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The Soviet Union in the Struggle for International Security

This year, the peoples of the Soviet Union are celebrating international labour day, the First of May, at a time when the Great Patriotic War is drawing to a victorious close. The days of Hitler Germany, which plunged Europe into the maelstrom of this most bloody and devastating of wars, are numbered. Led by the great Stalin, the Red Army has shattered the German war machine. The Soviet forces advancing from the East have formed a junction in the middle of Germany with the troops of our Allies advancing from the West. The Red Army has hoisted the flag of victory over Berlin and is crushing the last resistance of the expiring fascist beast. On the eve of the complete triumph of our just cause, the world resounds to the grand and vigorous words of the First of May Order of the Day of Supreme Commander, Marshal of the Soviet Union Stalin. There is no doubt that the task set in that Order of finishing off the fascist beast will be accomplished in the very near future.

The Soviet people are emerging from the World War a victor people, tempered by the stern trials of nearly four years of a war unparalleled for its magnitude, and for the effort and material expenditure involved. The eyes of the world have been opened to the giant might of the Red Army, the invincible strength of the Soviet social system, the firmness of the Soviet state, and the gigantic potentialities of the socialist economic system. The Soviet people, who are accomplishing miracles at the front and in the rear, have revealed the unshakable strength of their patriotism. As Stalin stated in his Order of the Day: “In the course of the war our Motherland acquired a first-class, seasoned army, capable of defending the great socialist gains of our people and of protecting the state interests of the Soviet Union.”

Now that the war of the freedom-loving nations with Hitler Germany is nearing a victorious conclusion, the problems of the post-war world structure are acquiring increasing urgency. The peoples who have made such drastic sacrifices on the altar of victory do not want these sacrifices to have been in vain. They are vitally interested in the war ending in a way which will ensure peace for as long as possible. This is the purpose of the international security organization, the foundation of which is to be laid at the Conference of the United Nations which opened in San Francisco on April 25.

The interest and attention with which the Soviet public are watching the course of the San Francisco Conference are only natural. Everybody knows the role the Soviet Union played in the effort to curb the fascist aggressors before the war and to defeat them during the war. Everybody also knows that our country is a determined champion of international security after the war.

The thoughts and feelings of the Soviet people on the subject of a reliable organization for the security of the nations were expressed at the Conference of United Nations by V. M. Molotov, head of the Soviet delegation. This speech reflected the firm determination of the Soviet Union to work hand in hand with all governments which are genuinely striving for a satisfactory solution of the great problem of ensuring lasting peace among the nations. At the same time the Soviet people are fully aware that there are many obstacles in the way of the achievement of this aim, obstacles erected by the foes of a strong and effective international security organization.

It would be a fatal mistake to forget the lessons of history, the deplorable experience of the pre-war period, when the League of Nations, which possessed neither authority nor power, far from preventing the aggressors from preparing for war against the peace-loving nations, actually tended some-
times to lull the vigilance of the nations towards impending aggression. Not infrequently the reactionary forces, which were least of all interested in curbing fascist aggression, endeavoured to make the League of Nations an instrument of their sinister intrigues. Unlike the war of 1914-18, the preparations for this war were not enveloped in secrecy; they were carried on in sight of all. The fascist brigands sharpened the knife against the liberty and life of the peace-loving nations openly, in full view of the world; and openly, in full view of the world, the foundations of the security of nations were shaken and the sinister game of "non-intervention" and "appeasement" of the fascist aggressors was played.

We cannot obliterate from history the fact that, as V. M. Molotov stated in his speech at the San Francisco Conference, "the governments which once claimed the leading part in Europe manifested their inability, if not their reluctance, to prevent war, with the consequences of which it will not be so easy to cope." For the prelude to the "desert zones" of the Second World War was the ashes of Abyssinian villages, the ruins of Guernica and the hecatombs of victims of the Nazi invasion of Austria and Czechoslovakia. We cannot forget that in the period of preparation for the Second World War nobody would harren to the warning voice of the Soviet Union, whose efforts to create by the joint forces of the peace-loving nations a barrier against fascist aggression found no support among the leaders of the West-European Great Powers. When Hitler Germany launched her criminal war for the conquest of Europe and the whole world she met with the first staggering rebuff only after she invaded the Soviet Union. By its iron determination and heroic resistance to Hitler’s hordes, our country saved European civilization from the modern vandals. And it is only natural that the voice of the Soviet Union should be heard at the Conference of the United Nations reminding the governments of the responsibility they bear for the fate of the peace-loving nations after the war.

This responsibility is great in the extreme, and it cannot be glossed over by grandiloquent promises or by hypocritical pseudo-democratic phrasemongering. It would be premature to think that the shortsighted politicians who had become immersed in the routine of the League of Nations and who to this day think on Geneva lines have quit the stage. But the minds of the peoples are alive not only to the deplorable consequences of the absence of unity among the peace-loving Great Powers before the war, but also to the encouraging example of such unity during the war. Now that the coalition of democratic Great Powers is consummating the defeat of the common enemy, Hitler Germany, the lessons of the war stand out with exceptional clarity. They teach us that victory is due both to the fact that the governments of the great Allies were aware of the responsibility they bore before history for the fate of their respective nations and of the world in general, and to the vast resources of manpower and material which the great freedom-loving powers had at their disposal and which they mustered for the defeat of the enemy. The victorious partnership-in-arms of the Great Powers which head the coalition of the democratic countries closely united against German fascism indicates the road that must be pursued if the problem of international security after the war is to be solved. The title of the concluding section of the decisions of the historic Crimea Conference is: "Unity for Peace for War." The guarantee of the successful formation of an international security organization is therefore close co-operation between the leading Great Powers, which are capable of rallying around them all other peace-loving countries, medium and small. Quoting from V. M. Molotov’s speech again:

"If the leading democratic countries show their ability to act harmoniously in the post-war period as well, that will mean that the interests of the peace and security of nations have finally received a firm basis and protection. But that is not all. The point at issue whether the other peace-loving nations are willing to rally around these leading powers to create an effective international security organization, and this has to be settled at this Conference in the interests of future peace and the security of nations."

There can be no doubt that all the conditions exist for the creation of a strong international security organization possessing the necessary powers and potentialities for the maintenance of general peace. Nevertheless, it would be dangerous to close our eyes to the many difficulties which stand in the way of the accomplishment of this great aim. For the defeat of Hitler Germany has not induced the opponents of an effective interna-
The Conference Comrade Molotov stated that there were millions in the Soviet Union who were capable of defending their country by force of arms, but that at the same time the people of our country were wholeheartedly devoted to the cause of lasting peace. The Soviet people are faithful and loyal to the idea of peace and the security of nations and are prepared to support with all the means in their power the efforts of other nations to achieve this by creating a strong and authoritative international organization. While keenly studying the recommendations and opinions of all sincere friends of international security, the Soviet people are prepared to administer a vigorous rebuff to the machinations of the foes of lasting peace.

