulder against the arch enemy, American imperialism and its ally, German militarism, and in so doing to exercise a great influence on the course of events." (1). Such language was not conducive to achieving the goal of uniting all fighters against fascism behind the banner of the FIR. Indeed, it was subsequently to become apparent that only associations from Communist countries or Communist-inspired organisations from the Western world would join the FIR. And yet the old theme was repeatedly put forward. The East German paper "Neues Deutschland" (2), for instance, wrote with reference to the meeting of the FIR Bureau in September 1952: "The aim of the meeting of the Bureau was, according to Bureau member comrade E. Kowalski, to mobilise the tremendous potential of resistance power and authority of hundreds of thousands of former members of resistance movements in the countries which had been occupied by Hitler, in particular the "Résistance" in the Western countries, and to make active use of this potential." Anyhow, the FIR was well able to fulfil one of the functions of a front organisation i. a. that of propaganda directed outwards.

As has been mentioned at the beginning of the second chapter, the anti-fascist character of this organisation, which had been provided in the past, was eminently suited to arouse the interest or even the sympathy of Western intellectuals and young people.

In the propaganda field the FIR followed the line which the Soviet Union had marked out for the front organisations. The fable of bacteriological warfare in Korea (analysed in detail by Clews in his book "Communist Propaganda Techniques") (3) was also put forward in the FIR publicity organs as having really taken place.

(In the last months of 1951, for reasons unknown, the FIR moved its headquarters from Jogoslavianska 4 in Warsaw to

Castellezgasse 35 in the Soviet sector of Vienna. This address already housed the Austrian organisation KZ-Verband. In mid-1953 a start was made with the publication of the "Widerstandskämpfer" (the Resistance Fighter), the official organ of the FIR. The editor-in-chief was André Leroy, secretary-general and former President of the FIAPP.)

A. The FIR and the Soviet Union

One of the most important personalities in the early years of the FIR was the Russian Aleksandr Goundorov. He had, as we have seen in the previous chapter, presided over the meeting of the International Committee at which the Yugoslav organisation had been turned out of the FIAPP. On the foundation of the FIR Goundorov had become vice-president, but did not represent a national association of resistance fighters for the simple reason that none existed in the Soviet Union. In other words, he was a representative of his government. Nevertheless he did not believe himself to be speaking on behalf of a handful of Russians when he proclaimed at the FIR Bureau meeting in September 1952 (4):

"The partisans of the USSR and the whole Soviet people support the FIR with all the means in their power in its struggle for peace and against the revival of fascism."

It was not until 1956, nine years after the foundation of the FIAPP and five years after that of the FIR, that the Soviet Union decided to create an association of former partisans. One of the leading figures during the foundation meeting in Moscow was Aleksandr Goundorov (5).

Since there was thus no Soviet partisan organisation in existence in the period 1951 to 1956, which Goundorov could represent, then the contributions which were handed over by him to the FIR must have come from government funds. The subject of the financing of the FIR in general will be gone into in rather more detail - as far as this is possible - in a subsequent chapter.

B. Some of the political standpoints in the early years

Though FIR propaganda was not at first directed mainly against the German Federal Republic, after the inclusion of

the Federal Republic in NATO in 1955 the target for propaganda was to become "the re-awakening of militarism etc. in West Germany" (6). Nothing which the Bonn government thereafter did or said could find favour in the eyes of the FIR.

As has already been mentioned, the United States, especially during the Korean war, was also a frequent object of attack, with the main accusations centring on so-called bacteriological warfare. In March 1952 the FIR Secretariat demanded that "everyone responsible for the bacteriological war should be brought before a people's tribunal and that the brutal enemies of humanity should be punished (7)." During the Buchenwald meeting organised by the FIR, which took place in April 1952, the delegates also protested against "the criminal use of bacteriological weapons in Korea by the American interventionists (8)." The FIR bulletin, using the heading "Criminal bacteriological warfare and extermination of prisoners-of-war must be put a stop to", launched all possible accusations against the Americans (9).

A year later, on 17th June 1953, the workers of East Berlin rose in vain against Ulbricht's régime. In the "Widerstandskämpfer" (10) this rising was described under the heading: "The Fascist plot in Berlin has miscarried."

Of the Hungarian rising which started in October 1956, the FIR was to express itself somewhat more cautiously (11): "The events in Hungary clearly show the injurious effects of the two bloc policy, so often condemned by us, a policy which leads to the presence of foreign troops both in Western and Eastern countries." Thus according to the FIR these "injurious effects" were the only thing which was to be condemned in the Soviet actions at that time. Nevertheless, the policy of the Russians towards some of the Hungarian former resistance fighters could have provided the FIR with ample reasons for making a protest.

There was, for instance, the case of the Hungarian general, Louis Veress de Dálnok, who had been very active in the resistance against the Nazis, who imposed the death sentence on him. When the Russians liberated the country from the Nazis he was again sentenced and spent 11 years in prison. He was freed by the Hungarian revolutionaries and, in spite

of the failure of the rising, he managed to flee the country (12).

The executive officers of the official Hungarian organisation of former resistance fighters faithfully followed the line laid down by the Soviet Union, and the extent to which this was done was a more important criterion for membership of this organisation than a person's past resistance record. For example, at the meeting of the FIR Bureau in April 1957 a certain General Daniel Georgenyi was the head of the Hungarian delegation. This Georgenyi was in fact a former captain in Horthy's army, which had fought with Hitler's troops. In January 1943 he had been captured by the Russians and was subsequently given an "anti-fascist" training (13). But let us return to the Hungarian November rising.

When this broke out the FIR Bureau was meeting Rome. The events in Budapest were discussed at length and it was evident that opinions were somewhat divided. It was finally decided that the FIR should not take sides in this question. Some hours after the close of the meeting Israeli troops advanced into the Sinai desert. Without consulting any of the other FIR bodies - as required by the statutes - the FIR Secretariat saw its way to stating its position. Israel was condemned and it was demanded that the UN decisions should be respected forthwith (14). But the UN (General Assembly) had also condemned Soviet intervention in the Hungarian rising and - as mentioned above - the FIR had not stated its position on this question.

During this period the Secretary General of the UN was refused entrance to Hungary. Where Hammerskjöld failed, a FIR delegation succeeded. On 4th and 5th December 1956 the FIR executives Leroy and Szurak had a meeting in Budapest with representatives of the Association of Hungarian Resistance Fighters.

This aroused the indignation of the Belgian Luc Somerhausen, one of the FIR Secretaries, who, like many other Communists at that time, could not agree with Russian action in Hungary. He published an Open Letter (15), in which he maintained that this Hungarian association no longer represented Hungarian resistance to the Horthy régime, but that it consisted of "a few functionaries or agents of the Kadar government."

On 16th December Somerhausen learnt that some of the former Hungarian resistance fighters were to be executed.

Amongst them were:

Geza Lesonczy, the leader of a resistance group during the German occupation;

Pal Maleter, who had on several occasions been dropped behind the German lines;

Miklos Gimes, a resistance fighter from the very first, who had fought with the Yugoslav partisans;

Jozsef Szilagyi, a man who had been tortured by Horthy's agents and later became a legendary hero of the Hungarian resistance.

Somerhausen immediately despatched a telegram to André Leroy, the Secretary-General of the FIR, asking for the FIR to take steps with the Hungarian and Russian authorities to prevent these executions. On 18th December he received a telegram in reply, the contents of which were (16): "Have considered your proposal - stop - believe that this question comes within the competence of the Bureau - stop - cannot take sides in a question on which not all members are agreed. Signed Leroy".

C. The FIR restricts itself to Europe

In April 1957 Luc Somerhausen resigned from all his FIR functions (17). This was preceded by a meeting of the Bureau from 5th - 7th April, at which Somerhausen, after several vain attempts to speak, hindered in particular by the Czech Stalinist Jan Vodicka (whom we have already come across in the history of the FIAPP), finally managed to address the meeting.

In his speech he plainly expressed his disagreement with the policy so far followed by the FIR. For example, he attacked a report from the Secretary-General, André Leroy, in which the latter expressed his displeasure over, amongst other things, the plans to establish the EEC and EURATOM.

Leroy said: "The Common Market and EURATOM, which in fact mean the repudiation of sovereignty, cut right across the independence of the peoples. As a result the resistance fighters, just as they defended the liberty of their fatherland in the past and are still having to defend it, must fight against the Common Market and against EURATOM ... The develop-

ment of a European policy of integration will result in the whole of Europe being transformed into one great Hitlerian Germany (18)".

In contrast to other front organisations the FIR has scarcely concerned itself with American policy since the Korean war. As has already been said, the German Federal Republic was to become the principal propaganda target for the FIR. Only in the last few years, with the war in Vietnam, has the FIR sometimes expressed disapproval of American action in an article or resolution; its working area remained limited mainly to Europe. Moreover, American action in Vietnam was subject to other criticism besides that of the Communists. Only in the case of the two Cuban crises has the FIR stated its position: When in April 1961 the unfortunate landing took place in the Bay of Pigs, the FIR took rapid action. The FIR Bureau passed a resolution in which it said (19): "The FIR calls on the UN to take measures to bring this aggression rapidly to an end, so that the national independence of Cuba may be fully respected." Over the crisis of 22nd October 1962, when the American Intelligence Service discovered that the Soviet Union was building launching sites for rockets in Cuba, whereupon the United States instigated the "blockade of Cuba", the FIR had little to say. The only action was a protest telegram from the then President of the FIR, Tibaldi, to the Security Council (20). The contents were as follows: "The blockade of Cuba, a member of the UNO, and the military measures accompanying it, represent an infringement of the right of peoples to self determination, as this is laid down in the Charter of the UNO and to which the resistance fighters attach great importance."

From this telegram it was evident that the FIR had no problems in coping with a question of the utmost difficulty in international law.

Notes

1. from "Widerstand gegen Krieg und Faschismus" published by General-Secretariat of the VVN, p.4.
2. Neues Deutschland, 28th September, 1952.
3. op.cit. p. 179 et seq.
4. FIR Bulletin, Vienna June, 1952.

5. Pravda, 30th September 1956, quoted by "Contre la Résistance", op.cit. p.11.
6. cf. Ost-Probleme, September 1961.
7. l'Humanité, Paris, 31st March 1952.
8. Tass, Moscow, 15th April 1952.
9. FIR Bulletin, Vienna, June 1952.
10. June/July number 1953.
11. Widerstandskämpfer, Nov./Dec., 1956.
12. cf. "Contre la Résistance", op.cit. p.29.
13. ibid.
14. cf. "La Voix internationale de la Résistance" (official organ of the UIRD), Brussels, February 1959.
15. Quoted by ibid.
16. Quoted by "Contre la Résistance", op.cit. p.31.
17. ibid: "Le Document Somerhausen", p.47 et seq.
18. ibid. p.50.
19. cf. "Widerstandskämpfer", May 1961.
20. Quoted by Benson, "International Communist Front Organisations, aims and programs, 1962-1963 (pamphlet).

V. ORGANISATION AND STRUCTURE OF THE FIR

In order to be able to understand the history of the FIR, which will be dealt with in the following chapters, broken down into separate subjects, some information will be given here concerning the internal structure and the resources which the FIR has at its disposal.

A. Headquarters (Statutes - see appendix - Art. III)

The official address of the FIR is: Castellezgasse 35, 1021 Vienna II (up to 1955 in the Soviet sector).

Up to 1952 the headquarters of the FIR were in Warsaw, Jugoslavianska 4. There is a smaller secretariat in Paris, 10 rue Leroux, Paris XVI, which is also the seat of the FNDIRP.

B. Statutes

These were amended at the Fourth Congress of the FIR in Warsaw on 16th December 1962 (1).

The statutes now consist of 28 articles.

Articles IV and V cover the official aims of the FIR and the means to realise these objectives.

At a session of the Bureau in Prague on 28th September 1963 Bye-Laws were approved, consisting of 10 Articles with certain extra conditions regarding the role of the Secretariat, etc.

C. Members (Art. XI)

The FIR recognises ordinary (full) members, namely the associations as these are described in Art. II. Delegates from these associations may be members of the Congress and are entitled to vote thereat. According to Art. VII there are also associate members, being associations other than those described in Art. II. These have only a consultative voice at the Congress, as do the individual (so-called affiliated) members (Art. VIII). The Bureau decides on the admission of new members. In the case of refusal by the Bureau, the Congress has the last word (Art. X).

Membership is terminated by resignation or expulsion. The Bureau decides on the latter matter, but again with the possibility of the expelled member appealing to the Congress (Art. XI).

Some 48 organisations from 22 countries (including the organisations of the Spaniards in exile and of West Berlin) are affiliated to the FIR. Eight of these countries are Communist: Albania, Bulgaria, DDR, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia (see appendix).

It cannot be said with any certainty how many resistance fighters the FIR represents. The Yearbook Of International Organisations (2) gives a total of 5,000,000 member, of whom 3 million are full members. Nevertheless, in the period subsequent to the expulsion of Yugoslavia from the FIAPP there has been a distinct decrease in the number of members. Not so much a decrease in member-organisations, but rather in the members of these organisations.

Should the FIR claim to number some 4,000,000 members, this number turns out to be an exaggeration when a closer estimate is made (3).

Then one arrives at the following total:

Poland (ZBOWID)	110,000 members
Czechoslovakia (SPB)	70,000
	<hr/>
	180,000

The organisations in the other East European countries are either Committees (DDR, SU) without actual members, or have an extremely small number of members. (3a)

In the Western countries we find:

Austria (KZ-Verband)	8,000
German Federal Republic (VFN)	35,000
France (ANARC/FNDIRP)	50,000

In the remaining countries and Israel there are only very small groups with a total of about

	7,000
	<hr/>
	100,000

If this estimate is correct - and we may even round it off well on the high side, - then the total number of members of the FIR is at most 300,000.

D. Finance

As we have seen in the first chapter, in the study of front organisations it is extremely difficult to gain exact information on financial matters.

Art. XXVI of the Statutes reads: "The financial resources for the realisation of the objectives of the Federation shall be derived from contributions, gifts, collections, legacies, foundations, subsidies and such like, as well as from the proceeds of events approved by the FIR authorities and of enterprises in keeping with the work of the Federation."

Nothing is stated about the obligation of members to pay contributions or how much.

Nor is it known how great the resources are under the heading "subsidies etc." or who provides them.

From an official FIR expenditure budget (4) for 1956 and 1957 it appears that the annual expenditure at that time amounted to more than 2,750,000 Austrian shillings (about \$ 34,000). If almost half this sum were spent on personnel costs (salaries, insurance, travelling expenses, etc.) and over and above this the FIR gave subsidies to the so-called Camp Committees and the "Widerstandskämpfer" had to be paid for, etc., etc., then there would not be much left over for the many conferences and manifestations which are organised by the FIR. In view of the fact that these events do take place, one begins to suspect that the expenses listed below, for example, are not entirely accurate and that the entry for 350,000 shillings in particular must be higher. Is it possible that the remaining amount is accounted for from sources such as "subsidies and the like"? And which government(s) would provide these subsidies?

Travelling expenses, meeting (Austr. sch.)	1956	1957
- Assemblies, Int. Conf.	350,000	350,000
- Meetings of the Bureau	60,000	180,000
- Meetings of the Secretariat	31,000	42,000
- Control Commission	11,000	12,000
- Travelling expenses members of the Sec.	110,000	150,000
- Miscellaneous	3,000	1,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	565,000	735,000
	(+ 170,000)	

Art. XIV and XXIV of the statutes deal with the "Financial Control Commission". This consists of at least five members and is appointed by the Congress. It meets at least once a year and can inspect the books of the FIR at any time. Its task is: "To check whether the accounts have been accurately kept and to examine the correctness of the expenditure (Art. XIV)" and "to draw up a report within the terms of its responsibility and to submit this to the Congress (Art. XXIV)." Art. 6 of the Bye-Laws specifies the role of the Treasurer, who is a member of the Secretariat. With regard to the balance sheet and expenditure he is responsible solely to Bureau.

E. Organs

a) The Congress

The principal organs of the FIR are the Congress, the General Council, the Bureau and the Secretariat of the Bureau (Art. XII).

In name the Congress is the highest body of the FIR. It meets - at the request of the Bureau - every three years (Art. XV). The Bureau determines the number of delegates per organisation at the Congress, which number is dependent on the size of the organisations concerned (Art. XVII).

The decisions of the Congress are usually taken by a simple majority vote. The task of the Congress includes the election of the Presidium (President and Vice-Presidents), the members of the Bureau and the Financial Control Commission. The Congress also determines the number of members of the General Council, who are nominated by national organisations, and confirms their nomination. Up to the present there have been five Congresses, i.e.