The Soviet people are determined and consistent supporters of a strong organization of international security. They face the future with invincible faith in the triumph of progress over all reactionary intrigues. As V. M. Molotov said: "Even if no such effective organization is created at present to protect post-war peace, this will be another indication of inability to cope with this great problem by means of the forces that are available. But that will not prove that the necessity for such an organization has not yet arisen, and that such an organization will not be established ultimately."

The firm and unshakable determination of the Soviet people to defend their liberty, honour and independence has raised the flag of victory over the citadel of fascist aggression—Berlin. The Soviet people are animated by an equally firm determination to ensure with all the means in their power lasting peace and international security after the war. Love of peace, based upon consciousness of its might and on respect for the rights and interests of sovereign peoples and states, and unfailing readiness for close cooperation with other nations in defence of general peace and security, are the firm foundation of the Soviet Union's foreign policy.
The Soviet-Polish Treaty

The SOVIET public hailed with deep satisfaction the conclusion of the Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Post-War Collaboration between the Soviet Union and Poland. Signed on April 21 by J. V. Stalin, President of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R., and E. Osóbka-Morawski, Premier and Foreign Minister of the Polish Provisional Government, this treaty is designed to create a basis of firm friendship between the sister peoples of the Soviet Union and Poland.

Poland is one of the Soviet Union's biggest neighbours in the West. The two countries have a long common frontier. The road to the chief vital centres of our country lies through Poland. Such are the geographical realities. As to the historical relations between the two countries, for centuries they bore an unfriendly character. This was undoubtedly detrimental to both our country and Poland, and just as undoubtedly beneficial to the common enemies of both countries, and primarily to the German aggressors. It need only be recalled that in the past thirty years Poland twice served as a corridor for the invasion of our country by the German marauders.

In the period between the two world wars Poland was assigned a major place in all anti-Soviet plans, in all attempts to isolate the Soviet Union, and in all schemes for a cordon sanitaire against the U.S.S.R. The anti-popular cliques which stood at the helm of state in pre-war Poland were willing partners in all anti-Soviet intrigues and evinced their complete readiness to loan the borders of their country to foreign imperialists. Poland's former rulers did not want good relations with the Soviet Union; they preferred a reckless policy of playing off Germany against the U.S.S.R. The results of this fatal policy of the Pilsudskis and Becks are well known. It led to the downfall of Poland and to five years of brutal German occupation.

The Polish people were liberated from the yoke of the Nazi aggressors by the victorious Soviet armies. In the crucible of the struggle for liberation against the German invaders, a new and democratic Poland was born. Her sons fought shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet soldiers for the liberty of their country. At the time of the signing of the Soviet-Polish treaty regiments of the Polish Army were marching side by side with the Red Army to storm the last citadel of Hitler Germany—Berlin. This common struggle against the German imperialists joined the peoples of the Soviet Union and Poland in brotherhood, a brotherhood cemented by blood. These new relations of friendship have now been officially sealed by the Soviet-Polish treaty.

This instrument, as Stalin said on the occasion of the signing of the treaty, is of great historical importance. It puts an end to the fatal policy of Poland's former rulers and supersedes it by a policy of alliance and friendship between Poland and the Soviet Union. It therefore marks a radical change in the relations between the two countries, it marks a turn towards firm alliance and friendship.

The Polish people were one of the first victims of Hitler's bloody aggression. They have undergone severe trials and have borne countless sacrifices in this war. The desire of the broad mass of the Polish people to put an end to the policy which brought Poland to the verge of destruction is understandable. Understandable, too, are the joy and satisfaction with which the conclusion of the Soviet-Polish treaty was hailed in Poland. This treaty ensures Poland the place she is entitled to in Eastern Europe. It is, as Stalin said, "a guarantee of the independence of the new, democratic Poland, a guarantee of her might, of her prosperity."

The Soviet Union is vitally interested in Poland being strong, independent, free and democratic. It has consistently and unwaveringly pursued a policy favouring the regeneration of the Polish state on democratic lines, and precluding the possibility of a reversion to the reckless policy of abetting German aggression.

It is well known that the Polish people have already achieved important success in restoring their statehood on a new, democratic basis. Functioning in liberated Poland is the Provisional Government, which has won enormous prestige among the Polish people. Being a democratic Government, and enjoying
firm support in its country, the Provisional Government of Poland is taking an active part in the struggle against the common enemy of the United Nations—Hitler Germany. There can be no doubt that the reorganization of this Government on a broader democratic basis provided for by the decisions of the Crimea Conference will still further enhance its prestige within and without the country and will mark a further step in the creation of the new, democratic Poland, which has firmly taken the path of friendship and alliance with the Soviet state.

The Soviet-Polish treaty is a weighty contribution to the cause of closer friendship among the Slav nations. Following on the Soviet-Czechoslovak and the Soviet-Yugoslav treaties, the treaty between the U.S.S.R. and Poland broadens the framework of alliance and friendship among the Slav peoples. The discord that prevailed among the Slavs in the past played into the hands of their worst enemies—the German aggressors who pursued the savage aim of exterminating the Slavs. Now the unity of the Slav nations, forged in the fire of their common fight for liberation from the German invaders, constitutes a powerful barrier against German aggression in the East. The Soviet-Polish treaty creates a united front of the two countries from the Baltic to the Carpathians, which will be a serious obstacle to the German Drang nach Osten. This united front will serve to avert the danger of a repetition of aggression on the part of Germany or of any other state which may unite with Germany directly or in any other form. In order that German aggression may be curbed, it is necessary that the barrier erected against it in the East be supplemented by a barrier in the West, in other words, by an alliance between our two countries and our Western Allies, as Comrade Stalin declared.

The Soviet-Polish treaty promotes the cause of lasting peace and international security after the war. For the treaty between the U.S.S.R. and Poland signifies, as Stalin said, “the consolidation of the united front of the United Nations against the common enemy in Europe.” The treaty gives expression to the desire of both countries to take part, in a spirit of sincere co-operation, in all international actions designed to ensure the peace and security of nations, and to make their full contribution to the achievement of these lofty aims. It is therefore clear that all sincere friends of international security cannot but welcome this treaty. The renegades in the Polish émigré “government” issued one of their regular “protests” in connection with this treaty and declared that they would not recognize it, but by this they only exposed themselves once again as political bankrupts who have lost all contact with the Polish people. The position of these bankrupts was quite aptly characterized by the London News Chronicle when it wrote the other day:

“Poles who oppose Poland’s alliance with Russia and deny that such a Poland could be independent pin their hopes on armed conflict between Russia and the Allies, Britain and America. They pray that such conflict may arise, and the sooner the better. Their hopes must be dashed and their prayer should not be heard, because they are evil.”