- I. The Foundation Congress in Vienna in June 1951 (see chapter III)
- II. In Vienna from 28th-30th November 1954. 350 delegates were present from 20 countries.
- III. In Vienna (two sessions):
 - a) from 28th-30th November 1958
 - b) from 20th-22nd March 1959, with 250 delegates from 33 organisations from 20 European countries and Israel.

- IV. This Congress was first convened for 6th-9th December 1962 in Vienna. It finally met from 13th-16th December 1962 in Warsaw. It was attended by 201 people (149 delegates and 52 observers and guests) from 39 member organisations, and 11 organisations which were not members of the FIR. At this Congress - as has been mentioned above - the statutes were amended and, moreover, several new organisations were admitted.
- V. In Budapest from 9th-13th December 1965, with 175 voting delegates and 98 guests from 23 countries who together represented 68 organisations. At this Congress the FIR executive was elected which is still in office.

b) The General Council

This consists of 1) The Bureau

- 2) The delegates from the national organisations (Art. XXI).

The General Council determines the Federation's "working schedule". The Council takes its decisions by simple majority vote; in the event of an equal number of votes, the President has the casting vote.

If one examines the present composition (5) of the General Council (without the Bureau), then it does not at first sight appear that the Communists have an overwhelming share: to a total of 63 members there are only 25 Communists (16 from Communist countries, who occupy important functions in their countries and 9 from non-Communist countries, who are members of a Communist party there in so far as this is allowed). This number may be higher since more exact information is not available about the remaining members (6).

In practice the General Council is - as far as the executive function is concerned - a rather unimportant body: it meets only once between two Congresses (at the request of the Bureau).

c) The Bureau

The Bureau of the FIR is really the most important body: between congresses the FIR is directed by the Bureau, which meets at least once per annum.

- The Bureau is composed of (Art. XII)
- 1) The Presidium (not an official FIR term)
 - 2) The Secretariat
 - 3) Members

The present composition of the Bureau (without the Presidium) shows much greater Communist influence than that of the General Council. To a total of 38 members there are 22 Communists (10 from a Communist country and twelve Communists from a non-Communist country).

The Secretariat is also part of the Bureau and is - officially - composed of the President, the Secretaries and the Treasurer (Art. XXIII). The Vice-Presidents always have access to the meetings of the Secretariat.

The Secretariat is the executive body for the decisions and directives of the Congress, the General Council and the Bureau. The Bye-Laws give a more detailed description of the task of the Secretariat in Art. 3: "For the purpose of settling routine business the Secretariat is entitled, in urgent cases, to take any initiative within the scope of the decisions of the above-mentioned governing bodies with a view to the realisation of the decisions. In all other cases, which come outside the scope of these decisions, the Secretariat shall ask the opinions of the members of the Bureau in writing." Art. 5: "The Secretary-General directs the work of the Secretariat; in his absence he is represented by the deputy Secretary-General or by another member of the Secretariat".

The composition of the present Presidium of the Secretariat is as follows (7):

President: Arialdo Banfi from Italy. He is the successor of Ettore Tibaldi who was a Nenni socialist in the Italian Senate and chairman of the Italian association of WCP. This Tibaldi was President of the FIR from 1959 to 1965. His predecessor - from the foundation of the FIR - was Frédéric Manhès. Banfi is a lawyer and has been a Senator for the Italian Socialist Party (PSI) since 1958. He is vice-president of the ANPI (not officially affiliated to the FIR) and a member of the ANPPIA.

Vice-Presidents: a) Jacques Débu Bridel (France). Author and politician and vice-president of the ANACR. It is rather remarkable that Débu Bridel gave up the chief-editorship of the paper "Front National" in October 1946, because - according to him - Communist influence in it was becoming too great. That could just as well be a reason for him to resign from this FIR body.

b) Albert Forcinal (also from France). A former Buchenwald deportee and member of the ANACR and the FNDIRP.

c) Josef Husek (Czechoslovakia). He became a member of the Czech Communist party in 1929 and was in the Dachau and Buchenwald concentration camps in the war. From March 1946 to May 1949 Husek was the candidate of the CC of the Czech CP. He is now chairman of the Czech Association of Anti-Fascist fighters (SPB).

d) Włodimierz Lechowicz (Poland). After the war he became, amongst other things, minister of Trade in Poland. He is now vice-president of the ZBOWID.

e) Alexei Maressiev (Soviet Union). For his wartime activities he was accorded the title of "Hero of the Soviet Union" and received, amongst other things, the Order of Lenin. Since 1958 he has been the secretary of the Soviet Committee of war Veterans, which - as has been mentioned - was not established until the end of 1956.

f) Georg Spielman (DDR). Has been secretary-general of the East German Committee of Anti-Fascist Fighters, which succeeded the VVN (East German) in 1953.

g) Dr. Josef Rossaint (German Federal Republic). President of the VVN.

h) André de Raet (Belgium), a lawyer.

i) Dr. Ludwig Soswinski (Austria). Member of the Austrian Communist Party (KPO), Vice-President of the "KZ-Verband" and executive member of the Czech-Austrian Committee of Friendship.

j) Umberto Terracini (Italy). This lawyer was already a vice-president of the FIR in 1951. Terracini is a senator for the Italian Communist Party (PCI) and was a member of the Politbureau of the PCI from 1948 until the 11th Party Congress in 1966. (After that only a member of the CC). He is vice-President of the Communist IADL, Council member of the WCP, President of the ANPPIA and the Italian-Bulgarian Committee of Friendship. Terracini is also a member of the Italian-Soviet and the Italian-Cuba Committee of Friendship. Up to 1922 he was one of the vice-Presidents of the Comintern. In 1939 he was expelled from the PCI because he did not agree with the Russian-German non-aggression pact. After Togliatti's return from Moscow in 1944 he was once more admitted to the PCI. Terracini has indeed been called to order several

times by the Communists, because he did not always want to follow a pro-Moscow line. In 1943 he joined the Italian resistance.

k) Pierre Villon (France). This is a pseudonym: this functionary's real name is Roger Ginsburger. He is an architect and a member of the CC of the PCF. He is also vice-President of the FNDIRP and President of the ANACR.

l) Svend Wagner (Denmark). Became known in the Danish resistance as "General Johansen". He is a member of the Danish Communist Party. In 1955 he received the East German medal awarded to Anti-Fascist fighters.

Of the above-named 12 vice-Presidents there are thus 8 who are Communists (4 functionaries from a Communist country and 4 members of a Western Communist party).

Secretary-General: Jean Toujas (France). In 1948 he became a député for the PCF in the French Assembly. He is also a member of the ANACR. At the fourth FIR Congress in Warsaw in December 1962 Toujas succeeded his compatriot André Leroy.

Secretaries: a) Gustav Alef-Bolkowiak (Poland). Member of the supreme Council of the ZBOWID.

b) Maurizio Milan (Italy). No details known.

Treasurer: Theodor Heinisch (Austria). He is a member of the Central Arbitration Committee of the KPO.

Double Functions: As often occurs in front organisations, some of the FIR executives also have functions in other fronts.

They are:

Jean Pierre Bloch, member of the General Council of the FIR	- WCP
Manclis Glezos, honorary member of the FIR	- IOJ
Otto Horn, member of the General Council of the FIR	- WFTU
Erwin Kock, Bureau member of the FIR	- IIP (8)
Comninos Pyromaglou, Bureau member of the FIR	- WCP
Umberto Terracini, Bureau member of the FIR	- IADL
Dr. Heinz Toeplitz, Bureau member of the FIR	- IADL

F. Special Days

These include (9): 11th April, celebrated every year by the

FIR as the Day of Solidarity of Former Political Prisoners and Fighters against Fascism.

13th September is International Memorial Day for Victims of Fascism, followed by Resistance Fighters (or international Fight against Fascism) Week.

N.B. There is a difference of opinion over the Communist use of the word "Fascism". The fact that - of all people - these former resistance fighters against "National Socialism" do not make use of the latter term on the occasion of these memorial days may have the following explanations:

1) The FIR wants - as it always has done - to spare the feelings of the many former Nazis who now occupy high posts in the DDR and even have their own party, the NDP (10), there.

2) The Communists prefer the term "Fascism" because they are able to include more of their opponents under this denominator. In the "Dictionary of Foreign Terms" of the East German SED we read on p.84 (11): "...Italian Fascism 1922-43, German Fascism 1933-45 and Japanese Fascism, in whose footsteps the American imperialists are walking."

3) As Stalin once remarked in a report at the Seventeenth Party Congress on 21st January 1934 (12): "...Fascism of the German type, which incorrectly calls itself National Socialism. After all, even after a very thorough examination it is impossible to discover any trace whatever of socialism."

G. Medical Activities.

The FIR devotes a great deal of attention to the psychic and physical effects of confinement in German concentration camps and prisons. The FIR has produced various publications (in German) on the subject, such as:

- 1) Premature senility and its treatment
- 2) Chronic progressive asthenia
- 3) Other after effects
- 4) Therapy for asthenia and premature senility.

Several medical congresses on these subjects have been organised. For example, the Third Medical Conference in March 1961 in Liège (Belgium) with the theme "Premature signs of senility in former concentration camp prisoners and resistance

fighters."

The FIR also has a clinic of its own at its disposal; this was built by the FNDIRP, opened on 30th October 1965 and is called the "Clinique Frédéric Manhès" after the first FIR President. It is situated in Fleury-Mérogies, about 30 miles from Paris, and deals particularly with the physical effects of dystrophy and hypertony in former resistance fighters. Up to August 1966 367 patients had been treated there.

H. Further Social Activities

At the meeting (13) of the Executive Committee of the FIAPP on 4th April 1951 in Warsaw a resolution had already been adopted which proposed that international friendship should be strengthened "through exchange visits, especially of children, and through the organisation of international meetings of former concentration camp prisoners."

The FIR has implemented this proposal through its Social Committee, which, since the Foundation Congress up to the end of 1963, had arranged for more than 10,000 children to have holidays abroad (mainly in Communist countries). Some 1,500 former resistance fighters have had a similar holiday. The FIR is also trying to arrange that resistance fighters should have a different status under international law in war-time than they have had up to now. According to the law of war resistance fighters do not have the same rights as regular troops; if they are captured they do not have the right to become prisoners of war. According to Art. 4 of the Prisoners-of War Treaty of 1949 only those citizens are put on a par with the regular troops who are members of volunteer corps which:

- a) are commanded by someone who is responsible for his subordinates;
- b) wear a fixed distinctive badge which can be recognised at a distance;
- c) carry weapons overtly;
- d) act according to the laws and uses of war.

Citizens who individually or collectively commit acts of violence against the enemy without fulfilling the above-mentioned conditions, may - according to the law of war at

present in force - be considered by the enemy as "illegitimate combattants" of "francs-tireurs", with all the consequences thereof (14). This is not the place to go extensively into the rights and wrongs of this provision of international law. I therefore draw attention to a publication, "Resistance Movements and International Law" edited by the World Veterans Association, Paris 1968, in which this subject is dealt with in detail. The legal Commission of the FIR has also worked on this question and has pressed for international recognition of the resistance movement: the provisions of the Geneva Convention are no longer considered applicable for the present day. The condition concerning the obligatory badge of recognition is particularly outdated: "...a condition which takes no account of the fact that the Nazis - in order to assure themselves of the domination of an occupied country - made use to a great extent of spies, secret police, detectives and collaborators, who wore no uniform and against whom people had to defend themselves. As a result all the Resistance activities had also to be kept secret (15)." If one looks at Art. IV of the FIR statutes, in which the objectives of the Federation are enumerated, it can be seen that also in sub-section 6 emphasis is put on defending the rights and causes of the resistance movement. But are these objectives and social activities really as important to the FIR as the statutes would lead one to believe?

As has already been mentioned in Chapter III, Pierre Villon said at the Foundation Congress in June 1951 that the real reasons for the existence of the FIR were not "the defence of the former resistance fighters and victims, but a necessary struggle according to the decisions and initiative of the WCP." On 25th July 1955 André Leroy, at that time secretary-general of the FIR (16), declared in Vienna: "The compensation actions, the defence of the rights and causes, the actions to enable every resistance fighter to gain the most advantage from the existing laws, even if the latter do not give adequate satisfaction, all this is a means to unite them, and if one begins to unite the resistance fighters in the field of compensation demands, then the possibility is created of talking to them about other questions and convincing them of the necessity not only of working on compensation actions, but also on

actions directed against the politics which result from the refusal to accede to these compensation claims."

A year later, in October 1956, at a meeting in Rome the Polish deputy Secretary-General Szurek said with reference to the children's holidays organised by the FIR (17): "We must conclude that our social activities and in particular the children's holidays must not be considered as secondary questions. Thanks to our social activities it is possible to reach further in accelerating the solution of other problems which are more important for the Resistance. Those who agree to declare their solidarity with us over the help for the child whose father fell in the struggle may - even if not immediately - at least very shortly agree with us in opposing the rearmament of West Germany."

I. History of the Resistance Movement

Most Communist historians have always maintained that the Resistance in the Second World War was almost exclusively a Communist concern.

An East German encyclopaedia, for instance, (18) says the following of the resistance in Germany: "The Communist Party of Germany (KPD) was the only national and democratic power which, under the direction of the CC, organised from the very first day of the fascist dictatorship resistance against the fascists, who were leading the nation to destruction, and through its (KPD) leadership pointed out to this resistance movement its path and its goal." And of the resistance in Europe as a whole (19): "... (the resistance) drew support from the decisions of the VII world Congress of the Comintern, which had been worked out by Dimitroff and other leaders from the international workers' class. During the Second World War it found expression in the struggle for the independence and freedom of the peoples who had been attacked and brought to slavery by fascism, a struggle which was led by the Soviet Union." How does the FIR view the Communist and Soviet role in this resistance?

From 26th to 29th March 1961, an international conference was held on this subject in Milan. According to the French professor Henri Michel the following conclusions, amongst others,

were drawn at this congress concerning the attitude of the allies to the resistance, whereby two periods may be distinguished (20):

"Firstly, the English period up to mid-1942. London was the arsenal, the bank and the headquarters of the resistance movement in Europe and was never replaced in its role as the driving power ...

Secondly, the Soviet period of the resistance movement. The Soviet Union found itself in the same situation as the occupied countries, its popularity increased daily and Moscow became the capital of the resistance movement according to the principles of Anti-fascism and of the Revolution.

There was no American period in the resistance ... nevertheless the Americans delivered to the resistance movement the necessary weapons and always took an interest in it."

There is no opportunity here to go more deeply into this historical rendering of a subject which is of the utmost importance for the former resistance fighters. It may be observed, however, that in the "Widerstandskämpfer" of a few months later (21) there was a kind of rectification: the Russian Deborin wrote, amongst other things, the following about the above-mentioned account by prof. Michel, not hesitating in so doing to classify scientific standpoints which did not please him as "characteristic of German fascist theoreticians". "The majority of the participants at the conference did not agree with Henri Michel's view that England had exercised great influence on the resistance movement in the first period of the Second World War. During the conference it was stressed that English policy was hostile to the peoples' resistance movement and remained so. Whilst England and the United States continued to squabble amongst themselves for influence in post-war Europe, they were busy trying to gain control of the resistance movement, so that their agents would come into power in the countries which had been liberated from the yoke of fascism. This was their aim in distributing their agents in occupied territory under cover of the struggle against fascism."

The FIR has organised three conferences on this subject, but latterly without the participation of non-Communist historians, since at these conferences propaganda and the scientific approach are inseparable.

With regard to the II International Conference on Instruction

in the History of the Resistance Movement the "Widerstands-kämpfer (22) contains a description of how it is planned to give this scientifically defensible instruction:

"...Publications are placed on show in an exhibition case and are such that someone who looked at them with a perfectly open mind would think that they dated from the Nazi period. Not a bit of it! The brightly coloured publications with the swastikas on the front page etc.... are now, twenty years after the unconditional surrender of Hitler's Wehrmacht, produced in millions of copies and distributed.... in West Germany, and give the youth of West Germany an impression of history which goes a considerable way towards the vision created by Hitler's propaganda chief Goebbels. In another show case there are more publications.... They are excitingly written stories and résumés of facts about the resistance struggle. These are published in the DDR and are intended to instil anti-fascism into the young people and to educate the nations in the spirit of friendship."

Up to March 1963, the FIR produced regularly 3 times per annum a publication called "Internationale Hefte der Widerstandsbewegung" (International Pamphlets on the Resistance Movement), which was devoted to a study of the history of the resistance movement. Thereafter this publication disappeared from the scene, since its purpose was superseded by the establishment of a Liaison Committee of FIR historians (23).

J. FIR Publications

Apart from the publications mentioned above (in the medical and historical field) the FIR has also produced some pamphlets with a heavy propaganda tinge, such as "Nuremberg 1946 and today", in which horror photos etc. from the Second World War are supposed to prove that nothing has changed in Germany (i. e. West Germany) after Nüremberg.