The sinister schemes of the pro-fascist intriguers will undoubtedly be defeated. Friendship and alliance between the U.S.S.R. and Poland will grow, to the benefit of the vital interests of the people of both countries and to the benefit of the cause of the freedom-loving nations, which are united in the fight against Hitler Germany and are now laying the foundations of the peace and security of all the freedom-loving peoples.
The Battle of Berlin

Major General M. GALAKTIONOV

The battle for Berlin focussed the attention of the world. That is quite natural. The headline to be found in the newspapers of all countries—"Red Army in Berlin"—sounded the death knell of Hitler Germany. In the early days of the battle the Times wrote that "although the issue of the conflict is already decided, the fall of Berlin must be accounted as an outstanding portent." The article speaks of the importance of Berlin as the strategical hub of Germany's major communications, and as the "symbol of Prussian militarism and the home of Nazi despotism."

The noteworthy thing is that the battle for Berlin took place at a time when Germany's strategical position was absolutely hopeless. Nevertheless, as the press of all countries rightly points out, this battle is of immense importance for the course, or rather, for the issue of the war. "The end crowns the work" is an old proverb which entirely fits the occasion. And no wonder that when they talk of Berlin the thoughts of many observers in the Allied countries revert to Moscow, Leningrad and Stalingrad. The battle for Berlin was the culminating stroke in the great offensive begun by the Red Army two and a half years ago. Our guardsmen advanced to storm the citadel of Hitler Germany carrying standards which had traversed an historic path of battles and victories from the Volga to the Spree and the Elbe.

The hopelessness of Germany's strategical situation is due to a number of reasons. The first and main factor which brought her to this pass was the decisive defeats administered to the German armed forces by the Red Army in the course of its grand offensive between the Vistula and the Oder. As a result of the crushing blows struck by the Soviet troops the Hitler command was obliged to transfer considerable forces to the East, thereby denuding a number of sectors on other fronts. The second reason for Hitler Germany's hopeless situation is the historic Soviet campaign through the Carpathians and the Balkans and in the Danube Basin, which brought the Red Army to Vienna and Brno. It is now quite clear that this campaign played a major role in the defeat of Hitler Germany. It shattered the Hitlerites' plans of organizing protracted resistance in the "Southern Redoubt." In the third place, the hopelessness of Germany's strategical situation is due to the fact that she is gripped in a vice between two fronts. The landing of our Allies in Normandy and the liberation of France and Belgium robbed the Hitlerites of any chance of protracting the war with their rear secured in Western Europe; and the transfer of German troops to the East helped the armies of our Allies to carry out a successful offensive between the Rhine and the Elbe. All these three factors must, of course, be taken in conjunction.

From the point of view of military science the position of Hitler Germany is absolutely hopeless. Yet she continues to resist. To call in the aid of logic to explain the actions of the Nazi adventurers would be just as futile as trying to argue a mad dog into reason. The fascist beast must be definitely destroyed, while soberly reckoning the number of teeth which still remain in its bloody jaws. In an article examining the strategy of the Hitlerites' so-called local resistance the Daily Telegraph remarks that the Germans will do their utmost to prevent the rehabilitation of Europe. The article declares that the Hitlerites have learned from many examples in history that a vanquished country can rise again by adroitly and skilfully exploiting the differences and antagonisms among the victors.

The Nazi wolves are not only out to save their skins; they are clinging to everything they can so as to be able in future to continue their sinister work of destroying European civilization and annihilating the liberties and independence of the nations. The Hitlerites' strategy was never confined to the battlefields; it had another side to it—a system of military-political machinations and intrigue. The German fascist "strategists" are now widely resorting to the weapon of chicanery, and there is nothing surprising in this.

Realizing that their position is hopeless, the Hitlerites are again doing all in their power to sow discord among the Allies. Actually, they are continuing their resistance only against the Red Army. There is no need to cite the countless reports of foreign war cor-
respondents which show that the Allied armies advancing from the West are encountering no resistance from the Germans. Only one characteristic episode need be quoted. The Associated Press correspondent with the American First Army reported that American patrols beyond the River Mulde ran into a hundred fully armed German soldiers who surrendered without firing a shot. One of the German soldiers said:

“Our order of the day this morning ordered us not to fire on the American troops, but only to fire eastward at the Russians.”

On the central part of the front our Allies advanced from the Rhine to the Elbe practically without opposition. Here the American Ninth Army halted, which in the opinion of a number of reviewers was due to the necessity of putting communications into shape and bringing up reserves and the services of the rear.

Adopting different methods in the West and East, the Hitlerites hoped by this insidious policy to provoke misunderstanding among the Allies. They ignored their defences in the West and intended to build an impassable barrier against the Red Army on the Oder and the Neisse. For this purpose powerful defence zones were created, constituting a single system with the Berlin fortified area. The Nazi command concentrated the great bulk of their remaining battleworthy troops in the centre of Germany, between Stettin and the Rudnik Mountains (on the borders of Czechoslovakia). Here, according to foreign observers, there were upwards of one hundred divisions.

The Red Army’s offensive, begun in the middle of April, completely upset the Hitlerites’ plans at this concluding phase of the war too. As during the whole course of the four years of this war of unprecedented magnitude and ferocity, it is the Red Army that is demolishing the main forces of the German army. It may be safely asserted that Germany has no large bodies of troops outside the area of hostilities between the Elbe and the Oder.

The engagement was distinguished by a brilliant manoeuvre executed by two Soviet armies—the First Byelorussian, which launched its offensive from the bridgeheads on the Oder, and the First Ukrainian, which forced the River Neisse. The troops of the First Ukrainian Army swung to the northwest and joined with the First Byelorussian Army on the River Spree east of Berlin. Somewhat later, troops of the First Ukrainian Army, who were enveloping Berlin from the southeast, joined in the Potsdam area with troops of the First Byelorussian Army who had outflanked Berlin from the northeast. The ring around Berlin was closed. Simultaneously, elements of the First Byelorussian Army broke into Berlin from the north and the east, while elements of the First Ukrainian Army invaded it from the south. In fierce street fighting the Red Army cleared one city district after another and gained possession of the German capital. Further to the north the Second Byelorussian Army captured Stettin and is continuing its westward advance. The Red Army has thus come to decisive grips with the main battleworthy forces of the German army. The enemy is offering fierce resistance, but his complete and final defeat is now plainly in sight.

The effects of the demolition of large forces of the German army in the centre of the battle area were immediately felt in the southern sector. Here the First Ukrainian Army continued its westward advance to the Elbe. Simultaneously, the American First Army, having captured Dessau, continued its advance eastward to the Elbe. Striking from the west, the Soviet troops and the British and American Allies split the German front and, on April 25, effected a junction in the centre of Germany, in the vicinity of Torgau.

Thus occurred the historic event which had been so impatiently awaited by the freedom-loving nations united for the defeat of Hitler Germany. The occasion was marked by messages from Marshal of the Soviet Union Stalin, British Premier Churchill and United States President Truman. These messages were one more demonstration of the strength and firmness of the partnership-in-arms of the Three Great Powers, by whose efforts victory in this long and trying war against a strong and cunning enemy is being achieved.

The enemy’s forces in North Germany are now cut off from those in the South. As Marshal Stalin said: “There can be no doubt that this circumstance signifies the end of Hitler Germany.”

In North Germany the Red Army is completing the destruction of the main group of German armies, which have been cut up into isolated parts and are being wiped out piece-meal by the Soviet troops. In the West the
Allies have captured Bremen and attained the lower reaches of the Elbe. Holland is cut off and is being liberated by the Allies. The Hitlerites' plans of protracting resistance in Denmark and Norway are obviously doomed to failure.

We have already referred to the intention of the Hitlerites to create a “Southern Redoubt” in the mountainous regions of Bavaria, Austria and Western Czechoslovakia. These plans were completely foiled by the Red Army, which has entered Austria and liberated a large part of Czechoslovakia. Further to the south the gallant Yugoslav army is completing the ejection of the Germans from the territory of its country. The American troops advancing in Bavaria have crossed the Danube and are now south of Munich. In places they have entered Austria and Czechoslovakia. The chief thing is that the Germans have no large forces in the South. Their main forces were concentrated in the centre, and here they are being demolished by the Red Army. This will greatly accelerate the collapse of German resistance in the South.

This is precisely “the final assault on the Hitler lair” referred to in Comrade Stalin’s First of May Order of the Day. The Battle of Berlin is over. The Soviet troops have, hoisted the flag of victory over the capital of Hitler Germany—the centre of German imperialism and the hotbed of German aggression. In the final stage of the war the Red Army has achieved a historic victory over the enemy.

Reuter’s military observer, Kimche, the other day expressed the following opinion:

“The final phase of a war, the period when fighting continues, although the ultimate issue has been decided beyond all doubt, belongs already to the post-war period.”

Kimche here has in mind the plans of the Hitlerites, which envisage the period follow-

The partnership-in-arms of the democratic states is the chief instrument for taking the sting out of the “strategy” of chicanery and intrigue to which the German imperialists are resorting and will resort after their defeat on the fronts of this war. This “strategy” is designed to foment unrest in post-war Europe, to create conditions which will enable the German imperialists to set about preparing for a third world war. These schemes must be strangled in their inception. Complete victory over Hitler Germany must not only crown the war, but also lay a firm foundation for peace and international security.
TODAY, in the sixth year of the war, the common conception of Great Britain as a land of established traditions and of tranquil, ordered life must be considerably modified. The war years have left their impress on the economy, the social life and the mentality of the English. They have had to pass through a severe ordeal, although they have fared much better than the peoples on the European continent.

The situation was exceptionally acute for Great Britain in the middle of 1940, when the danger of invasion was very real indeed. At that time the British Army consisted in the main of the 300,000 men and officers of the Expeditionary Force which succeeded in getting away from Dunkirk. These troops, which had lost nearly all their equipment, needed reorganization. Home Guard units were formed of civilians capable of bearing arms who underwent military training after working hours. It is doubtful, however, whether, notwithstanding their staunchness and determination, these improvised detachments could have offered serious resistance to a large regular army. Such was the unanimous opinion of Englishmen with whom I had occasion to speak.

Nevertheless, Great Britain had a powerful Navy and a considerable Air Force which were held for defence purposes. Consequently, the invasion of the British Isles was an extremely risky undertaking for the Germans. Hitler did not dare to attempt such an invasion. In the autumn of 1940 he tried to break the spirit of the English by bombardment from the air. According to official statistics, out of the 13,000,000 houses in England before the war, 4,500,000 were damaged by German aircraft; of these 202,000 were entirely wrecked and 255,000 were rendered uninhabitable. The effects of this bombing are visible in nearly all the big towns of Great Britain which I have visited—London, Glasgow, Liverpool, Cardiff and others. In London, the City, the business quarter of the town, suffered most. Residential districts suffered considerably, especially the East End, the dock district, the areas around the railway stations and electric power stations. Among the buildings that were damaged are the Houses of Parliament, Buckingham Palace, County Hall, St. Thomas' Hospital and the hall of the Royal Philharmonic Society. Over 1,100,000 houses suffered from the effects of German flying bombs.

Hitler's attempts to break the morale of the British people by air operations proved unsuccessful. Hitler Germany's attack on the Soviet Union and the stubborn resistance put up by the Red Army, which contained the enemy's main forces on the Soviet-German front, gave Britain a breathing space. She obtained the opportunity of unfolding her enormous war-industry and military potential, of mobilizing her resources of manpower and material.

A few figures will suffice to illustrate this. At the end of 1944 the number of persons called up for military service was 4,500,000 men and 500,000 women—the latter serving only in auxiliary units. The number belonging to Home Guard units, counting only those who served full time, was about 300,000. The number of workers employed in war industries rose to 5,100,000. The total number of persons in the armed forces, commerce, industry and agriculture, and in the Civil and Municipal Services, in 1944 was 22,000,000 compared with 18,500,000 before the war. The source of this increase was 1,250,000 unemployed, and 2,250,000 persons who had not been previously gainfully employed. The number of employed men constitutes over 93 per cent of the male population of 14 to 64 years of age, and the number of women employed constitutes 44 per cent of the female population of 14 to 59 years of age.

It is characteristic that female labour is still underrated in Great Britain. When visiting locomotive and car repair plants I noticed that women performed mainly unskilled, or auxiliary work. It is considered expedient to employ women only on work in which the processes are uniform and simple. On the railways, women are not allowed to work as engine drivers, despatchers or yard foremen.
In addition to this, women, as a rule, are paid less than men for equal work.

In those branches of industry which produce war supplies an 11-hour day has been introduced, and this has ensured a considerable increase in output. With piece work there has been a corresponding increase in earnings, but this increase lags behind the rise in prices, and in many cases a deterioration of living conditions is very noticeable.

In developing her war potential Great Britain utilized the enormous material resources she had accumulated during the course of many decades. A large part of the available industrial enterprises were switched over to producing supplies for the Army and Navy. Many new enterprises were also built. On approaching London one sees large and well-let new factories. Many of these specialize in the manufacture of certain parts of aircraft, tanks and guns. Such specialization calls for carefully planned co-ordination, which is conducted on a wide scale.

The transfer of industry to war production and the erection and starting of new plants imposed a great strain on the transport system. Suffice it to say that enterprises under government control alone require about 1,000 trains per day to carry their employees to and from work. In addition, large numbers of workers travel by automobile.