Regular publications are:

- 1) "FIR Informations-Dienst" (FIR Information Sheet), published every two months, also in French "Service d'Information de la FIR".
- 2) "Der Widerstandskämpfer" (The Resistance Fighter), /French

title "Résistance Unie", the first number of which rolled from the press in 1953. Subscriptions can be taken out via the official address of the FIR in Vienna, or otherwise via one of the national organisations (see appendix). The annual subscription amounts to a little over \$ 2.- Up to January 1968 this organ appeared once a month or once in two months and was printed at the "Globus" printing house in Vienna, owned by the Austrian Communist Party (KPO) (the KPO organ "Volksstimme" (The Voice of the People) is also produced here).

At a meeting of the General Council of the FIR (from 3rd-5th December 1967 in East Berlin) it was announced that in future the "Widerstandskämpfer" would be printed in Czechoslovakia (24). This would be at the printing house Polygrafické závody, Bratislava.

The "Widerstandskämpfer" now appears quarterly; the price has remained the same.

The Austrian Oskar Wiesflecker is the editor-in-chief (his predecessor from 1957 onwards was the Frenchman Lucien Volle, who is now a member of the central executive of the ANACR). Wiesflecker is also a member of the Presidential committee of the "KZ-Verband".

If one scrutinises the composition of the editorial committee, it is seen to consist of all the members of the FIR presidium and secretariat.

What is the real task of the "Widerstandskämpfer"? As the Secretary-General Jean Toujas said at a meeting of the General Council in December 1965 in Vienna (25): "Our periodical is a weapon which must not be underestimated and with which we can carry on the struggle in the various fields of activity of the FIR right through the year." The "Widerstandskämpfer" is only published in French and German. This periodical will therefore be read virtually only in the Western countries. And then the suspicion grows that the "Widerstandskämpfer" is also intended for those countries, in other words that it fulfils a purely propaganda function according to the old tactics of the front organisations in forcing their views on the "Innocents". Something which strengthens this supposition is the so-called "Wettbewerb" (competition) for gaining subscribers, in which the "Widerstandskämpfer" encourages its readers to participate.

The results of this competition are published regularly. It one scrutinises the results, (26) then it can be seen that people only trouble about winning subscribers from non-Communist countries (27).

Notes

1. cf. Yearbook of International Organisations, Brussels 1966, p. 678.
2. ibid. The information in this Yearbook is mostly derived from the organisations themselves.
3. According to estimates e.g. by Mr. Hubert Halin of Brussels.
- 3a. The Committees in those countries however might claim to represent perhaps millions whom they regard as "members". Following that line of reasoning the FIR could reach a total membership of five million.
4. Copy in the possession of author.
5. cf. "Widerstandskämpfer", January 1966.
6. Information about people (in so far as available): "Der Widerstandskämpfer", "La Voix Internationale", Interdoc Weekly (The Hague) and various Who's Whos.
7. ibid.
8. International institute for Peace; a WCP body.
9. cf. Phelps-Fetherston, op.cit. p.177.
10. cf. "Handbuch der DDR", published by DDR State Printing House 1964, p.105 et seq.
11. Quoted by Salter & Thomas "Taschenbuch des Kommunismus", Bad Godesberg, p.79.
12. cf. "Fragen des Leninismus, East Berlin 1951, p.521 et seq.
13. See Chapter III.
14. See for further information amongst others Guggenheim "Lehrbuch des Völkerrechts", Basle 1951, p.910 et seq.
15. "Widerstandskämpfer", December 1964.
16. Quoted by "Contre la Résistance", op.cit. p.23 (underlining by this author).
17. ibid.
18. Meyers Neues Lexikon, Leipzig 1964, part 6, p.733.
19. ibid p.735.

20. "Widerstandskämpfer", May 1961.
21. August/September 1961.
22. May 1965 (underlining by this author).
23. cf. "Internationale Hefte der Widerstandsbewegung", March 1963.
24. cf. "La Voix Internationale", February 1968.
25. "Widerstandskämpfer", January 1965.
26. e.g. "Widerstandskämpfer" June 1967.
27. Even so the circulation in the Western countries is not very extensive. For instance, the central catalogue of the Royal Library in The Hague, which covers all the important libraries in the Netherlands, has no entry for "Der Widerstandskämpfer", nor for the French edition.

VI. THE ATTITUDE OF THE FIR ON THE QUESTION OF A DIVIDED GERMANY

In Chapter IV it has already been pointed out that the FIR's field of propaganda work has up to now been confined mainly to the Federal Republic.

If one reads the "Widerstandskämpfer" regularly, then one sees that in literally every issue the Federal Republic is the target for attack. This is done in such a one-sided manner and with so much repetition of the same accusations that it becomes quite tedious to read this FIR publication. At the same time the FIR pays a great deal of attention to the eastern half of Germany, the German Democratic Republic (DDR).

By means of a very black and white presentation it is suggested to the reader of the "Widerstandskämpfer" that the "German danger" is still very much alive, but can evidently only be kept down by a Communist régime.

Hereunder follows a description of the FIR's approach to the question of the two Germanies.

A. The FIR and the Federal Republic

In order to give an example of the above-mentioned one-sidedness displayed by the FIR with regard to the Federal Republic, a few typical passages from the "Widerstandskämpfer" may be quoted here.

In the fifth chapter it could be seen how the "Widerstandskämpfer" acclaims the method of comparison between the two Germanies for historical instruction, since this always turns out to the disadvantage of the Federal Republic.

From a FIR activities report for 1958 we quote the following (1):

"It is our right and our duty to point out that there is a difference between the two Germanies... No-one can deny that in the Federal Republic militarism and racialism are once more rearing their heads and that the Nazi and racist ideologies are emerging again... Now it is a fact that in the DDR no territorial claims are made; militaristic and

revanchist propaganda is forbidden; militaristic and Nazi organisations are not allowed to re-establish themselves." The FIR believes that the so-called "Wiedergutmachung", the compensation which Germany owes for the harm and misery she inflicted during the war, is an obligation which rests exclusively with West Germany. The "Widerstandskämpfer" writes, for example, (2) that: "...the Federal Republic of Germany is bound both morally and legally to compensate the victims of persecution and their assigns." Any evidence for the proposition that this obligation does not rest on the DDR is not forthcoming.

The difference in state responsibility between the Federal Republic and the DDR can provide material for an exhaustive discussion in the field of international law. One is then immediately confronted with the different conceptions held by the two countries on the subject of the succession of states. The Communists proceed on the assumption that in the territory of a perished Hitler-Germany two new states have come into being, i.e. the Federal Republic and the DDR. The Federal Republic claims the opposite and regards itself as the successor in title to the whole of Germany with all the accompanying obligations according to international law. This is not the place to go into this difference of conception in detail, but one thing is certain and that is that the Federal Republic feels bound to compensate the victims of Nazi terrorism.

In 1959 the Federal Republic concluded a treaty for this purpose (3) with Luxembourg, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Greece, France, Belgium, Italy and Switzerland. A similar agreement had already been reached in 1952 between Bonn and Israel and between Bonn and Yugoslavia. The "Widerstandskämpfer"'s reproach against the Federal Republic (4) is that this country is applying discrimination, since the Federal Republic will only give compensation to victims in countries with which the Federal Republic has diplomatic relations.

No reproach whatsoever is directed at the DDR. As the grounds for Ulbricht's refusal to compensate Nazi victims, the Communists cite the Potsdam Agreements, from which it could be seen that reparations payments from the Soviet

Zone only benefit the USSR and Poland. But these agreements make absolutely no provision for the obligation under international law to pay compensation to individuals who have been victims of Nazi persecution (5).

The reproach that the Federal Republic will only give compensation to countries with which it has diplomatic relations can just as well be directed against the DDR. Ulbricht has no intention of obliging countries which do not recognise East Germany.

The reproach against the Federal Republic is also not entirely valid, since the Federal Republic, through the good offices of the International Red Cross, pays compensation to former Polish prisoners, on whom pseudo-medical experiments were carried out in the concentration camps.

Moreover, when the agreement between Bonn and Israel mentioned above was concluded in 1952, it was long before there were any diplomatic relations between the two countries. Up to 31st December 1961 the Federal Republic had paid out 16.4 milliard German Marks in compensation, which sum will reach 40 milliard in 1970.

Of the money which the Federal Republic has so far paid to Jewish victims in Israel, the DDR has not contributed a "Pfennig". Nor will the FIR expect this of a Communist state. One can, however, ask oneself who would then have been expected to make reparation for the harm done to the victims of the Nazi period if the Federal Republic had also come under a Communist régime.

The identification of the Bonn government with neo-Nazism is one of the most important objectives of the FIR. The Federation takes the view that the Western allies have not only allowed this development to take place, but have even stimulated it: "...Since the foundation of the FIR the world has undergone a fundamental change in favour of better understanding in international relations (...) However, there are still dangers to be eliminated: there are still numerous potential sources of war, of which the most dangerous is West Germany (...) By re-arming Germany and by systematically annulling one clause after another, both of the Potsdam Agreement and of the Treaty of Paris, the Western allies have favoured the resurgence of German imperialism

(...) The government of the Federal Republic, which permits and supports the activities of pro-Nazi organisations, wanted to prohibit the VVN, the organisation of Anti-fascist resistance fighters in West Germany (6)."

At a meeting of the General Council in Vienna (1st-3rd December 1961) the new Secretary-General Jean Toujas also spoke of the possible suppression of the VVN (this subject will be discussed further in the next chapter) and the support which - according to the FIR - the Federal government is supposed to be giving to incipient Nazism: "In West Germany, where it has been made possible for police and government functions to be carried out by SS'ers and Nazi judges, democratic organisations and parties are suppressed."

As a matter of fact, the parties which have up to now been prohibited in West Germany were not so very democratic, for example the (Communist) KPD and the (neo-Nazi) Sozialistische Reichs Partei.

With reference to the "democratic organisations", by which is meant the VVN amongst others, it may be remarked that the latter organisation at any rate still exists in West Germany. The only reason why there was any danger of the suppression of this organisation was that it was believed - and rightly - that the VVN was not a genuine association of former resistance fighters, but a cover organisation for the - forbidden - KPD.

There are some ten other, non-Communist organisations of former deportees and resistance fighters in West Germany whose existence is in no way threatened. These organisations can focus attention upon possible neo-Nazi symptoms in the Federal Republic far more effectively than does the FIR and its members. This is because there are honest motives, not propagandistic, behind their actions; this can also be clearly seen from their publications (e.g. the journal "Freiheit und Recht") (Freedom and Justice) of the "Bund der Verfolgten des Naziregimes" (Association of Victims of Nazi Persecution) gives excellent information).

Amongst these organisations - which have at some time broken away from the FIR and the VVN - are: the AVS (Arbeitsgemeinschaft verfolgter Sozialdemokraten) (Union of Persecuted Social Democrats), the ZDWV (Zentralverband Demo-

kratischer Widerstandskämpfer und Verfolgtenverbände - Central Association of Democratic Resistance Fighters and Victims of Persecution) and the BVN (Bund der Verfolgten des Naziregimes Association of Victims of Nazi Persecution).

Whilst the VVN in West Germany need no longer fear possible suppression, this organisation was disbanded in East Germany as early as 1953 without a single protest being heard from the FIR. The reason for the dissolution of the VVN in East Germany was that (7): "the programme (of the VVN)... had been fulfilled as a result of developments in the DDR," and, as the FIR wrote (8):

"The continuance of resistance work has become the objective of the whole nation." The VVN's place was taken by a committee "The Committee of Anti-Fascist Resistance Fighters", the task of which was primarily to support the VVN in West Germany "in its struggle for the defence of rights and democratic freedom (9)." Thus, though the DDR no longer had an official association of former resistance fighters, former members of the NSDAP were allowed to create their own party (see Chapter V) with representatives in the "Volkskammer" (People's Parliament). The FIR never directs its disapproval against the existence of this party in the DDR. There is in West Germany, as one knows, the "Nationale Demokratische Partei Deutschlands (National Democratic Party of Germany). This West German NPD is continually presented (by the FIR) as a party, whose objectives receive the full approval of the Bonn government, and vice versa. This is an extremely propagandistic presentation of the facts.

As an editor of "La Voix Internationale de la Résistance" wrote (10): "If one appreciates the significance of universal and secret suffrage, then one cannot doubt for a moment that those who vote for the NPD are people who above all wish in this way to emphasise their disapproval of the policy of the government and of the coalition parties (SPD-CDU/CSU)."

If Bonn were indeed pursuing a neo-Nazi course, as the FIR claims it is, then there would be no reason whatever for the neo-Nazis to vote for any other parties than those of the above-mentioned coalition.

Other tactics which are used by the official Communist press and by the "Widerstandskämpfer" in order to bring the Fed-

eral Government into discredit are those of suggesting that former Nazis and SS'ers enjoy official protection and that the trials of these people have been a mockery and the sentences far too light.

In fact the situation is that a great deal of important evidence against these criminal elements is in the hands of the Communist authorities, who have only recently and as a great exception allowed the West German judicial authorities to have access to it. As a result West German judges have frequently been forced to dismiss a case against a former SS'er because of "lack of evidence".

In August 1967 the judicial authorities of the Federal Republic at last received an offer from the Soviet government to have access in the Soviet Union to the necessary documents (11). Up to then Communist tactics had been quietly to await the start of a case against Nazi criminals, knowing that the evidence was in Communist hands, and then to pour forth disapproval when the Nazi criminals inevitably received an extremely light sentence. The following quotation from the "Widerstandskämpfer" may serve to illustrate this (12): "The scandal over the ex-SS "Gruppenführer" (squad leader) Heinz Reinefahrt, who is known in Poland as the "Executioner of Warsaw", reached its climax with the statement by the Schleswig-Holstein Minister of Justice that the Public Prosecutor had asked for the case against the "SS-Führer" to be dismissed (...) We are now in a position to produce fresh evidence concerning the crimes for which Reinefahrt is responsible. The Commission of Enquiry into Nazi crimes in Poland has published an abundance of shocking declarations from witnesses as well as other documents, from which we shall shortly quote but a small selection ..."

B. The FIR and the DDR

Just as the Federal Republic is in the eyes of the FIR the reincarnation of all the evil against which the resistance fighters struggled in the war, East Germany represents a successful example of how this evil can be transformed into a sort of paradise with honest, upstanding people (as long as this transformation is left to a Communist party to carry it through).

The Secretary-General of the FIR, Jean Toujas, said at a

meeting of the General Council in Vienna(13), at which he was describing a visit to East Germany: "The European resistance fighters could once more become "au fait" through studying the important successes achieved in the DDR, where the spirit of aggression and oppression of the Nazi period has made way for the spirit of brotherly co-operation and friendship between the peoples. They could above all be convinced by the people's - and especially the young people's - growing attachment to the idea of Peace and the determination to fight to maintain this Peace."

It is regularly pointed out that the interests of the DDR run parallel to those of the FIR. The deputy chairman of the East German Council of Ministers, Alexander Abusch (14), for example, speaking to the FIR executive officers during a meeting of the FIR Bureau on 1st and 2nd December 1967 in East Berlin, said: "You will find the right atmosphere for your meeting here with us, since your objectives are our objectives."

Measures which aroused great repugnance in the non-Communist world, such as the putting down of the Berlin Uprising on 17th June 1953 and the building of the Wall, are greeted with enthusiasm by the FIR. In Chapter IV mention was made of how the "Widerstandskämpfer" described the rising of the East Berlin workers and its failure ("The fascist plot in Berlin has miscarried").

When on 13th August 1961 Ulbricht's régime was responsible for erecting a wall between the two sections of Berlin, it was once more Jean Toujas who defended this inhumane action on all possible points (15): "Most of the newspapers from the Western countries have reported the discontent about the measures taken by the government of the DDR in Berlin in a way which is far from the truth. I have made myself au fait with the situation on the spot: I found the population of East Berlin calm, conscious of their own strength, convinced of their rights, full of the desire for peace and confident that these measures are in their own interests." And "The Berlin resistance fighters assured me, moreover, that these measures had the approval of the people of the DDR."

It has already been described how the VVN was disbanded in the DDR in 1953 and was replaced by a committee of a very obscure stamp. At the Second FIR Congress in November

1954 in Vienna the East German delegate Fritz Beyling commented on what he considered to be the most fitting occupation for former resistance fighters (16): "Many former prisoners and resistance fighters have exchanged the prison clothes, which the Nazis made them wear, for the uniform of the "Volkspolizei (VOPO)" (People's Police) and are now guarding against the possibility of fascism being able to exist once more in the DDR."

At the V. FIR Congress (9-13 December 1965 in Budapest) the Federation launched an appeal to the whole "International Resistance Movement", in which it was stated with reference to the possible participation of the Federal Republic in nuclear plans such as MLF and ANF (17): "The top figures in the "Bundeswehr" (Federal Defence Forces), which they want to see equipped with such weapons for mass destruction, are former Hitler officers, who have in the past taken part in the murder of the population in so many countries."