Enormous industrial reserves have been utilized for the purpose of defence. The following are a few examples relating to the railways. Nearly two-thirds of the railway system in Great Britain has two or more tracks, although traffic was relatively light before the war, amounting to less than 1,000,000 ton-kilometres per annum. A network approximately one-third the size of ours carried before the war one-tenth of the traffic carried by our railways. Freight cars, although not very large—of about 12 tons' capacity on the average—numbered 1,250,000. Bearing in mind the volume of traffic, it will be clear that Great Britain possessed a vast reserve of rolling stock. The trunk lines are laid with heavy rails and metal ballast. This ensures high speed and relatively low expenditure on labour for the maintenance of the permanent way. With technical equipment on such a vast scale, even a relatively slight improvement in the utilization of technical resources can result in a large increase in traffic.

In a town in the South of England I saw a large locomotive repair works which had been set up in some old railway workshops which had been abandoned after the First World War. The administration's first concern was to obtain the necessary equipment. They succeeded in repairing some of the old machines and utilized these. Other machines that were needed they obtained partly from war plants, which gave up part of their superfluous or obsolete machinery. Thus, only a very small quantity of new machinery had to be purchased. With equipment collected piecemeal in this way, they managed to organize in this derelict building the medium and capital repair of locomotives. Actually, they built up a new plant capable of taking the place of a regular railway works which had gone over to the production of armaments. It goes without saying that this could not have been done without large reserves in the shape of buildings and equipment.

The conversion of industry for war production called for the re-distribution of labour power and raw materials among the different branches and stimulated the output of raw materials. The output of iron ore rose from an average of 12,400,000 tons per annum in 1935-38 to 18,500,000 tons in 1943. Steel output rose from 11,300,000 tons to 13,000,000 tons; the output of hard timber rose from 150,000 tons to 1,250,000 tons, aluminium from 18,000 tons to 56,000 tons, etc. Nevertheless, the output of ferrous metals lagged behind the output of the munitions industries. In the very first years of the war the collection of metal scrap was organized throughout the country. At the present time no iron railings or metal signboards are to be seen in London; they have all been smelted down.

Considerable changes have taken place in the country's agriculture. Before the war Great Britain produced only a small proportion of the food she needed. In the main, the requirements of the population were covered by imports. The measures taken to develop agriculture during the war years have been extremely effective. The crop area has increased more than half as much again. Many women, mobilized under the compulsory labour service laws, have been sent into the country on farm work. Prisoners of war are also employed in agriculture as auxiliary labourers. As a result, the output of food products has increased about 70 per cent (in calories) over that of pre-war. This increase cannot, however, compensate for the reduction of imports, particularly of such produce as meat, eggs, cheese, fruit, etc.
During the war the rolling stock of all forms of city transport has diminished. The Underground Railway is not nearly as beautifully decorated as our Metro. The stations and crossings are untidy. The cars are narrower and lower than ours. The Underground is overcrowded and the trains are not as frequent as on our Metro.

The towns of Great Britain, and London in particular, are experiencing an acute housing shortage. This is a consequence of the considerable destruction of houses by air bombing. The housing question is a constant theme of discussion in the newspapers and of heated debate in Parliament and in Municipal Councils. A large fund has been accumulated in England out of air-raid property insurance premiums. This money is at the disposal of government departments which are drawing up plans for restoring houses and building new ones. It is proposed to build pre-fabricated one and two-storey houses to be assembled on the building sites. Experimental all-metal houses have been built out of metal scrap obtained mainly from the aircraft industry. Some calculate that sufficient quantities of this scrap are available to build several hundred thousand small houses. As yet, however, this scheme is in its propaganda stage. Propaganda in favour of these houses is being conducted in the press, at the cinemas, and at special exhibitions.

** * * **

Although the British Army has suffered fewer casualties in this war than in the last one, the effects of this war are much more seriously felt. Enemy air raids have caused numerous casualties among the population and considerable destruction. The inhabitants have had to put up with a number of difficulties and inconveniences. It is sufficient to recall the wholesale evacuation of London and of other threatened districts, compulsory labour service and restrictions in food supplies. The ordinary Englishman hates fascist Germany as being responsible for the present war and is of the opinion that all possibility of a revival of German aggression must be prevented. The English realize that peace and security can be ensured only by maintaining and fostering the closest cooperation with the Soviet Union and the United States. Representatives of government and business circles, railway men and scientists with whom I have conversed, all ex-
pressed admiration for the brilliant victories achieved by our Red Army and for our successes on the economic and cultural fronts which made them possible.

The Red Army and its Supreme Commander-in-Chief, Comrade Stalin, are extremely popular in Great Britain. Portraits of Stalin and of his closest military colleagues—the Marshals of the Soviet Union—may be met with in the newspapers and magazines, in bookshop windows, and on posters. Stalin's appearance on the cinema screen invariably evokes applause. After the Red Army commenced its winter offensive, short biographies and the portraits of our Soviet Marshals appeared in the newspapers, and the number of articles they published on the Red Army and the Soviet Union as a whole increased. The sale of textbooks on Russian, of English-Russian dictionaries and other aids to learning Russian is larger than ever before.

Nevertheless, information about Russia is still far from adequate. The average Englishman friendly towards Russia sometimes has the queerest notions about certain aspects of our life. I have been asked whether it is true that everybody gets the same pay in the Soviet Union, whether we are allowed to own any property, whether all Soviet people wear uniforms, and so forth.

A number of post-war problems of increasing acuteness are now rising before Great Britain. One of the biggest and most complicated of these problems is that of employment. Employment will have to be found for millions of men who will return from the Army, and the problem will arise of keeping in employment the new people, women in particular, who came into industry during the war.

I had occasion to discuss the solutions that are proposed for these post-war problems with people in different walks of life. One of them, Philip Noel-Baker, a prominent Labourite and Joint Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of War Transport, expressed the view that this problem was not such a complex one after all. When the war is over, he said, there will be an enormous amount of work to do to restore the worn-out basic capital in industry and in transport, to restore the vast number of buildings that have been damaged, to build new houses and to produce consumers' goods, so necessary to replace the articles that have been worn out during the war.

All this is true, of course, but the matter is not so simple. The idea that the capitalist system can be made to satisfy the requirements of society always leads to grave disappointment. After the war it will be necessary to find within the country means for new capital investments in industry and at the same time to find an effective demand for its products. As is well known, the solution of these problems was by no means easy after the last war.

Post-war problems will be the keynote of the parliamentary elections that are to take place this year. The parties constituting the present government coalition—Conservatives, Labourites and Liberals—will contest the election separately. Whatever the result of the elections may be, there can be no doubt that the country will be faced with extremely complex and difficult problems when the war is over.
Labour Reparations

Review of the Foreign Press

A. TRAININ

THE WAR is drawing to a close. The liberation of Europe from the Hitler robbers is being consummated. The German aggressors are leaving behind them a monstrous heritage: vast areas with innumerable towns and villages converted into a desert zone, reduced to charred ruins. The fruits of the labour of many generations, the material wealth of nations that had been accumulated in the course of centuries have been laid waste.

Now the day of reckoning is approaching. The Crimea Conference of the leaders of the Three Great Allied Powers decided on this question to compel Germany to make compensation for the damage she has caused "in kind to the greatest extent possible."

From the legal aspect, this matter is beyond dispute. No advocate of the "appeaser" breed can throw even a shadow of doubt on the right, universally recognized in international relations, of the victorious side to compensation for damage caused by enemy action. When, however, freedom-loving nations which have been victims of predatory aggression come forward as the victors, this right acquires a new character and new force: the right to demand reparations becomes a duty; for leniency towards the aggressor may give rise to new wars. The choice of the form of reparations—in money or in kind—is a question of military and economic expediency.

Speaking on February 10, 1919, at a meeting of the Reparations Commission of the Versailles Peace Conference, Mr. Hughes, the Prime Minister of Australia, said:

"The right to reparation rests upon the principle of justice, pure and simple, in this sense that, where damage or harm has been done, the doer should make it good to the extreme limit of his resources. This principle is universally recognized by all laws. . . ."

By unleashing war and transforming it into a system of militarized banditism, Germany caused enormous damage to the freedom-loving nations who became the victims of her aggression. Naturally, Germany must draw upon all her resources for the purpose of compensating to the greatest extent possible for the damage she has caused.

In the Versailles Treaty "the Allied and Associated Governments recognize that the resources of Germany are not adequate... to make complete reparation for all such loss and damage" as she caused in the war of 1914-18 (Article 232 of the Versailles Treaty). Consequently, in addition to considerable money reparations, the Versailles Treaty provided for reparations in kind. Germany undertook to transfer to the Allies on account of reparations ships "for ton and class for class, of all merchant ships and fishing boats lost or damaged owing to the war," Annex III, par. 1), coal, chemical products, and livestock.

The damage caused by Hitler Germany in the war of 1939-45 is immeasurably greater than the damage the Germans caused in the war of 1914-18. Germany must compensate for this damage to a considerable extent in kind. Reparations must also take the form of labour power which Germany must place at the Allies' disposal for the purpose of restoring the property which the Germans have destroyed. In this connection the following must be taken into consideration.

The German troops committed this damage methodically and systematically; they were not prompted by considerations of military necessity. This destruction was caused as methodically and systematically as was the cold-blooded extermination of millions of civilians and prisoners of war in the Hitler death camps. Hence, labour reparations are not only an expedient but also an absolutely just form of compensation for damage: those who destroy must restore what they destroyed.

Lastly, it must not be forgotten that, of the tasks which the victor peoples have to accomplish, enormous importance attaches to that of liquidating Germany's military potential. The employment of Germans on restoration work in the countries they have devastated will naturally facilitate the effective economic disarmament of Germany.

The decision of the Crimea Conference concerning reparations in kind has evoked wide favourable comment in the foreign press.

Lord Winterton, a Conservative Member of the British Parliament, stated in an article published in the Sunday Express that certain quarters
"openly complain of proposals to make German civilians work in Russian territory in order to repair the immense damage which their armies caused. These complaints are untenable on either moral or practical grounds. Such labour will provide a reasonable form of reparation."

Labour reparations are also supported by prominent public men and organs of the press in America. Thus, Moley, an associate editor of News Week, stated:

"The argument for German enforced reparations labour outside of Germany is based on sound practical and moral factors."

He went on to say:

"The destruction [caused by the German army] considerably exceeded military requirements. The Nazis have devastated one-third of Soviet European territory and, moreover, for many years enslaved about six million Soviet citizens, and millions of Poles, French, Belgians, Dutch, and others."

Mellett, the reviewer of the New York Post, expressed the opinion that "labour reparations" provide a "simple and sensible solution..." There is "little difference between the utilization of German war prisoners in United States agricultural work in regions of labour shortage and employing Nazi ex-soldiers on post-war reconstruction in the Soviet Union. The Germans, after deliberately estimating the risk, marched into Russia and laid waste to cities and farms. What can be more appropriate than to march them back to rebuild what they destroyed?"

Baird, the reviewer of the Washington Star, supporting the idea of labour reparations, observed:

"Socialist economy permits the Soviet Union, unlike other nations, to utilize foreign labour without disemploying its own citizens."

Recently the United States Institute of Public Opinion conducted an enquiry on the question of employing Germans on restoration work in the Soviet Union. The question was formulated as follows: "After the war should three or four million German men be required to spend two or three years to help to rebuild the Russian cities which they destroyed?" Nearly three-fourths (71 per cent) of the Americans questioned replied in the affirmative, nine per cent refrained from answering, and only twenty per cent answered in the negative.

The American journalist Quentin Reynolds, in an article published in Collier's, shared with his readers the impression he had obtained on the spot of how the question of labour reparations is regarded in the Soviet Union.

"I remember," writes Reynolds, "standing with some Red Army officers in the complete ruins of Nyazma, some 130 miles from Moscow, The Germans had destroyed the city when they retreated from it. 'You can never rebuild this city,' I said, looking at the horrible rubble that a few days before had been a city of 80,000.

"'It will be rebuilt,' a Red Army general said grimly. 'So will every other city they have destroyed be rebuilt. Believe me, my friend, there will be no unemployment in Germany for many, many years after the war. We will keep them all busy rebuilding those cities of ours which they have destroyed.'"

It goes without saying that the voice of this Red Army general was the voice of law and justice.

Although public opinion in the Allied countries widely supports the idea of employing Germans to restore the property they have destroyed there are certain circles which oppose this idea. The opponents of labour reparations primarily express apprehension that such reparations will lead to the economic exhaustion, to the "impoveryishment" of Germany, and that this, in turn, will injure world trade and world economy. This argument has been repeatedly advanced by the London Economist, for example.

The other day the same apprehensions were expressed by the London New Statesman and Nation in the following words:

"If Germany's industrial productivity is not restored within prescribed limits the ravages of war in Europe will not be made good during the life of this generation."

It must be borne in mind that these apprehensions are not new. Similar arguments were zealously disseminated by certain quarters after the First World War. As is well known, the upshot then was that the Germans were generously provided with loans with the aid of which "exhausted" Germany built up a gigantic war industry and prepared for the Second World War. This lesson must not be forgotten.

The argument that labour reparations will injure world trade is unsound. The destruction of Germany's war-economy, potential does not in the least imply the liquidation of her economy and, therefore, her dropping out of world trade. It was precisely her enormous armaments and her policy of economic autarky, pursued for the purpose of preparing her economy for war, which diminished Germany's share in world trade.
The abandonment of this policy, and of the militarist trend of economic development which is its concomitant, will make Germany far more dependent upon the world market than she was before, notwithstanding the fact that the general level of production in Germany will of course drop as a result of the payment of reparations in kind and in labour. On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that this will be compensated and more than compensated for by the growth of the production capacities of the countries which have suffered from German aggression, and which will receive reparations from Germany. Under these circumstances, the argument that impoverished Germany will disappear from the world market as a result of labour reparations is merely a bogey raised by certain quarters closely interested in the German market.