But what is the situation in the other part of Germany and what is the FIR's reaction to the presence of former Hitler officers in the DDR? As long ago as 1948 - when the existence of the DDR had not even been proclaimed - a start was made with the building-up of a "Nationale Volksarmee" (National People's Army) (18). Officers of wide experience were sought who could train the young soldiers and these officers were available in large numbers. On 11th November 1949 and 2nd October 1952 several laws were passed which made it possible for former members of the NSDAP and "Wehrmacht" officers to occupy important government post once more (19). In Ulbricht's official party paper the following comment appeared (20): "The German workers do not think of former officers as war criminals, nor do they judge them on their past, but on what they are doing today for freedom and for German unity". When it appeared that former Hitler officers were indeed being given important positions in the East German army, the former FIR executive Luc Somerhausen (see Chapter III) expressed his disapproval in a letter of 14th April 1957 (21): "For a long time the DDR has repeatedly assured us that the entire leadership of the People's Army, from the rank of major to the very highest rank, was in the hands of officers from the working class (...) And I believed this until 3rd

April 1957 when the President of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe established that this was not true. He made known that sixteen important commands in the People's Army are at present occupied by former Nazi generals."

Who are or were these Nazi generals? (22)

The brain behind East German re-armament was Marshal Paulus, who was placed on the list of war criminals by the Belgian government on account of the part which he played in the Vinckt murders in 1940. When he died in 1957 Paulus was given a state funeral in East Germany.

As early as 1948 General Hermann Rentsch, former "Wehrmacht" lieutenant-colonel, had been put in charge of the frontier police.

On 1st September 1952 Vincent Müller, a former general under Hitler, became supreme commander of the "Nationale Volksarmee (NVA)". In December 1941 this same Müller had personally directed the forced evacuation of the Jewish population of Artamovsk, during which 1,300 Jews were murdered by the SS. Müller, who at that time commanded the German Third Army Corps, was captured by the Russians, who "re-educated him into an "anti-fascist". After the war Müller (died 13.5.61) was sent to East Germany to organise first the "Volkspolizei" and thereafter the army. Müller also became the leader of the party for former Nazis, the NDP.

Another important function was bestowed on Arno von Lenski: from 1952 to 1958 he was a major-general in the NVA and NDP deputy in the "Volkskammer".

Von Lenski received the East German medal for "Fighters of Fascism 1933-45", notwithstanding the fact that from 1939 to 1942 he was a member of the National Socialist "Volksgerichtshof" (People's Tribunal) in Berlin. In this capacity he had, amongst other things, a share in condemning to death 19 German, Polish and Dutch citizens.

Other high-ranking generals of Hitler who received important posts in the NVA after 1949 were Bechler, Heitsch, Korfes, Lattman, Freytag, Wulz and Borufka.

The FIR has never uttered a word of protest against the facts mentioned above, nor about the way in which the NVA training is done (the goose-steps of Hitler's "Wehrmacht" are still held in esteem).

Thus whilst former Nazi generals can occupy important posts in the DDR, the status of former resistance fighters is not always on such a high level in East Germany. Indeed, things have gone very badly for some of these people, whereby the FIR wholly omitted to show the solidarity which they were so keen to show with resistance fighters in West Germany and even repeated accusations for which they had no grounds and which resulted in these resistance fighters going into East German prisons.

Franz Dahlem, who, amongst other things, had been in the Mauthausen concentration camp (23) and who after the war was one of the leaders of the East German VVN, was arrested three months after the suppression of this organisation and accused of "high treason". At that time Dahlem occupied the highest position but one (after Ulbricht) in the Communist hierarchy of the DDR. After he had spent three years in prison, it appeared that the charges against him were unfounded and he was "rehabilitated". However, this rehabilitation did not mean that Dahlem got back his functions in the Secretariat, the Politbureau and in the CC of the SED. He was not even admitted to the executive of the Committee of Anti-fascist Resistance Fighters", which had succeeded the VVN (24). The founder of the VVN in the Soviet Zone was Karl Raddatz, who had spent twelve years in concentration camps. He became secretary of the VVN and showed himself a militant Communist. For example, on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the October Revolution he wrote an extensive article about the glorious deeds of the Soviet army after the Revolution and the struggle and victory against fascism (25): "The Soviet army not only conquered Hitler's mighty war-machine, which brought suffering and horror to the peoples of Europe, but also helped the peoples who had been liberated from fascism to find their way to democracy." And "...just as the Soviet Union played the major part in the conquest of fascism, which threatened the nations, so in our Zone she has made it possible for the progressive democratic forces in our nation to develop to the full."

In July 1960 Karl Raddatz, his wife, his secretary and a few of his friends were arrested by the East German police (26) and in May 1961 a secret case was brought against him.

Raddatz was sentenced to 6 years imprisonment, but the indictment was never made public.

The FIR's reaction to this case against a former resistance fighter was the following (from the FIR executive Georg Spielmann (27)): "We don't want to anticipate the outcome of the case, but it is known that Raddatz belonged to the group of American agents who carried on their evil work in the DDR. The employers of this man, who had morally sunk so low, thought they stood on firm ground. They believed that past imprisonment in a concentration camp would be good cover for Raddatz' hostile activities. However, this turned out to be a miscalculation...."

Notes

1. "Rapport d'activité, sept années au service de la Résistance et de son idéal" (Activity report, seven years in the service of the Resistance & its ideals) Supplement to "Résistance Unie", August 1958.
2. ibid.
3. cf. Des SS au Parlement, op.cit. p.18.
4. cf. "Der Widerstandskämpfer" April/June 1968.
5. cf. Des SS au Parlement, op.cit. p.19.
6. "Der Widerstandskämpfer," June 1961.
7. See Meyers Neues Lexikon, op.cit. Part VIII, p.445.
8. Bulletin de la FIR, February 1953.
9. ibid.
10. "La Voix Internationale", February 1968.
11. cf. Daily Telegraph, 17th August 1967.
12. "Der Widerstandskämpfer", March 1967.
13. idem, January 1965.
14. idem, December 1967.
15. idem, August/September 1961.
16. cf. "Volksstimme Wien", 30th November 1954.
17. cf. "Der Widerstandskämpfer", January/February 1966.
18. cf., amongst others, Des SS au Parlement, op.cit. p.24.
19. cf. "Contre la Résistance", op.cit. p.33.
20. Neues Deutschland, 25th March 1954.
21. Quoted by "Contre la Résistance", op.cit. p.49.
22. Biographical details from: a. "Contre la Résistance", op.cit. p.49.

b. "Ehemalige Nazis im Pankows Diensten", op.cit.

23. cf. "Unser Appel", Berlin August 1947.
24. cf. Des SS au Parlement, op.cit. p.12.
25. Unser Appel, November 1947.
26. cf. Des SS au Parlement, op.cit. p.14.
27. "Der Widerstandskämpfer" March 1962.

VII SOME NATIONAL RESISTANCE MOVEMENTS AND THEIR RELATIONS WITH THE FIR

Mention has been made in Chapter III of the number of resistance fighters who turned away from the FIAPP at the beginning of the Fifties and also refused to take up contact with the Federation's successor, the FIR.

These non-Communist resistance fighters established their own international associations, which will be dealt with in the next chapter. The remaining organisations of the FIAPP and the organisations which became affiliated to the FIR were led by Communists. The role played by these Communist resistance movements in their own country varies greatly. From the sociological point of view it is interesting to see to what extent the former resistance fighters were to occupy important positions in their respective countries after the Second World War.

In many East European countries the Communist resistance fighters formed an important cadre, all the more so since life was made impossible for their non-Communist colleagues (or whose ranks had already been greatly reduced during the war, as in Poland, for example, where the Polish Home Army was destroyed by the German occupation forces at the time of the Warsaw Rising, whilst the Red Army calmly looked on a few miles away.)

In the Western countries the Communist resistance organisations are of no significance whatever (with the possible exception - from the propaganda point of view - of the VVN in the Federal Republic and some associations in France and Italy).

The ties which these organisations have with the FIR are, as circumstances require, either proudly emphasised or strongly repudiated.

The VVN case, which came to a premature end, might have clarified the relationship between the FIR and national organisations as far as the legal aspect was concerned, but this did not come about (as we shall see later).

Descriptions follow below of the activities of two of these national member organisations, and of an association which is not an official member of the FIR, but does, however, have close contact with it (see also Appendix II).

A. The VVN

The organisation "Die Vereinigung der Verfolgten des Nazi-regimes" was established on 17th March 1947 in Frankfurt. The VVN still has its headquarters there (Rossertstrasse 4) and now numbers about 35,000 members.

It became an official member of the FIAPP in May 1948 (1). On 18th December 1951 the executive of the Communist Party of Germany (KPD) informed the VVN that the KPD Secretariat had decided to place at the disposal of the VVN four reliable people, who would direct the political and administrative apparatus of the association (2).

The VVN thereupon sent a letter (dated Frankfurt/Main, 27th December 1951) to the above-mentioned KPD Secretariat (3), in which they made certain proposals for people who, on 13th January 1952, should be included in the VVN executive. The writer of the letter asked the KPD Secretariat to "confirm" these proposals.

Amongst the proposed functionaries were - understandably - very many members of the KPD, e.g. Marcel Frnkel (also FIR Bureau member), Oskar Müller, Hans Dinger, Willi Müller and Paul Assmann.

On 17th August 1956 the Federal Constitutional Court pronounced sentence on the KPD, which became from then on a proscribed party. A few years later, on 20th October 1959, the then Minister of Internal Affairs, Dr. Schröder, asked for the VVN to be proscribed (4).

The legal proceedings before the actual case took place in Karlsruhe on 23rd and 24th January 1962 (5).

The most important complaint lodged against the VVN was the way in which this organisation acted in the spirit of the proscribed KPD, in other words, that the VVN could be deemed to be the successor of the KPD.

It was soon evident that it would be extremely difficult to prove this allegation.

The Federal Government representative attempted to show that membership of the FIR constituted an incriminating circumstance for the VVN. This membership would imply that the VVN, as a member of the FIR, was bound by the decisions and policies of this Federation. In so far as these policy lines were contrary to the constitution of the

Federal Republic, that would provide grounds for proscribing the VVN. That these policy lines were indeed contrary to the constitution of the Federal Republic was supposed to be evident from the fact that the FIR was "the most militant organisation of world Communism."

The large number of KPD members in the VVN was also supposed to be proof of the Communist persuasions of the VVN. We have already pointed out in the first chapter how difficult it is to arrive at scientifically acceptable political criteria, which can be used to show that a particular association is a Communist front organisation. Legally speaking this proved to be even more difficult.

The "Widerstandskämpfer" contested the allegation that the VVN was bound by the decisions or recommendations of the FIR with the argument that the FIR was not a centralistic organisation with national associations which had no say in affairs, but a Federation, the members of which are not bound by the regulations of the Federal organs (6).

The distinguishing feature of a federation is that the members are only autonomous in so far as they are not bound by the federal decisions. However, in the statutes of the FIR there is not a single article in which this commitment is explicitly stated.

With regard to the allegation that the FIR was "the most militant organisation of world Communism", the prosecutor was unable to produce any evidence. The "Widerstandskämpfer", probably not being "au fait" with the factors enumerated by Clews as mentioned in Chapter I, named the fact that there were some non-Communists in the Presidium of the FIR as sufficient to be able to show that the FIR was not a front organisation (7).

Nor did the presence of so many former KPD members in the executive bodies of the VVN form an impediment to the constitutionality of this association, since there was no law in the Federal Republic which prohibited former KPD members from occupying such executive functions (8).

How this legal battle would have ended, nobody ever knew, as the actual VVN trial before the Senate of the Federal Constitutional Court in West Berlin on 29th November 1962 came to a premature end.

The VVN and the FIR could not have been more fortunate, for

it appeared that the President of the court, Dr. Werner, had certain blemishes in his past which rendered him not the most suitable figure to preside this case.

We will let the "Widerstandskämpfer" itself describe the events on the day of the trial in triumphant tones - as though it were a tragic farce which the FIR had organised successfully (9): "The Senate had scarcely taken its place, when a sound as of a trumpet blast boomed through the courtroom. The voice came from the public and was not anonymous. A man, a former resistance fighter, stood up and said loudly and distinctly: Mr. President, Prof. Dr. Werner, I have something to say which concerns your person. You were a member of the SA and have belonged to the NSDAP! Agitation and amazement amongst all those present in the court. After a short silence the President asks the lawyers and the Presidium of the VVN if they back up these allegations. 'Yes', says comrade Hauser, member of the Presidium. 'The hearing is adjourned', says Prof. Dr. Werner, whose past is so tainted..." After this no further case has been brought against the VVN.

B. The ZBOWID

The Polish Association of Fighters for Freedom and Democracy (Związek Bojowników O Wolność i Democrację - ZBOWID) is established in the Ul. Ujazdowskie 6a in Warsaw. The Association numbers about 180,000 members and is thus the largest national organisation in the FIR (9a); the President is Mieczysław Moczar (up to July 1968 also Minister of Internal Affairs); Kazimierz Rusinek is the Secretary-General.

In 1945, after the defeat of the German troops, several groups of former Polish prisoners founded the "Polish Association of Former Political Prisoners" with the aim of providing help for the next-of-kin of their massacred comrades (10).

The Association soon numbered 177,013 members and, in co-operation with other Polish social organisations, carried out excellent work.

It was also this Association which organised the first International Congress of the FIAPP from 3rd - 5th February 1946 in Warsaw (see also Chapter II).

However, on 10th September 1949 the Association was dis-

banded and replaced by a great co-ordinating association, the ZBOWID, which came under the direction of the Polish premier Cyrankiewicz.

From 1949 to 1956, during the Stalinist period in Poland, the ZBOWID was wholly absorbed on the political plane and achieved extremely little on the social plane.

After the rising in Posen on 28th June 1956 and after the return of Gomulka, the activities of the ZBOWID were closely scrutinised. On 19th and 20th December 1956 the Executive Council of the ZBOWID met in Warsaw. On the second and last day of the meetings the Council issued a statement, in which they said, amongst other things (11): "We must acknowledge that the errors of the past period have weighed heavily on the activities of the ZBOWID. These errors found expression in an inclination to dissolve the Association, to underestimate the role and the significance of the struggle for national liberty, to falsify the history of that period, to take unjust reprisals against innumerable meritorious patriots and to discriminate against various members of anti-fascist organisations of the resistance movement (...) There were often people who, though they had lost the ability to work because of their share in the fighting or imprisonment in Hitler's fascist gaols, and similarly the widows and orphans of those who lost their lives, who had no means of livelihood, received no help of any kind whatsoever from the government". After the meetings were over the official organ of the Polish Communist Party, Tribuna Ludu, wrote (12): "During the first session, presided over by the President of the Executive Council of the ZBOWID, who is also Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Josef Cyrankiewicz, the vice-President of the Executive Bureau, Wilhelm Garnarczyk, read out a report, which included the following passage: "...During the period just ended there have been tendentious attempts to minimise the merits of the members of the Resistance movement; the traditions of the soldiers and partisans from the Second World War have been forgotten and there have even been frequent cases of former resistance fighters from the ranks of the AK (Armia Krajowa, the non-Communist Polish "Home Army") unjustly becoming victims of discredit and reprisals." But what essential changes have taken place within the

ZBOWID after these words? Certainly with the Polish prime Minister at its head, it could not be expected that this Association would deviate from the official Polish government line. At the ZBOWID congress in September 1959 Cyrankiewicz made the following statement, from which it was evident that the discrimination which was supposed to have been put a stop to at the end of 1956, was still persisting (13):

"The determining factor for admission to the organisation (ZBOWID) is the patriotic bearing of the candidate during the struggle for freedom, as well as his patriotism towards the People's Republic of Poland and towards the socialist building-up of our country. Collaborators, former members of fascist organisations, which existed during the occupation period, and the present enemies of the People's Republic of Poland have no right to become members of the ZBOWID (14)."

In September 1965 during a ZBOWID congress General Mieczyslaw Moczar was appointed chairman of the ZBOWID Presidium (15). Cyrankiewicz remained chairman of the Executive Council.

Who is Moczar? According to the French daily paper "Le Monde" (16) Moczar's ideology is "a remarkable mixture of orthodox Communism and extreme nationalism, with a touch of anti-semitism and great veneration for the army". He is the leader of a group of former resistance fighters whose influence is very great at the present time, and who are still called the "partisans".