Other opponents of labour reparations advance no coherent objections to this idea, but confine themselves to uttering frightful words, such as “forced labour,” “enslavement,” and so forth. These people oppose labour reparations only because these will be imposed on Germany. Thus, von Wiegand, the notorious Hearst correspondent in Madrid, asserts that the proposal to employ German workers on restoration work implies that “the United States and Great Britain sanction a return to slavery in Europe.” He was echoed by Shuster, President of Hunter College, New York, in a speech he delivered at the United States Foreign Policy Association, in the course of which he said that labour reparations were tantamount to “enslavement.” The sticking on of labels such as “slavery” and “enslavement” is, of course, one of the easiest of mental exercises; it requires neither knowledge nor brains. But as proof its value is nil.

Indeed, one could as easily and as convincingly describe money reparations as “robbery,” the demilitarization of Germany’s industry as her “ruination,” and so forth. This, however, is precisely the argument of the German fascist cannibals who believe that they have a right to commit any crime they please, but that calling them to book for the crimes they commit is tyranny and injustice. This argument of the Hitler gangsters is now being knocked on the head, of course. The utter rout and unconditional surrender of Germany will show that law and justice, for which the Allied troops have been fighting, are not fleshless slogans and pious wishes, but political and military realities, which have the power to ensure not only the triumph of justice, but also the security of the peoples against a recrudescence of German aggression. The “Herrenvolk” will be deprived of their General Staff; they will have to disband their army, disarm their industry, compensate for the damage they have caused, and restore what they have so savagely destroyed.

The Deutsche Zeitung in Norwegen, the German fascist newspaper published in Norway, drops into plaintive lyricism in discussing labour reparations. It writes as follows:

“The German soldier has not been separated from his wife and children and kept away from his trade for six years in order, as a result of unconditional surrender, to receive from the Allies the right to be separated from his wife and children and not to work at his trade for another ten years, or for the rest of his life.”

Of course, the German robbers did not fight for this. On the other hand, the freedom-loving nations have not made their incalculable sacrifices in order to allow the unprecedented crimes of the Hitlerites to go unpunished. Germany, of course, is displeased with the outcome of the war and with having to bear the consequences of her vandalism. That is understandable. That the defenders of the German aggressor in certain foreign quarters should feel disturbed is also understandable. But nothing can now save either the one or the other. The ruins of Europe will be restored to the utmost possible extent at Germany’s expense and to a large extent, by German hands.
INTERNATIONAL LIFE

NOTES

TWO SPECIES OF WEREWOLVES

According to reports in the foreign press a leaflet is being circulated in Switzerland signed “Members of the German Colony,” in which it is stated that the German diplomatic officials and representatives of the Nazi press resident in Switzerland have proclaimed themselves anti-Hitlerites.

Among these werewolves are Krauel, the German Consul General in Geneva, Trump, the press attaché of the German embassy in Bern, Prince Auersperg, Gisewius and Waetgen, embassy officials, and Reibstein, the chief correspondent of the German Information Bureau. These newly hatched “anti-Hitlerites” say in their leaflet that “it is necessary to create a new Germany,” although they maintain an eloquent silence about what should be the fate of German fascism.

Facts of this kind are observed in other “neutral” countries too.

The French journal France intérieure quite rightly observes that this “changing of signboards” is being done on the direct instructions of the fascist chiefs who want to save their cadres, no matter by what means.

The role played by the Swiss authorities in this masquerade is worthy of attention. Throughout the war Switzerland has been helping the German fascists in every way on the principle of “non olet”—money does not smell. Now that German fascism has met with disaster she is helping Hitler to save both his money and his men.

Here we have two species of werewolves: the fascist species, which is disguising itself as “anti-Hitlerites,” and the pseudo-democratic species, which is taking the former under its protection and is helping it to hide in hospitable Helvetia. Thus the land of William Tell is being converted into a haven for hastily disguised Hitlerite criminals.

* * *

INSOLENCE ENCOURAGED BY IMPUNITY

Two new screeds have appeared in the Paris book market, the publication of which in liberated France can only give rise to astonishment. In the first place, the author of these pamphlets himself is deserving of our attention. He is Fabre-Luce, the French Hitlerite who mixed with the so-called Paris Centre of the traitors who were grouped around the German “ambassador” and chief spy, Abetz. During the occupation Fabre-Luce made money in two ways: he engaged in the lucrative occupation of writing eulogies to collaboration and, in addition, speculated in currency.

After the Germans were ejected Fabre-Luce was arrested and taken to the Drancy prison but instead of being haled before a court and tried for treason and communication with the enemy, he was soon set free. Encouraged by this, he threw off all restraint and published two pamphlets: A Prisoner and Free, which represent the credo of French reactionary quarters.

Fabre-Luce’s productions are full of eulogies of the collaborationists and scurrilous attacks upon the resistance movement. Not in the least afraid of overdoing it, he openly and lavishly scatters praise of the traitor Marshal Pétain and the butcher Pucheu, who was shot by order of the court.

“It will be said,” insolently declares Fabre-Luce, “that I collaborated with the Germans. Of course I did. It was necessary for business reasons.”

That such open boasting of treachery should be permitted in Paris in 1945 seems incredible!

The author goes on to say:

“Now, at last, we shall know who our Nazis are: they are the tried fighters in the resistance movement.”

This unblushing traitor does not limit himself to vilifying the members of the resistance movement. He turns his guns on the policy of the French Government, particularly on the question of relations with the Soviet Union, and expresses regret that there
is no rapprochement between France and a “chastened Germany,” a rapprochement which “remains theoretically ideal.”

Fabre-Luce’s pamphlets do not bear the censor’s imprint. Evidently the author published them himself. Nevertheless, the fact that such disgusting stuff can be circulated in France after all she has gone through, and that this open enemy agent continues to remain at large, is worthy of attention.

* 

Tainted Goods

Although outwardly a staid and respectable newspaper, the New York Times sometimes displays an astonishing lack of discrimination and publishes “news” which is anything but creditable.

The other day Callender, the Paris correspondent of this newspaper, presented its readers with sensational “news” about the Polish question, gleaned from certain “well-informed French circles” of whose identity he alone is aware.

Callender reported that information had been received in France to the effect that there was no administration whatever in Poland.

“There is no real government,” he wrote, “but only a foreign-chosen regime which represents hardly anyone in Poland... and the Russians are more feared today than ever.”

Callender, of course, does not disclose the source of his information. How can he? He would have to point to the filthy kitchen where the whole story was concocted from beginning to end. But we can be quite sure that this slick American correspondent drew payment for his tainted goods not only from the New York Times... 

* 

FORCED LABOUR IN AFRICAN COLONIES

Last week a debate took place in the House of Commons on the employment of forced labour in Kenya, Tanganyika and Northern Rhodesia, the British colonies in Africa.