During the Second World War they belonged to the Polish resistance fighters "who were in contact with the Soviet partisans, who operated in Polish territory. These people have an "orthodox" and anti-Western attitude. They nurture little sympathy for the revisionists and the "liberals", who gave the rising of 1956 such revolutionary allures; they want to remain faithful to the traditional Marxist-Leninist methods, but naturally without repeating the "errors" of the Stalinist period; and they appear to share another of the characteristics of anti-liberalism: anti-semitism (17)."

When the Red Army invaded Poland Moczar collaborated with the Soviet authorities in the deportation to Siberia of Polish soldiers who belonged to the non-Communist Home Army. He became an important functionary in Bezpieka (close to Lublin),

where he kept the local population under a reign of terror. Moczar climbed hereafter ever higher up the administrative ladder and knew how to adapt himself to the different political lines of policy:

"When Gomulka disappeared in 1948, Moczar remained on good terms with the Stalinists and even attacked Gomulka (...) When Gomulka returned in 1956, Moczar was one of the first people to support him and to gain his confidence (18)." In December 1956 Moczar was given the post of Vice-Minister of Internal Affairs, in which function he became the direct head of the Security Service and was able to place his yes-men in the most important posts.

Three months after his election as President of the ZBOWID Moczar became - on 12th December 1965 - Minister of Internal Affairs. He tried to derive the maximum profit from the Association, the reins of which were now in his hands: he particularly wanted to "protect" the young against "a certain sort of wiliness and cynicism" by imparting to them the ideals of his partisans (19).

After the war in the Middle East in June 1967 the ZBOWID's anti-semitism became increasingly evident. On 17th July 1967 at 19,30 hours the Secretary-General of the Association, Kazimierz Rusinek, delivered a speech (Radio Warsaw) on the "problems of the ZBOWID", in which he also referred to what he believed to have been the reason for the success of the Israelis during this June-war (20):

"Everyone knows that there are numerous Nazi criminals working for the state of Israel and present in Israeli territory. I cannot name the exact number, but I am convinced that more than a thousand experts from the "Nazi Wehrmacht" have become Israeli army advisers."

The effect which these and similar remarks had on the relations within the FIR (after all there is an Israeli organisation the FIR) will be described in Chapter IX.

On 12th March 1968 the ZBOWID addressed an appeal to the youth of Poland, in which these young people were encouraged to behave according to the example of the "partisans". The "International Zionist Movement" was held to be the greatest offender in the "slander campaigns of imperialist and revanchist circles in the United States and the German Federal

Republic against Poland and socialism (21)."

Moczar's career reached great heights in 1968: at the session of the CC of the PCP on 9th July 1968 he was elected Secretary of that Committee and substitute member of the 12-man strong Politbureau (22).

Political commentators see Moczar more and more as a rival of Gomulka.

How this will develop further, how great the influence of the partisan groups will eventually become, is not yet known at the time of writing this study. However, a week after Moczar's promotion in the PCP, the partisan leader suddenly retired from the post of Minister of Internal Affairs and was succeeded by a much younger man, the 45-year old Kazimierz Switala, a former judge (23).

What consequences this will have for the ZBOWID and this Association's relations with the FIR remains to be seen.

C. The SUBNOR

The Yugoslav organisation "The Federation of Associations of National Liberation Fighters of Yugoslavia" (SUBNOR) has its seat in Belgrade, Trg. Bratstva i Jedinstva br. 9.

This Federation is not really a resistance organisation as are the member organisations of the FIR, but embraces all former participants in both World Wars: partisans, prisoners-of-war, political prisoners, deportees, former Spanish Civil War participants, etc. The SUBNOR numbers more than 1 million members, of which at least 40% have an important function at government level with "direct influence on the entirely new socialist life of the state." (24)

In Chapter III a description was given of the way in which the FIAPP closely followed the orders of the Soviet Union and managed by means of various intrigues to remove the Yugoslav organisation from its ranks.

This Communist antipathy for the Yugoslavs was also the reason why, when the FIR was set up, there was no room for a Yugoslav organisation; on the contrary, the agitation against Tito's régime was carried on in the publicity organs of the FIR. Thus, for instance, in the "Bulletin de la FIR" (25) there was an appeal to "all resistance fighters" to fight

"to free from the Yugoslav death camps, which are copied from Nazi-Germany, the millions of patriots, who have been imprisoned by the Fascist régime of Tito."

However, when - with the advent of Khrushchev - the Soviet Union sought to improve relations with Tito, the FIR's attitude also underwent a change.

In June 1956 the Secretary-General, André Leroy, wrote (26): "The unjust manner in which the Yugoslav resistance fighters have been treated has since been condemned by our executive authorities."

From this it appears that it is possible to alter one's line of thought fundamentally in the space of five years, according to the political necessity for so doing. After all, during the FIR Foundation Congress (end of June 1951) Leroy had had a completely different opinion with regard to the Yugoslavs (27):

"The tortures which are applied by Tito's people... would not shame the brutal methods employed by Hitler's butchers. The people of Yugoslavia - freed from slavery by the Soviet Union - are now passing through the worst period in their history."

Nevertheless, the contacts were gradually restored and after the close of the 1950's one can speak of firm new ties between the FIR and the Yugoslav organisation, the SUBNOR, which ties have not yet resulted, however, in the SUBNOR's becoming affiliated to the FIR. It is difficult to say whether a factor here is the reluctance of the Yugoslav organisation to expose itself to a similar experience to that of 1950 - should the relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia once more deteriorate. As far as the FIR is concerned, the absence of official ties with the SUBNOR has certain advantages, which will be explained below.

At the fourth Congress of the SUBNOR in Belgrade (29th June - 1st July 1961) chairman Rankovic said the following, which is the best illustration of the contacts between the FIR and the SUBNOR (28). Rankovic welcomed the representative of "... the International Federation of Resistance Movements, with whom we are in touch and with whom since 1958 we have kept up regular relations after the impediments to our co-operation had been removed. Although we do not officially belong to the FIR, we maintain very good contacts with this

international organisation. Our Federation takes an active part in almost all the deliberations of the organisation and in all the international actions which it undertakes. This participation in the work of the FIR permits us, amongst other things, to get into touch with representatives of associations, which are members of the FIR, and with whom we have no permanent bilateral contacts, since the necessary conditions for such contact are at present lacking."

SUBNOR participation in FIR "international actions" has been manifested, for example, in its joining the so-called Social Commission of the FIR in order to help in organising "youth holiday camps" and "exchange actions for youth and students." (29)

The ties which the FIR has with the SUBNOR, it has also with an Italian organisation, the ANPI (Associazione Nazionale Partigiani d'Italia) (National Association of Italian Partisans). The ANPI does not belong to the FIR (for different reasons than the SUBNOR), but has the same address as the most important Italian member of the FIR, the ANPPIA (Associazione Nazionale Perseguitati Politici Italiani Anti-fascisti/National Association of Italian Political Prisoners and Anti-fascists). This address is: Via degli Scipioni 271, Rome; up to 1960 the ANPI' address was Via Tre Canelle 22.

The present President of the FIR, Arialdo Banfi, is a member of the ANPPIA, but also vice-President of the ANPI.

When, at the fifth Congress of the FIR (December 1965 in Budapest), Jean Toujas highly praised the contact the FIR had with the SUBNOR, he added: "At the same time we would also like to emphasise the fruitful co-operation we have with our comrades from the Italian Association, the ANPI (30)."

The advantage which the FIR sees in co-operation with the SUBNOR and the ANPI lies especially in the sphere of the FIR's striving for unity, for one great international organisation, which embraces all resistance fighters. We shall return in more detail to this striving for unity in the following chapters, but we can here throw more light on the role which is allotted to the SUBNOR and the ANPI.

At the sixth Congress of the ANPI (February 1964 in Rome) the ANPI President Boldrini (also member of the CC of the Italian Communist Party) said:

"To maintain and to achieve unity is one of the essential tasks of the associations in all countries which are affiliated to the FIR or participate in its activities (31)."

Another manifestation of the FIR's struggle for unity is its repeated attempts to become a member of the FMAC, the non-Communist organisation which unites participants from both world wars.

The SUBNOR is the only member of this Federation from a Communist country and has always been assiduous in trying to arrange contact between the FMAC and the FIR, but up to now without success. Even attempts by the SUBNOR to enable the ANPI to become a member of the FMAC have come to naught.

In view of the fact that the SUBNOR is not an official FIR member it can - as it is untainted in that respect - maintain contact with ex-service organisations in the FMAC from the developing countries, which can again mean indirect FIR influence on these countries.

Outside the FMAC the SUBNOR also takes a great interest in developing countries, especially those from the Arab world and North Africa. From 8th - 15th September 1967 a delegation of Algerian partisans was received in Belgrade (32), during which visit both organisations condemned the "Israeli aggression".

Two months later, from 21st November to 3rd December a SUBNOR delegation paid a return visit to Algiers, which resulted in a joint resolution condemning "Israeli imperialist aggression against the Arab countries, as well as "the genocide committed by the Americans in Vietnam."

Both organisations decided to "co-operate" further. To what extent the FIR considers these contacts with developing countries desirable will be gone into in Chapter IX.

Notes

1. cf. "Die Orientierung", Pfaffenhofen/Ilm, January 1963.
2. According to documents shown in "Contre la Résistance", op.cit. p.62.
3. idem, p.63.
4. cf. "Der Widerstandskämpfer", October 1962.
5. idem March 1962.

6. ibid.
7. ibid.
8. idem April 1962.
9. idem December 1962.
- 9a. cf. Chapter V, note 3a.
10. Bulletin de la FIAPP, 30th March 1947. Also quoted by "Contre la Résistance" op.cit. p.56.
11. Quoted by "Contre la Résistance", op.cit. p.28.
12. idem p.60.
13. idem p.61.
14. Underlining by this author.
15. cf., amongst others, "La Voix Internationale" April 1966.
16. Le Monde, 23rd July 1965.
17. cf. Témoignages, Monaco, 29th January 1963.
18. ibid.
19. Interview with General Moczar in the weekly "Polityka" 30th January 1965, quoted by "La Voix Internationale" April 1966.
20. Quoted by "La Voix Internationale" July/August 1967.
21. cf. PAP (Polish Press Agency) 12th March 1968.
22. Het Parool, Amsterdam, 10th July 1968.
23. idem 16th July 1968.
24. According to "Der Widerstandskämpfer" August 1961.
25. Bulletin d'Information de la FIR, January 1952.
26. Quoted by "Contre la Résistance" op.cit. p.32.
27. Already quoted in Chapter III.
28. "Der Widerstandskämpfer" August/September 1961
29. idem, March 1964 (see also Chapter V).
30. idem, January/February 1966.
31. idem, March 1964 (underlining by this author).
32. ADN (East German Press Bureau) 5th September 1967.
33. Radio Belgrade, 21st November 1967, quoted by Interdoc weekly, The Hague, No. 49 1967.

VIII THE INTERNATIONAL CAMP COMMITTEES ;
THE FIR's STRIVING FOR UNITY

When the FIR was set up at the third FIAPP Congress (from 30th June-2nd July 1951 in Vienna), it was decided that it should bear the name "International Federation of Resistance Fighters, Victims and Former Political Prisoners of Fascism" (see Chapter III). The FIR retained this long name for a time at the beginning of the Fifties. Thereafter we see that the official name of the FIR is : International Federation of Resistance Movements (see also statutes, Art. I, Appendix 1). This meant that the Victims and Former Prisoners of Fascism, who had originally been members of the FIAPP, had been transferred elsewhere.

This also meant that the FIR - according to the change of name - had openly become an organisation which was going to concentrate more on being politically militant than on promoting social interests.

During the Fifties the so-called International Camp Committees came into being and it is justifiable to suppose that the FIR disposed of the "Victims and Former Political Prisoners of Fascism" in these organisations.

The function which the FIR has allotted to these camp committees can be described as the carrying out of the propaganda tasks which the FIR has delegated. The FIR itself expressed it somewhat more neutrally: "International Committees for former Nazi concentration camps have been set up and are co-operating closely with the FIR (1)".

The advantage of this system is that the Committees do not appear to be subordinate to the FIR, which makes it more difficult to find out whether committees' activities are exclusively directed towards a propaganda function. Moreover, a storm of protest is evoked if one tries to break down the taboo which has become interwoven with the conception, for example, of Auschwitz, Ravensbrück etc., in order to show that these conceptions are often disgracefully misused for party political purposes. This taboo was clearly evident when, in the Spring of 1968, a Netherlands television company

devoted a programme to the International Auschwitz Committee, in which it was pointed out that this Committee was a Communist group. That this supposition was fully justified could be proved by numerous experts - such as members of the Dutch Institute for War Documentation and Simon Wiesenthal - with well-founded statements.

The reactions from a section of the Netherlands press showed, however, that statements from experts carried no weight with a large group of television viewers. As soon as a Committee covered itself with the words Auschwitz, Ravensbrück, etc. no-one was allowed to say anything detrimental about it. At the Second Congress of the FIR (28th - 30th November 1954 in Vienna) the then Secretary-General, André Leroy, announced in his report (2), that the FIR had set up the International Committees of Buchenwald, Auschwitz, Mauthausen, Dachau, Ravensbrück and Sachsenhausen.

However, the International Dachau Committee currently occupies an exceptional position in this group, since its activities are quite distinct from those of the other Committees in that it is not bound by Communist directives. This is apparent in, amongst other things, this Committee's refusal to participate in the establishment of an "International Bureau of Concentration Camps", a plan for which was put forward at the beginning of 1966 (3). This International Bureau was to be brought into being by seven international committees (apart from those mentioned above also the International Neuengamme Committee) with the aim in fact of organising a great manifestation against the Federal Republic.

The plan for the founding of the International Bureau was a brainwave of the Frenchman, Marcel Paul, former deputy for the French Communist Party (Paul had at one time taken an active part in the executive bodies of the FIAPP. He is now President of the International Buchenwald Committee).

The FIR gives financial support to the activities of the International Camp Committees, as may be concluded, for example, from the budget for 1957 (4), in which 40,000 Austrian Sch. were allocated for contributions to four of these Committees.

A. The International Auschwitz Committee

One of the most active camp committees is the International

Auschwitz Committee (IAK).

The seat of the IAK (i.e. the Secretariat-General) is in Warsaw, Koszykowa 6. Up to mid-1968 the President was the Frenchman, Prof. Robert Waitz, and the Secretary is the Pole, Mieczyslaw Kieta. In 1962 the IAK comprised 20 national committees (5), which number now be somewhat higher. Up to mid-1961 one of the Secretaries of the IAK was the Austrian, Hermann Langbein. Langbein was a sort of representative (fondé de pouvoir) of the Auschwitz Committee in Vienna, but in mid-1961 this came to an abrupt end. The Auschwitz Committee issued the following communiqué (6): "The IAK declares that Hermann Langbein, Weigandhof 5, Vienna, no longer represents the Committee and has no right to undertake any action whatsoever on behalf of the IAK or to enter into obligations (...) The power-of-attorney for the IAK has been withdrawn from Langbein by a valid and unanimous decision taken during a plenary session of the IAK on 18th and 19th July in Warsaw." What had Langbein done that he was divested of this function? Jos Slagter of the Netherlands, member of the IAK, who had attended this session of the IAK in Warsaw, described the situation as follows (7): "At our international discussion, held according to the regulations, only two IAK members were absent: Dr. Adler from London was unable to be present owing to engagements elsewhere. Mr. H. Langbein, the IAK representative with power-of-attorney, refused to come on the grounds that the preparations had been too short. His absence was strongly resented, especially as he was the only foreign functionary who had important assignments." However, in the Information Bulletin of the IAK for Sept./Oct. 1961 there was a stencil, obviously written by Langbein, in which a more detailed explanation of his absence was given: "In July 1961 a meeting of the IAK executive was organised in Warsaw at such short notice that two members of the executive, Dr. H.G. Adler and Hermann Langbein, were unable to make themselves free to attend this meeting. In their absence Langbein was divested of his power-of-attorney and resolutions were taken under one-sided Communist influence which were contrary to the principle accepted at the last general meeting of the Auschwitz Committee. This principle places the executive under the obligation of performing its work in such a spirit of impartiality and independence,

that every former inmate of Auschwitz, regardless of his political viewpoint, can support this work ... The violation (of this impartiality) is only one of the consequences of all the attempts which have recently been made and which have once before paralysed the activities of the office in Vienna. Dr. Adler and Langbein have therefore resigned from their functions and from the IAK executive." The other members of the IAK Executive blamed Langbein for his absence at the session of 18th and 19th July in Warsaw. Langbein defended himself - as we have seen - by saying that the meeting was convened at too short notice. There is reason to suspect that this was done on purpose. Jos Slagter writes that Langbein "was the only foreign functionary with important assignments"; was this fact not a reason for inviting Langbein somewhat earlier if his presence was so urgently required? In September 1962 Langbein had another "apology" (signed by him) distributed (8), in which he wrote of how, during his period in the executive, he had been increasingly disturbed - and had let it be seen - by the close party line followed by the IAK and the Communists' reactions to his attitude: "The Communist Party finally designated me as 'no longer to be tolerated'. In order to get me out of the IAK, they organised a slander campaign. The most disappointing thing was that the campmates who knew me well from Auschwitz days also lent themselves to the campaign. In private conversations they admitted that there were no grounds for the gossip which had been put about, but a clear, unqualified, public withdrawal of such accusations was evidently not allowed." The result of this was, as we have seen above, that it was made impossible in all sorts of ways for Langbein to carry out his work and he thereafter resigned. One last quotation from Langbein's letter in which he gives an explanation of the IAK's partiality: "It is very simple to get rid of the impartial character of the IAK, since the Communists have a permanent majority in the executive."

On 16th April 1967 an international memorial was unveiled in Auschwitz, which had been created by Polish and Italian sculptors and architects (9). A great deal of money had to be collected for this monument.

However, many Western governments were chary of contributing, since they feared that the unveiling of this monument would turn into another propaganda manifestation. Thus the Netherlands government (De Quai, Marijnen) refused several times to give financial support, but finally in 1966 after actions carried out by the Netherlands Auschwitz Committee, the Cals government was prepared to give a financial contribution. The German Federal Republic also contributed with a sum of DM 200,000 (10). The unveiling was attended by almost 200,000 people.

The only representatives of governments were those of Israel, Italy and the DDR (11). The actual organisation of the unveiling was not in the hands of the IAK, but of the ZBOWID. It will be seen further in this chapter that this did not make much difference to the organisation. The President of the IAK, Prof. Robert Waitz, made a speech which was apparently very impressive and which threw light on the tragedy of the European Jews (12).

Another speaker during the unveiling was the Polish premier and honorary chairman of the ZBOWID, Joseph Cyrankiewicz. What many Western governments had foreseen, did indeed happen, as can be seen from the following quotations from his speech: "...The Federal Republic leaves nothing untried to free Hitler and the Third Reich from the stigma or responsibility for the world war... In only one third of the national territory of Germany, in the German Democratic Republic, have conclusions been drawn from the problems of the German and European tragedy, which were Hitler-Fascism, militarism and imperialism."

For more than an hour Cyrankiewicz kept up a tirade of hatred against the Federal Republic along those lines. Nor did he once mention the word "Jew", which was most remarkable at a commemoration of 4,000,000 victims of a concentration camp, 3,000,000 of whom had been Jews.

The FIR would not have minded the omission of the word "Jew", for they had written before the unveiling (14): "This monument in its entirety will call up one immeasurable and collective grave of 4,000,000 human beings who were murdered by the Nazis, without distinction of nationality, race, ideology or religion."

If, however, the FIR proceeds upon this standpoint, then it is making a historical mistake, since for 3,000,000 of the victims of Auschwitz just such a racial distinction had been made, which was the only reason why they had to die.

The unveiling of the Auschwitz monument was transmitted by many television stations in Eastern and Western Europe. It was not transmitted in the Federal Republic and the DDR (15). We can understand that the West German television stations were not eager to transmit Cyrankiewicz' tirade of hatred. The question as to why the DDR had no interest in providing its own viewers with information on this commemoration is more difficult to answer.

As a result of the propagandist character of the unveiling of the Auschwitz monument, disagreement slowly developed within the Auschwitz Committee.

When the June war between the Israelis and the Arabs broke out a few months later, this disunity became increasingly evident. The blatantly anti-Israel standpoint of the East European countries was a great disappointment to many of the former inmates of Auschwitz, the majority of whom are Israelis.

The Secretariat of the IAK, which is established in Warsaw, was particularly strong in its anti-Israeli views. That this Secretariat should have expressed itself in such anti-Israeli terms, and still does so, was explained by Prof. R. Waitz in a letter which he wrote on the occasion of his resignation as President of the IAK (16).

During the unveiling of the Auschwitz monument Waitz had already placed himself in an exceptional position, since he had, as we have seen, held a speech on the tragedy of the European Jews. The feeling of sheer inability to get his ideas carried out in the IAK drove him to offer his resignation: "It was scarcely possible for me to carry on an action, since the Secretariat-General of the IAK is established in Warsaw. This secretariat is an offshoot of the ZBOWID, the Association of Former Resistance Fighters in Poland. There is thus no possibility of taking a standpoint independent to that of the ZBOWID."

Another question which Waitz had always opposed during his

period of office is the plan of the Secretariat-General of the IAK to establish an Auschwitz Committee in Hiroshima. The intention behind this is quite clear: Communist propaganda would hereby be able to bracket together: "the revanchist Nazis of Bonn, who are responsible for the crimes of Auschwitz" and the "imperialist Americans, who bear the responsibility for the crime of Hiroshima (17)."

The anti-semitism, which has developed strongly in Poland since June 1967 and which is particularly evident in the ZBOWID, has alarmed many national Auschwitz Committees. Thus, for instance, in June 1968, the Netherlands Auschwitz Committee (NAC) refused to attend a meeting of the IAK in Warsaw because of this anti-semitism. A representative of the NAC said: "They call it anti-Zionism. But if the 25,000 Jews in Poland, who are still left over out of the 3,000,000, are not left in peace, that is pure anti-semitism. The Jews who still live in Poland are certainly not Zionists."

B. The FIR's Striving for Unity: a) the FIR and the FMAC;
b) the FIR and the UIRD

Though the FIR had managed to get the "former political prisoners and victims of fascism" catered for by the Camp Committees named above, this did not mean, however, that the Federation did not need a more extensive field of action. On the contrary, one of the FIR's dearest wishes has always been to unite all former resistance fighters behind its banner. An assistant Secretary-General of the FIR expressed it thus at a meeting of the General Council in Vienna in September 1952 (19): "We must make use of all the existing possibilities to get in touch with other organisations, according to the methods and principles which are adapted to the special situation in each country."

a) The FIR and the FMAC

In the seventh chapter we described how the FIR managed to employ the SUBNOR in its attempts to establish contact with the FMAC (20). We shall go into this in more detail below. The "Fédération Mondiale des Anciens Combattants" (also

referred to by the abbreviation WVF, i.e. World Veterans Federation) was founded in 1950 by organisations of war veterans and war victims from six countries. By 1967 the Federation already numbered 140 organisations from 49 countries from all parts of the world. The FMAC represents the interests of 20,000,000 people. The President of the FMAC is the Dutchman, W.Ch.J.M. van Lanschot.

The FMAC also devoted attention to the problems of the Resistance Movement, especially with regard to the status of resistance fighters in international law. This could mean that there was no impediment to cultivating ties between the FMAC and the FIR, since the FMAC also has national organisations of former resistance fighters (at the 12th General Meeting of the FMAC in October 1967 in the Hague the Netherlands "Nationaal Federatieve Raad - Voormalig Verzet Nederland" (Former Netherlands Resistance) became a member, amongst others). However, the FMAC executives know the background and the real objectives of the FIR and that restrains them from responding to the FIR's attempts at rapprochement.

Thus the FIR's approaches were turned down at the 9th General Meeting of the FMAC held from 8th - 12th May 1961 in Paris. The "Widerstandskämpfer", which was very disappointed by this, wrote of this repulsion (21): "Since the FMAC only looks to one side and refuses to enter into a dialogue with others, it condemns itself to sterility and is therefore not in a position to contribute to the solution of the most important questions, and to Peaceful Co-existence between the nations."

During this General Meeting two associations, which are well-disposed to the FIR, were very active in making propaganda for the FIR's striving for unity: "In this context the French and Yugoslav unions submitted resolutions in favour of the Universality of the FMAC, but these were watered down and amended and only express a pious, but futile wish (22)." We already know that by the "Yugoslav union" is meant the SUBNOR. The French union mentioned is the UFAC (Union Français des Anciens Combattants - French Veterans Union), an organisation of veterans from both world wars. Two of the

Bureau members of the UFAC are (23) Fournier-Bocquet, Secretary-General of the ANACR and Bureau member of the FIR, and Charles Joineau, Secretary-General of the FNDRIIP and member of the General Council of the FIR (the ANACR and the FNDRIIP are, as is known, member organisations of the FIR).

In the executive bodies of the UFAC the influence of the FIR is ever on the increase, which explains why the UFAC supports the SUBNOR in its attempts to bring the FIR closer to the FMAC.

b) The FIR and the UIRD

Another international organisation with which the FIR would like to establish contact in order to bring about "unity amongst the former European resistance fighters" is the UIRD (Union Internationale de la Résistance et de la Déportation - International Union of Resistance and Deportee Movements).

In 1953 the "Comité d'Action Interallié de la Résistance (CAIR) was established in Brussels, which Committee was re-christened in 1957, also in Brussels, as "Commission Internationale de Liaison et de Coordination de la Résistance" (International Commission for Liaison and Coordination of the Resistance Movement). This international Commission was a group which aimed solely at promoting the interests of the former resistance fighters and at preventing by various means (publications and the like) the development of another such situation as had made the resistance struggle necessary. These aspirations needed international coordination, but, in contrast to the FIR, were not to be determined by party objectives and propagandist motives.

The FIR did not approve of this at all; it claimed to represent the unity of all European resistance fighters. Thus the "Widerstandskämpfer" wrote (24): "There is political discrimination amongst the resistance fighters, to which some resistance organisations were delivered over after the liberation, just as there is a campaign of hatred against the "Communist" resistance fighters (as they are termed) and against the FIR, which embraces all resistance fighters without distinction.

This discrimination and this hate campaign, which are carried on by a "Commission Internationale de Liaison de la Résistance", which has its seat in Brussels, has only one aim in view: to sow dissension in the Resistance Movement...". At the Fourth International Conference of the Resistance, which was held in Turin on 8th July 1961, organised by the "Commission Internationale de Liaison de la Résistance", the UIRD was founded. This Association now numbers 60 national associations (a total of 500,000 members) from 12 (non-Communist) countries. The UIRD publishes a monthly paper "La Voix Internationale de la Résistance", edited by the secretary-general of UIRD, Hubert Halin (28 Place Flagey, Brussels 5), which gives excellent information, especially on neo-Nazi and neo-Fascist phenomena all over the world. Since mid-1968 the President is the Belgian, Albert Guérisse - known from Resistance days as "Pat O'Leary" - who is also Chairman of the International Dachau Committee. Notwithstanding the FIR's opinion about the UIRD's objectives, as embodied in the quotation from the "Widerstandskämpfer", it has continued to try to use the UIRD in its propaganda manifestations, especially when they are directed against the Federal Republic. Thus in December 1964 the Secretary-General of the FIR, Jean Toujas, sent a letter to the UIRD to invite them to participate in a "joint action with the FIR" against the threatening prescription of war crimes in the Federal Republic. The UIRD's answer to this letter (25) was: "We are sorry that we cannot agree with your proposal, as the UIRD does not consider your Federation, which draws its greatest strength from East European countries, to be the mouthpiece of the resistance fighters and victims of Nazism, but an instrument of agitation and propaganda in the service of objectives, which are kept closely to the party line. Everyone knows that the former resistance fighters and victims of Nazism in these countries have no opportunity of organising themselves, any more than they are free to carry on their activities. The associations which have been set up there are in fact agencies of the Communist parties, whilst the other resistance fighters are the victims of systematic discrimination, which has in very many cases had extremely tragic consequences, but the FIR has never raised its voice on behalf of these resistance fighters (...) Moreover, these appeals for unity by the FIR, just as those of the other mass

organisations which serve Moscow, are only directed towards one-sided objectives, as these have been laid down by the Communist Internationale, for which "the tactics of the United Front are simply a means to direct and to monopolise the masses'..."

The letter ended with the declaration that the UIRD would itself continue its actions against the prescription mentioned above. Thus on 31st January 1966 a UIRD delegation called on the German Ministers of Internal Affairs and of Justice (Lücke and Heinemann), to set forth the outspoken viewpoint of the resistance movement on this question (26).

Notes

1. "Résistance Unie" (French version of the "Widerstandskämpfer", Aug./Sept. '58.
2. Report 2nd FIR Congress, 1954, p.21.
3. cf. "La Voix Internationale", February 1966.
4. See Chapter V, note 4.
5. "Der Widerstandskämpfer", May 1962.
6. To be found in "Informations Bulletin IAK", Warsaw Sept./Oct. 1961 and in "Der Widerstandskämpfer", January 1962.
7. Information Bulletin of the Netherlands Auschwitz Committee, Amsterdam, October 1961.
8. Copy in possession of this author.
9. Neue Zürcher Zeitung, 19th April 1967.
10. "La Voix Internationale", June 1967.
11. NZZ, 9th April 1967.
12. ibid.
13. cf. "Der Widerstandskämpfer", April/May 1967.
14. "Résistance Unie", March 1967.
15. NZZ, 9th April 1967.
16. Letter dated Strassbourg 6th May 1968, quoted by "La Voix Internationale", July 1968.
17. cf. "La Voix Internationale", February 1968.
18. Quoted by "Algemeen Handelsblad", Amsterdam, 5th June 1968.
19. Quoted by "Contre la Résistance", op.cit. p.22.
20. Opinions within the FIR have not always been unanimously favourable towards the FMAC. cf. Luc Somer-

hausen in his letter ("Contre la Résistance" p.53), in which he quoted amongst others the Czech Vodicka and André Leroy. Vodicka: "The FMAC is a bellicose organisation." Leroy: (With reference to the FMAC's protests about Hungary 1956) "The ideological crusade of the FMAC."

21. "Der Widerstandskämpfer", June/July 1961.
22. Ibidem. Underlining by the author (the word "Universality" is often used in Communist jargon to indicate the wish that Communists should be included in a certain organisation.)
23. "Der Widerstandskämpfer", November 1962.
24. August/September 1958 (Supplement to Résistance Unie).
25. Amongst others quoted in "Der Widerstandskämpfer", March 1965.
26. "La Voix Internationale", April 1967.

IX. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN THE FIR

In this chapter more detailed attention will be given to some of the developments which have already been mentioned above, such as differences of opinion within the executive organs of the FIR with regard to the Middle East question, and the FIR's attempts to extend its field of activities (with all the consequences of such an extension).

Whether the questions, which will be gone into here more closely, will be decisive for the future of the FIR is naturally a matter of conjecture, but they are in any case important enough for mention to be made of them.

A. The FIR and Israel

When the activities of the Polish FIR member, the ZBODIW, were described in Chapter VII, mention was made of the anti-semitism of this Association.

Since the ZBOWID numbers the most members of any of the associations affiliated to the FIR, this fact could certainly produce serious consequences within the FIR in the long run (1). The Israeli member organisation of the FIR is the "Union des Combattants Anti-Nazi d'Israel" (Union of Anti-Nazi Fighters of Israel). This organisation is established in Tel Aviv (11 Bar Kochba St.).

The Chairman is Dr. A. Bermann, an Israeli Communist. There are a considerable number of Communists in this Union, but many of them remain Israelis above everything. The extremely prejudiced attitude taken by the East European countries with regard to the June war in the Middle East drove 562 Israeli former resistance fighters (1a) to give back the many distinctions which they had received from the USSR and Poland for their services during the Second World War in Russian and Polish partisan groups (these decorations were returned to the Finnish chargé d'affaires in Tel Aviv, since the Soviet Union had broken off diplomatic relations with Israel as a result of the June war). During a session of the Secretariat of the FIR in Sofia (from 2nd - 6th June 1967) there was nearly a split in the Federation because the different points of view on the war in the Middle East were

so diametrically opposed to one another. The FIR thus formed an exception to the other Communist front organisations, none of whom had the slightest difficulty in formulating anti-Israeli resolutions (2).

When on 17th July 1967 the Secretary-General of the ZBOWID, Kazimierz Rusinek, held his notorious speech over the Polish radio, in which he accused the Israeli government of receiving support from former Nazi criminals, there were repercussions within the FIR.

During the meeting of the General Council of the FIR (from 3rd - 5th December 1967 in East Berlin) there appear to have been very heated discussions on this question. Rusinek wanted the General Council to formulate a resolution which would brand Israel as an "aggressor". Dr. Bermann, Chairman of the Israeli Union, managed, however, to prevent this (3), so that a very moderate resolution was drawn up, in which the withdrawal of the Israelis was demanded from the areas occupied in June 1967, but also (4) "respect for and recognition of the sovereignty, the territorial inviolability and the political independence of all states in this area, also the right of these states to live within set and recognised frontiers, protected against threats and acts of violence." However, the FIR has not, up to now, dissociated itself from Rusinek's notorious remarks. This Rusinek, not content with the above-quoted resolution, gave the members of the ZBOWID after his return to Warsaw a version entirely of his own of what had taken place during the meeting of the General Council of the FIR. He wrote the following in the January number of the ZBOWID organ "For Freedom and People" (5): "The Polish delegation had a controversy with the Israeli delegate, who defended the war of aggression by asserting that it was a defensive war. This type of argument reminds us of those used by Hitler (...)

Whilst the Polish delegation condemned the Israeli aggression, they recommended that the FIR should accept the decision of the Security Council on the conflict in the Middle East. They proposed that there should be a foreword attached to this decision, which would unequivocally state who the aggressor was and who the victim of the aggression. The General Council of the FIR unanimously accepted the Polish delegation's

proposal."

When this report came to the notice of Dr. Bermann, he sent a letter of protest on 23rd February 1968 to the Secretary-General of the FIR, Jean Toujas, in which he accused the ZBOWID of having published something which "was far from the truth". Bermann asked Toujas to take measures against the lies published by the ZBOWID. However, Toujas did not react to this request. The reason for this could well be that the FIR does not want to upset the ZBOWID, in view of the fact that in September 1968 the "Vth International Medical Congress" of the FIR would take place in Warsaw, for which the FIR naturally needed all possible co-operation from the ZBOWID.

B. The FIR Seeks New Areas for Activity

It must gradually have become apparent to the FIR that its efforts to get into contact with organisations such as the FMAC and the UIRD offer little hope for the future. This means that this organisation, which wants to accentuate how active it is, is faced with three important problems, for which a solution must be found in one way or another. These problems are:

1. Through the activities which have been described in the previous chapters, the FIR has acquired the odium of being a "Communist front organisation". Its national organisations are also known as such. How can the FIR rid itself of this odium?
2. In view of the fact that the members of the FIR are resistance fighters from the Second World War (in other words, in contrast with professional and student organisations, a non-recurrent qualification), they are now - almost 25 years after the war - getting on in years. What can the FIR do to counteract the inevitable shrinkage (through decrease etc.) in its membership?
3. The FIR is an organisation of resistance fighters from countries which were occupied by the Germans in the Second World War (except, of course, for Israel). This means that the field of action of the FIR is also fixed geographically. How could the FIR extend this field

without violating its official designation and objectives? The answer to these three questions might possibly lie in a theory which crops up sporadically and about which opinions differ somewhat, but which is worth mentioning here.

This theory means that the FIR would have to aim at an entirely new resistance movement, also called in Italian style "Nuova Resistenza" (7).

The term "Nuova Resistenza" was first heard in a few Italian cities in the years 1962/1963. The term came to the fore internationally during a large congress in Florence (21st - 23rd September 1962), where various Communist youth organisations, such as the WFDY, the IUS and the FGCI were represented (8).

At this congress the "Nuova Resistenza" of Italy was set up on the initiative of - amongst others - the vice-President of the FIR, Umberto Terracini. The influence of the ANPI (President Boldrini) is also unmistakable.

At a more recent congress in Genoa (23rd-25th May 1963) the idea of the "Nuova Resistenza" was further developed and it was announced that an international union of the New Resistance Movement would be established. In the meantime national unions had been established in several other countries besides Italy, notably in Germany, Denmark, England and Sweden.

However, after the congress in Genoa the development stagnated: there was criticism from within the Communist ranks that the original aim of interesting non-Communist youth in the idea had not been achieved. This term has re-appeared once more since then in the context of a protest against the military coup in Greece (April 1967).

The advantages which there would appear to be for the FIR in the "Nuova Resistenza" are as follows:

- the FIR could be turned into a new organisation without a "blemished" reputation, attractive to younger people, where by the ageing process of the FIR could be counteracted,
- the theme "struggle against fascism" offers possibilities for attracting the young people who have no memories of their own of the last World War. The term "anti-Fascism" can be used against anyone who now too does not agree with the Communists,

- the geographical extension possibilities are unlimited (especially with regard to the developing countries). This last advantage can, however, produce certain risks, which trouble all front organisations except the FIR, as, for example, the Sino-Soviet conflict.

With the present composition of the FIR this conflict has already made itself felt (although only to a very slight extent) during the Vth Congress in December 1965 in Budapest. The representative of the country which in the Sino-Soviet dispute is on the side of China, the Albanian Ndreçi Plasari (11) claimed in his speech that there were in the FIR certain "forces which - just as earlier on - want to bring the FIR under the control of a great power and want to use the FIR as a tool with which to try to achieve a certain policy of co-operation with American imperialism." The Vth Congress of the FIR had passed a resolution on Vietnam which, in comparison with resolutions on the same subject from other front organisations could be called extremely restrained. The resolution called on the American government "to stop the bombing and all intervention in Vietnam" and to settle the conflict through negotiations on the basis of the Geneva Convention on 1954. The only vote against the resolution came from Plasari.

According to him this resolution had not had its origin in solicitude for the Vietnamese people, but in the fear that the Vietnamese war might form "an impediment for Soviet-American co-operation."

As has already been remarked in Chapter IV, the question of Vietnam is not an important propaganda subject with the present composition of the FIR. The FIR considers the Federal Republic a much more important target.

If, however, the composition of the FIR should be altered (for example, through the setting-up of the "Nuova Resistenza"), the new members of the FIR would certainly not be satisfied with having only the Federal Republic as the field of propaganda.

Nevertheless, the FIR is obliged to say something about Vietnam at every important meeting of the Federation. The tone of the resolutions on this subject has become more severe, as, for instance, during the meeting of the General Council (from

3rd - 5th December 1967) in East Berlin (12): "... The resistance fighters and victims of Nazism declare that the American intervention, which daily becomes more murderous, will extend outside Vietnam."

Some months earlier, at the meeting of the FIR Bureau (more Communist in its composition than the other FIR bodies) from 7th - 9th April 1967, a resolution was passed to send a delegation to Vietnam "to collect material on the war crimes of the USA (13)." Up to now, however, no further reports about this delegation have appeared.

The last great manifestation which was organised by the FIR took place in June 1968 in the former concentration camp Dachau. Here too it was evident that the "Vietnam" theme has by no means been able to replace the "Federal Republic" theme. This manifestation had been preceded by a meeting in Rome (from 2nd - 3rd March) of 90 representatives of the "European Resistance Movement" (14).

The central theme was the "revival of Nazism and Fascism, with especial reference to their development in the Federal Republic." For the organisation of this meeting in Rome an Initiating Committee had already been set up under the direction of the vice-President of the FIR, Jacques Débu-Bridel (15), in May 1967.

The most important resolution which was passed in Rome was that for the plan to hold a great gathering in Dachau on 23rd June 1968, once more with the central theme "Nazism in West Germany" (16). The intention this time was to obviate any impression that the FIR was the real organiser so that non-Communists would also be willing to take part in the manifestation. However, at the VIIth conference of the UIRD it was decided by the UIRD executive that they would refuse the invitation. This decision was followed by the "Union des Résistants pour une Europe unie" (URPE), the "Comité International des Camps (CIC), the Italian Federation of Volunteers for Freedom (FIVL), the Italian National Association of Former Internees (ANEJ) and some German associations (17). All these organisations felt the strong arm of the FIR to be too evident behind the forthcoming manifestation. An article in the East German paper "Neues Deutschland" (18) confirmed that this supposition was justified. The article appeared under the

prominent heading: "FIR shows up re-Nazification of Bonn, meeting of resistance fighters planned in Dachau."

Notes

1. cf. Chapter V, note 3a.
- 1a. "Freiheit und Recht," October, 1961.
2. cf. "Die Orientierung" July 1967.
3. cf. "La Voix Internationale" February 1968.
4. "Der Widerstandskämpfer" December 1967.
5. Quoted by "La Voix Internationale", May/June 1968 (underlining by this author)
6. ibid.
7. cf. "Die Orientierung", January 1963.
- 8/9. cf. "Activities of World Communism Front Organisations", The Hague, II, 1967.
10. cf. "Die Orientierung" January 1963.
11. "Der Widerstandskämpfer", January/February 1966.
12. idem, December 1967.
13. Neues Deutschland, 12th April 1967.
14. FIR Information Service, No.5, 1968.
15. Tass, March 1968, quoted by Interdoc Weekly, 1st March 1968.
16. FIR Information Service, No.5, 1968.
17. "La Voix Internationale" May/June 1968.
18. Neues Deutschland, 7th March 1968.

X. CONCLUSION

After the preceding consideration of the History and Background of the FIR, we inevitably come to the point of answering the question posed in the first chapter: Is the FIR a Communist front organisation?

If we intend to give an affirmative answer, then we must - as has already been stated - provide evidence. In the first chapter we called in the help of "Clews' criteria" in the form of eight questions, the positive answering of which may be able to provide proof that the FIR is a Communist front organisation. We should like to emphasise once more that these "criteria of Clews" are not yet generally accepted criteria in the politico-scientific field. But they are an attempt in the right direction and therefore extremely valuable for this little studied terrain.

Question 1. To what extent does the FIR co-operate with the campaigns, activities, and publications of the Communist party or other front organisations?

The history of the FIR dealt with in the previous chapters teems with examples, which show that the FIR co-operates to a great extent in such campaigns etc.

We shall only mention here as an example the way in which the FIR publications participate in the propagandist campaigns of the Soviet Union against the United States, in which the accusation was made that "America was carrying on bacteriological warfare in Korea and was also exterminating prisoners-of-war there" (see chapter IV).

Question 2. Does the FIR share the same address as other fronts? This question has already been answered in the affirmative in the first chapter. (We are here naturally working on the assumption that it is possible to prove that the organisation with which the FIR shares an address is also a front.)

Question 3. Does the organisation receive favourable publicity in the Communist press?

We need only mention the East German paper "Neues Deutschland", which regularly publishes very favourably about the FIR. For the opinions of other Communist publications

reference may be made to the footnotes of this study.

Question 4. Do the publications of the FIR reflect the Communist party line?

Does it regularly publish articles by Communists?

See the answer to Question 1, which is also applicable to this question.

The FIR publications are even systematic in reflecting this line. If one reads the "Widerstandskämpfer" regularly, one sees that in every number the majority of the contributions are from Communists, who follow the official party line in their articles.

Question 5. Is the FIR's printing done by a Communist printing house?

See chapter I and V (The "Widerstandskämpfer", the most important FIR publication) was printed up to January 1968 at "Globus" in Vienna, the official printing house of the Austrian Communist Party. Thereafter the work was taken over by the "Polygrafické zavody" in Bratislava, Czechoslovakia.

Question 6. Does the FIR itself follow the Communist party line?

The FIR is an organisation which is stronger in "words" than in "deeds".

An example of a "deed" which shows how stringently the Communist party line is followed is the expulsion of Yugoslavia from the Federation (which was then still called the FIAPP). See chapter III.

Following his election as President in December 1965 (Vth Congress) Arialdo Banfi said that "after weakly following Soviet foreign policy for many years the FIR was becoming more flexible (1)."

Question 7. Are the FIR's funds transferred directly or indirectly to the Communist party or to other fronts?

As Clews himself says, this question is extremely difficult to answer, since the front organisations do not publish their accounts. At first sight it does not even look as though this question is applicable to the FIR, since this Federation will not collect so much money from the contributions of about 300,000 members that it can provide other organisations with financial support therefrom. If such a transfer does take place (which would appear to be the case to judge from

Chapter VIII), then this means that the FIR evidently draws money from other - unknown - sources. The FIR would then serve as camouflage, whereby certain committees or organisations were indirectly financed.

Question 8. Does the FIR have Communists in positions of power?

If one looks at Chapter V, where the composition of the most important executive bodies of the Federation is given, then the answer to this question is a straight-forward "Yes". After answering these eight questions the conclusion is justified that the FIR - purely according to Clews' criteria - is a Communist front organisation. However, we said in Chapter I that the front organisations can now no longer all be bracketed together, since one organisation is more affected by the internal conflicts in World Communism than another.

To conclude this study we should like to draw attention once more to certain general aspects, in which the FIR differs both from the other front organisations and the non-Communist organisations, which have the same objectives as those which appear officially in the statutes of the FIR.

The FIR is an organisation

- which in contrast to other front organisations always keeps the same members, since it is composed of resistance fighters from the Second World War. This has the following consequences:
 - a. the organisation will gradually become smaller as members die off (see also chapter IX)
 - b. the views within the organisation are scarcely subject to change.
- which one-sidedly interprets the objectives set out in its statutes and subordinates them to party policy
- which puts forward viewpoints in the name of the entire former resistance and all victims of Nazism, whereby it is suggested that all former opponents of Hitler (also the deceased) would now also share these very one-sided views.

Note

1. Avanti (Italy), December 29, 1965

The Hague, July 1968

S T A T U T E S O F T H E F I R

Article I

The name of the Association shall be: "International Federation of Resistance Fighters (FIR)". The name may be translated into the language of each member organisation. The Association may extend its activities to cover the whole world.

Article II

The Federation shall unite the national unions, which comprise:

- a) the resistance fighters, the partisans and all patriots who have taken part in the liberation of their fatherland;
- b) the deportees, the internees, former political prisoners and all other victims of Nazism and Fascism; and
- c) their legal assigns.

Article III

The seat of the Federation shall be in Vienna and may be changed to another place by a decision of the Congress or of the General Council of the FIR.

Article IV

The a i m s of the Federation shall be:

1. To unite its members in peacetime, just as in wartime resistance movements, to secure the independence of their fatherland, liberty and world peace.
2. To strive actively for the defence and assurance of freedom and human dignity against any form of racial, political, philosophical and religious discrimination and against the revival of Fascism and Nazism in all their forms.
3. To honour the martyrs of the resistance and all who fell for their fatherland and to cherish their memory.
4. To defend the spirit and values of the resistance and to make known its historical role.
5. To recall to mind the horrors of the prisons and the concentration camps and to demand the punishment of all crimes against humanity.

6. To strive for the defence of the rights and claims of the resistance movement, for the material and moral interests of those having due rights and causes and their legal assigns and to create and to develop social services in their aid.

7. To co-operate in the attainment of the aims laid down in the United Nations Charter, to bring about friendly and peaceful relations amongst the peoples, and to strengthen links of fraternity and solidarity between the resistance fighters of all countries.

Article V

The Federation shall strive to achieve its objectives by legally permissible ideal and material ends.

These ideal means shall be:

Lectures, meetings, exhibitions, enquiries, congresses, appeals, resolutions, decisions and other notifications of any kind whatsoever, which are made by natural and legal persons, respectively organisations and associations, qualified to do so, as also the dissemination thereof, the institution and distribution of prizes, the establishment and direction of libraries, the issue of films, bulletins, periodicals, books, brochures and posters in any language whatever; the acquisition of films and organisation of film shows, making use of all modern means of informing public opinion, such as the printed word, slides, film, radio and television; the organisation of events of any kind whatever; the working out of advice of all kinds for the general public or for specific bodies; taking the initiative for and providing plans for international organisations of all kinds; direct co-operation with the UN and all its commissions and affiliated organisations, direct negotiations on all subjects of international law, in so far as this may be possible within the framework of constitutional and international law, offering and rendering good services to avoid or to settle international conflicts by means of negotiations, sending of delegates to organisations of all kinds etc.

Article VI

Full members shall be associations which conform to the conditions named in Article II, which adhere to the principles laid down in the statutes and which pay their contribution. The delegates of the full members shall be entitled to vote at the

Congress; they shall be eligible for election to the executive bodies of the FIR, in which they shall also be entitled to vote.

Article VII

Associate members shall be organisations which conform to the conditions named in Article II, which participate in the work of the FIR and which pay their contribution. The delegates of the associate members shall have a consultative voice at the Congress.

Article VIII

Affiliated members may be persons who participate in the activities of the FIR and pay a contribution. The affiliated members shall have a consultative voice at the FIR Congress.

Article IX

Delegates of associate and affiliated members may be invited to participate in the activities of the executive bodies of the FIR with a consultative voice.

Article X

All applications for membership by associations or persons shall be addressed to the Secretariat of the Bureau of the Federation. The Secretariat shall submit the application to the Bureau. The Bureau shall decide on acceptance or rejection. In case of rejection the application may be brought before the Congress, whose decision is final.

Article XI

Membership shall be terminated:

1. by resignation
2. by expulsion

Expulsion can take place by reason of failure to pay contributions or serious infringement of the constitution of the Federation. The Bureau shall decide on expulsion, subject to confirmation by the Congress. The expelled member shall lose all his rights with effect from the time that the Bureau takes the decision. The member may, nevertheless, demands to be heard by the

Congress.

Article XII

The governing and executive bodies of the FIR shall be:

- the Congress
- the General Council
- the Bureau
- the Secretariat of the Bureau (the executive body of the Bureau, the General Council and the Congress).

Article XIII

The Federation shall be represented in external matters by the President or a member of the Secretariat. In the case of written promulgations and proclamations, two signatures are required to be legally binding for the Federation, i.e. that of the President and the Secretary-General, or the President or the Secretary-General, each with one member of the Secretariat.

Article XIV

There shall be a financial control to supervise the accuracy of the accounts and the correctness of the expenditure. The report hereof shall be submitted to the various governing and executive bodies of the FIR.

Article XV

The supreme body of the FIR shall be the Congress. The Congress shall be convened by the Bureau and shall meet as an ordinary Congress once in three years. An extraordinary Congress may be convened by a decision of, or at the request of a third of the full members of the Federation.

Article XVI

Date, place and agenda of the Congress shall be determined by the Bureau and made known to all members at least three months before the meeting of the Congress, except in the case of an Extraordinary Congress. Every member organisation shall have the right to request the

inclusion of a certain point on the agenda. The organisation must make this known to the Bureau two months before the date of the Congress.

All associate and affiliated members shall have the right to request that the Bureau checks the suitability of any particular point for inclusion on the agenda.

Article XVII

The total number of delegates to the Congress and the total number of delegates per organisation, whether it be a full or associate member, shall be determined by the Bureau according to the number of members of the organisation. Each member organisation shall have the right to send at least one delegate. A voting delegate shall only be entitled to one vote.

Article XVIII

The Congress shall elect its Bureau. It shall receive reports from the Bureau of the Federation on the work of the FIR, from the Treasurer and from the Financial Control Commission. It shall consider and take decisions on the reports and on the points placed on the agenda; it shall determine the expenditure of the Federation.

Article XIX

The Congress shall elect in particular the President, the vice-Presidents and the members of the Bureau, whose number shall be determined by the Congress. The choice shall be derived from a report drawn up by a committee, which has been elected by the Congress, and which proposes candidates. The Congress shall determine the number of members of the General Council, who are nominated by the national associations, and shall confirm their nomination. The Congress shall further elect the members of the Financial Control Commission.

Article XX

All decisions of the Congress shall be taken by a simple majority vote, with the exception of the cases provided for in Article XXVIII. The decisions shall be valid if at least half

the number of full members is directly represented.

Article XXI

The General Council shall consist of:

- - the Bureau
- - the delegates of the national associations whose nomination is confirmed by the Congress according to the conditions mentioned above.

Each national association shall have the right to have at least one representative on the General Council and may change its representatives during the term of office, subject to approval by the Bureau. The General Council shall meet at least once between two Congresses at the request of the Bureau. It shall receive the report drawn up by the Bureau and lay down the Federation's scheme of work.

Each member of the General Council shall have one vote. All decisions of the General Council shall be taken by a simple majority vote. In the event of equality of votes the President shall have the casting vote.

Article XXII

The Bureau shall consist of :

- the President of the Federation
- vice-Presidents
- a Secretary-General
- a deputy Secretary-General
- Secretaries
- a Treasurer
- members

Between Congresses the FIR shall be governed by the Bureau. This Bureau shall meet at least once a year at the request of the Secretary-General, who takes the initiative on the instructions of the Secretariat.

The Bureau shall supervise the execution of the decisions of the Congress and of the General Council, shall determine the budget and, if necessary, the amount of the contributions. The Bureau shall convene the General Council and the Congress. It shall draw up the Bye-Laws, which are necessary for the realisation of the objectives of the FIR. The Bureau shall elect from amongst its members the Secretary-General, the

Secretaries and the Treasurer. If members of the Bureau should no longer be able to exercise their function, then they shall be temporarily replaced by the Bureau, on the understanding that this shall be confirmed by the General Council or Congress.

The Bureau shall take its decisions with at least half the Bureau members present by a simple majority vote; in the event of equality of votes, the Chairman shall have the casting vote.

Article XXIII

The Secretariat of the Bureau shall consist of the President, the Secretaries and the Treasurer. Any of the vice-Presidents may attend sessions of the Secretariat.

The Secretariat shall deal with the execution of the decisions and directions of the Congress, the General Council and the Bureau, to whom the Secretary-General shall be responsible and shall take all the necessary measures herefore.

The Secretariat shall deal with the financial affairs of the Federation in pursuance of the decisions taken by the governing bodies hereto empowered in the statutes.

Article XXIV

The Financial Control Commission shall be elected by the Congress. It shall consist of at least five members who are not members of the General Council and shall elect a chairman from amongst its members. It shall draw up a report within the terms of its responsibility, which shall be submitted to the Congress. It shall meet at least once a year and can at any time inspect the books. The members of the Financial Control Commission may take part in the meetings of the General Council with a consultative voice. The decisions of the Financial Control Commission shall be taken with at least three members of the Commission present and by a simple majority vote; in the event of equality of votes, the Chairman shall have the casting vote.

Article XXV

1. Any disagreements which may arise between members of the Federation and the Federation itself shall be handled

by a Committee of Arbitration.

2. The Committee of Arbitration shall consist of five members of the General Council. Both parties shall make known the names of two such members within a time limit set by the Bureau. These four members shall elect by simple majority vote one more member of the General Council to act as Chairman of the Arbitration Committee.
3. In the event of these four members being unable to agree on a chairman, the Bureau shall appoint one. If the Bureau is itself one of the parties, the General Council shall appoint a chairman.
4. The Arbitration Committee shall lay down its own regulations. Its decisions shall be taken by a simple majority vote and it shall not be bound by any particular rules of procedure, with the exception of the following:
When a question is under consideration, only the parties to the disagreement and their spokesmen shall be admitted; the deliberations shall be secret.
5. An appeal against the ruling of any Arbitration Committee may be made to the General Council.

Article XXVI

The financial resources for the realisation of the objectives of the Federation shall be derived from members' contributions, gifts, collections, legacies, foundations, subsidies and such like, as well as from the proceeds of events approved by the FIR authorities and of enterprises in keeping with the work of the Federation.

Article XXVII

The Statutes may only be amended on a proposal put forward by the Bureau or at the request of at least one third of the full members of the Federation who have paid their dues on time.

The proposals shall be submitted to the Secretariat at least three months before the Congress meets. The statutes may only be amended by a two thirds majority vote of the Congress.

Article XXVIII

A Congress which has to decide whether the Federation should

be dissolved, shall be expressly convened for this purpose. At least two thirds of the full members must be represented at this Congress. If this number cannot be reached, then the Congress shall be convened again after the lapse of at least a month and is then entitled to take decisions regardless of the number of delegates present. However, a two thirds majority of the delegates present shall be an unconditional requirement for liquidation.

In the case of voluntary liquidation by a decision of the Congress, the Congress shall elect a liquidation commission and shall determine its rules of procedure.

Bye-Laws attached to the Statutes

(adopted by the Bureau of the FIR at a meeting in Prague on 28th September 1963)

Article 1.

On the grounds of Article XXII of the Statutes the FIR shall be governed in the period between two Congresses by the Bureau, which meets at least once a year. Since the Bureau members must, according to Article XVIII of the Statutes, be personally elected, no substitution is in principle permissible. In the event of a member of the Bureau being prevented for serious reasons from attending a meeting of the Bureau, a member of the General Council may participate in the meeting in his place, but only with a consultative voice and subject to the approval of the national association, to which the Bureau member belongs. If there are special points on the agenda, experts may be invited to participate in the meeting of the Bureau, with a consultative voice.

In order to be able to develop its activities in various fields, the Bureau of the FIR shall empower the Secretariat to set up commissions. The task and functions of these commissions shall be laid down by the Bureau.

Article 2.

The Secretariat shall meet at least twice a month on a set date under the chairmanship of the President of the FIR, the

Secretary-General or one of the Secretaries. The decisions shall be recorded in minutes, which shall be kept in the archives of the Secretariat and shall be available to members of the Bureau.

Article 3.

The Secretariat of the Bureau of the FIR shall work out plans, which are submitted to the Congress, the General Council and the Bureau. For the purpose of settling routine business the Secretariat shall at the same time be entitled in urgent cases to take any initiative within the scope of the decisions of the above-mentioned governing bodies with a view to their realisation.

In all other cases which come outside the scope of these decisions, the Secretariat shall ask the opinions of the members of the Bureau in writing. The Bureau's report of its activities, draft resolutions, proposals for alterations in the Statutes, as well as all other documents produced by the commissions, must be submitted to the affiliated organisations two months before the meeting of the Congress and the General Council of the FIR take place.

The national associations wishing to submit proposals for alterations, must send them to the Secretariat of the FIR Bureau at least a month before the meeting of the Congress or the General Council.

Article 4.

The Secretariat shall deal with the taking-on and dismissal of personnel within the scope of the budget laid down by the Bureau of the FIR.

Article 5.

The Secretary-General shall direct the work of the Secretariat; in his absence he shall be replaced by the assistant Secretary-General or by another member of the Secretariat.

Article 6.

The financial resources of the FIR and the control thereof shall be arranged in accordance with Articles XXIII and XXIV

of the Statutes.

The Treasurer shall also submit to the Bureau the accounts and a provisional estimate for the annual budget. Each month he shall submit to the Secretariat a summarised report on the financial situation and he shall direct the administrative work of the Federation. In special cases the Secretariat is empowered to authorise expenditure which exceeds the budget estimate up to a total amount of 20,000.- Aust. sch.-, but it must subsequently obtain the approval of the Bureau.

Article 7.

The amount of the remuneration of the permanent members of the Secretariat is determined by the Bureau.

Article 8.

The travelling expenses accruing from the execution of the work laid down by the FIR shall be determined by the Bureau.

Article 9.

The official languages of the Federation are: French, German, Russian. In cases of doubt, the French text shall be valid.

Article 10.

These Bye-Laws shall come into effect immediately after their approval by the Bureau.

MEMBER ORGANISATIONS OF THE FIR

(as at 1964)

- Albania : Committee of Former Albanian Resistance Fighters
Seat : Rue Abdi Toptani 3
TIRANA
- Austria : Bundesverband Osterreichischer Widerstandskämpfer und Opfer des Faschismus (KZ-Verband)
Seat : Castellezgasse 35
VIENNA II (1020)
- Belgium : Front de l'Indépendance (F.I.)
Seat : 38, Rue du Taciturne
BRUSSELS
Amicale de Buchenwald
Seat : Monsieur Ferdinand de Grève
8, Rue Joseph Stephens
BRUSSELS
Amicale nationale des anciens prisonniers politiques de Dachau
Seat : 65, Rue de Haerne
BRUSSELS
Amicale de Neuengamme
Seat : Madame Blicq-Bouffieux
98, Rue Mignot Delstache
BRUSSELS
- Berlin : Vereinigung der Verfolgten des Naziregimes - West-Berlin
Seat : Boddinstrasse 64
Berlin/Neuköln

Bulgaria : Committee of Antifascist Resistance Fighters

Seat : 2, Bd. Dondoukov
SOFIA

Czechoslovakia : Swaz Protifasistických Bojovniků (S.P.B.)

Union of Antifascist Fighters

Seat : Legerova 22
PRAGUE II

Denmark : UDVALGET AF TIDLIGERE FANGER OG
MODSTANDSFOLK

Seat : Boulevard 84
c/o Folketurist
COPENHAGEN/N

HORDEROD UDVALGET

Seat : Mr. Niels Thomsen
Stuckenbergsvej 16
LINGBY

"Rolf Krake"

Seat : Mr. Erik Bernard
Kaerstykkevej 6
HVIDOVRE

"A 5"

Seat : Albert Frandsen
Fredensvej 42
CHARLOTTENLUND

"P 6"

Seat : Mr. Poul E. Hansen
Strandboulevarden 31
COPENHAGEN/0

A.M.P.A. Union of Former Prisoners and
Resistance Fighters

Seat : Mr. Eivind Lykkestrand

Mecklenborggade 1/II
COPENHAGEN S

Association of Stutthof Inmates

Seat : Mr. Helge Kjerulf
Kidhøj 10
BAGSVARD

Landesforeningen af Sachsenhausenfanger

Seat : Mr. Ehgon Nielsen
Lyongade 34/4
COPENHAGEN S

Association of Neuengamme - Inmates

Seat : Karl Nommels
Kostenborgvej 23
HVIDOVRE

Federal Repu-
blic of Ger-
many

Vereinigungen der Verfolgten des Nazi-
regimes (VVN)

Seat : Rossertstrasse 4
FRANKFURT/MAIN

Vereinigte Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Naziver-
folgten e.V.

Seat : Simon von Utrechtstrasse 4, Hths.d.
HAMBURG

Arbeitsgemeinschaft Neuengamme der politisch,
rassisch und religiös Verfolgten des Naziregimes

Seat : Maria Louisenstrasse 65
HAMBURG 39

Finland

Comité de la résistance finlandais

Seat : Mr. Reine Eero (?)
Kotkankatu 9
HELSINKI

Association nationale des anciens combattants de la résistance (A.N.A.C.R.)

Seat : 16, rue des Jeuneurs
PARIS II

Fédération nationale des déportés et internés résistants et patriotes (F.N.D.I.R.P.)

Seat : 10, rue Leroux
PARIS XVI

Amicale des anciens internés de Chateaubriand-Voves

Seat : Cam. Scolari
Mairie de MALAKOFF/SEINE

Association nationale des familles de fusillés et massacrés de la résistance

Seat : 10, rue Leroux
PARIS XVI

Union des juifs pour la résistance et l'entr'aide (U.J.R.E.)

Seat : 14, rue de Paradis
PARIS X

Comité de liaison de la résistance de l'Isère

Seat : Monsieur le docteur R. Tissot
26, rue de Lycée
GRENOBLE/ISERE

Amicale des anciens déportés juifs de France

Seat : 120, rue Vieille du Temple
PARIS III

Amicale de Ravensbrück et des commandos dépendants

Seat : 10, rue Leroux
PARIS XVI

Association française Buchenwald-Dora et commandos

Seat : 10, rue Leroux
PARIS XVI

German Democratic Republic :

Komitee der Antifaschistischen Widerstandskämpfer (KAW)

Seat : Unter den Linden 32-34
BERLIN W 8

Greece :

Pannellinos Enosis "O FINIX"

Seat : Thimaton Germanikis Katochis
rue Chateaubriand N 4/4e étage
ATHENS

Union panhellenique des invalides et blessés de la résistance nationale pendant la période 1941 - 1944 (P.E.A.T.E.A.)

Seat : Patission n.14, Stoa Fexy 8e étage,
Bureau 4
ATHENS

Pan Hellenic Association of Fighters of the National Resistance Movement

Pan Hellenic Association of Officers and Non-Commissioned Officers

Pan Hellenic Union of Resistance Fighters

Hungary :

Association nationale pour la défense des intérêts des persécutés du nazisme en Hongrie

Seat : Beloyannis st. 16/III/10
BUDAPEST V

Fédération des Partisans hongrois

Seat : 16, Szabadsag-ter
BUDAPEST V

Israel : Union des combattants anti-nazi d'Israel
Seat : Monsieur le docteur A. Berman
11, Bar Kochba St.
TEL-AVIV

Italy : Associazione Nazionale Perseguitati Politici
Italiani Antifascisti (A.N.P.P.I.A.)
Seat : Via degli Scipioni 271
ROME

Luxemburg: Réveil de la résistance
Seat : Case postale 433
c/o Monsieur François Frisch
LUXEMBURG

The Netherlands : Verenigd Verzet 1940-1945
Seat : Okeghemstraat 8/1 / Chr. Smit,
AMSTERDAM Z Roerstraat 75,
AMSTERDAM Z

Norway : Comité norvégien de liaison avec la FIR
Seat : Postbox 5157
OSLO NV

Poland : Zwiazek Bojowników O Wolność i Demokrację
(Z.B.O.W.I.D.)
Association des combattants pour la liberté et la
démocratie (Z.B.O.W.I.D.)
Seat : ul. Ujazdowskie 6a
WARSAW

Rumania : Comité Fostilor Demiti si Deportati Antifascisti
din R.P.P. (C.F.D.A.)
Seat : Str. Onesti Nr. 11
Raionul "30 Decembrie",
BUCHAREST

Soviet Union: Soviet Committee of Former Fighters
Seat : Kropotkina 10
MOSCOW

Spain : No organisation. Just a few representatives in
exile.
The following organisations do not belong to the
FIR but collaborate with this Federation and
its national associations :

Italy : Associazione Nazionale Partigiani d'Italia
(A.N.P.I.)
Seat : Via degli Scipioni, 271
ROME

Association nationale des ex-déportés dans les
camps nazi (A.N.D.P.I.G.)
Seat : Via Bagutta, 12
MILAN

Yugoslavia : Federation of Associations of Fighters in the
National Liberation war of Yugoslavia
(S.U.B.N.O.R. or S.U.B.N.O.R.J.)
Seat : Trg. Bratstva i Jedinstva br. 9
BELGRADE

The *purpose* of INTERDOC is to promote a better and wider knowledge of East-West problems, through the exchange of documentation and information.

INTERDOC *specialises* in the collection of information, the preparation and dissemination of periodicals and special studies, and the organisation of conferences.