Reuter reports that in answer to a question put by Mr. Sorensen, Emrys-Evans, the Under-Secretary of State for the Dominions, made the following statement:

“The latest figures available show that at the end of November 1944 the number of conscripts in Kenya was 26,032 and in Tanganyika at the end of December 26,256.

“In Northern Rhodesia, the Governor has authority to permit the recruitment of up to 1,000 men for work on essential food production. In this colony there is also a government labour corps with a maximum strength of 630.”

Emrys-Evans added that the utilization of forced labour is under constant control, and will cease “as soon as circumstances permit.”
Two Months in the Balkans

S. OBRAZTOV

RECENTLY I made a tour of the Balkan countries with a company of Soviet stage performers. Every journey to new places is extremely interesting; all the more interesting was it to visit the Balkans at the present time, when the war is still raging and the Balkan countries are on the road to regeneration, to a new life.

We took off from the Moscow aerodrome for Belgrade via Kiev, Odessa and Bucharest.

At the Bucharest aerodrome three other passengers were waiting for the next aeroplane. They were military men—a Bulgarian, a Rumanian and one of our Soviet officers, a major. As I was talking to the major the Bulgarian offered me a cigarette and the Rumanian gave me a light from his cigarette lighter. A Yugoslav came up and joined in the general conversation. Everybody felt quite at ease except myself. I recalled the skeletons of the houses in front of the famous Odessa stairway and looked at the Rumanian. Before my eyes rose the map of the Balkans on which I could distinguish Macedonia, only recently liberated from the invaders, and I glanced at the Bulgarian, then at the Yugoslav, and then at our major. No, not a single eye betrayed a sign of anger or suspicion. I put out my cigarette and climbed into the aeroplane. As I did so I thought to myself: I shall visit all these countries, and then I shall understand.

The audience in the theatre in Belgrade welcomed our appearance on the stage with a storm of applause and cries of “Zivio Stalin!” “Zivio the Soviet Union!” “Zivio! Zivio! Zivio!” We sang song after song without end, all the songs we knew, but they kept on asking for more. After the concert Marshal Tito came on to the stage. He has a strong, slightly tanned face, which looks as if it has been chiselled out of stone, and blue, smiling eyes. The men in Yugoslavia are stalwart and strong. They have the hands of warriors and the eyes of poets. The orchestra conductor stood at his stand in a military uniform, a soldier above all else. In the streets the women wear breeches and heavy boots. The men carry tommy guns. Partisans, men and women, marching down the street, sang beautiful folk songs, the words and images of which any professional poet would envy.

We strolled round the town, gazed at the waters of the Danube and the Sava, and admired the ancient fortress, which the Romans built. In the city squares there are numerous graves of our men; they are decked with flowers, and over them burn sacred lamps. Who brings these flowers? Who pours the oil into the lamps? An old lady came up. We asked her, but she did not understand our questions.

“What do you mean who?” she asked us in turn. “We Belgradians, of course! When your men helped us to liberate Belgrade they didn’t use their artillery, they captured every house in hand-to-hand fighting so as to save the city. Can we forget that?”

We left Belgrade by car for Novi Sad. On the way we passed through beautiful villages and saw tall and magnificent horses, and pigs which amazed us, for they were covered with curly hair, looking more like poodles than pigs. We drove up to the ferry where we were to cross the Danube. There a large crowd was gathered. The front was not far away. There were numerous soldiers about, Yugoslavs and Bulgarians, peacefully conversing with each other. The ferry-boat arrived and wounded men on crutches disembarked. By their bandages and faces we could tell that they had only recently come from the battlefield. A number of women, old and young, were waiting with us to get on to the ferry-boat. They carried bundles and sacks. They were going to the front to take their husbands and sons some food, typical peasant fare—griddle cakes and bacon.

While we were waiting for the ferry-boat a dispute arose between a Belgrade actress who was accompanying us and a truck driver. By their animated gestures and their flashing eyes we guessed that they were arguing about some thing very important. I found it hard to catch the words when Yugoslavs talked with each other, particularly when they talked rapidly, but gradually I began to get the drift of what these two were saying. The truck driver argued that since Serbia was already liberated from the Germans, whom he hated, there was
no need to continue the war to liberate the Croats. Didn’t the Croatian Ustashi gangs kill hundreds of thousands of Serbs? I could not forget that heated argument for a long time, because it reflected in miniature the difficulties Yugoslavia has to go through. I understood, and sensed still more concretely, how wisely the new leaders of the country had acted in building the new democratic Yugoslav state on federal lines. Only when the Croats, Serbs, Macedonians, and Montenegrins become conscious of their equal rights and equal importance will they cease their mutual strife. This strife can only benefit those who are opposed to having a strong Yugoslavia and who stand to lose by the establishment of friend-ship among Slavs. That is why the fascists of all countries, and particularly of Germany, supported both the Chetniks and the Ustashi. But people of the type of the truck driver I mentioned above are growing fewer in Yugoslavia. They are prompted by the inertia of the past, and this inertia is spending itself.

Novi Sad once belonged to Austria. This is evident from the architecture of the buildings, the shape of the windows, the tiled roofs and the Gothic Catholic Cathedral. The mayor of the town is intelligent, educated and progressive. He knows what the fight is about. Four of his sons were killed in partisan fighting, and all the women of his family—his mother, his wife and his daughters-in-law—were killed by the Germans.

On returning to Belgrade we spent a few more days there. At the reception held to celebrate the 27th anniversary of the Red Army we were introduced to Dr. Subasic, who had just arrived in Belgrade, and to Field Marshal Alexander of the British Army, who was passing through the town. The Field Marshal has something to be proud of in this war, but only the innumerable ribbons and bars that covered his chest like a piece of tapestry indicated the high position he held in the British Army. He is modest and simple in his intercourse with people and is a merry and witty conversationalist.

From Belgrade we flew to Skoplje, the capital of Macedonia. The surging Vardar cuts this beautiful city into two parts, which are connected by an ancient bridge. On one side there are numerous churches, on the other no fewer mosques with their tall minarets. In the principal square of the city stand the ruins of a bank building. It was blown up by a delayed action bomb ten days after the Germans were ejected from the city. This was an act of wanton fascist vengeance. Next to these ruins stands a museum. The windows were blown out by the blast. Large white curtains fluttered out into the square like signals of distress.

The pavement in front of the hotel was thronged with men, women and children. They grasped our hands and offered us huge red apples. An old woman with a child in her arms made a dash for Bryushkov, our pianist, and kissed him. Bryushkov kissed her and the child, and I could see tears trickling down his cheeks. These people would not let us put up at a hotel. They took us to their homes, gave us their best beds, blankets and pillows, and shared with us their food, which was not in the least abundant. The country has been devastated by the Germans, and life is hard at present in Yugoslavia.

We gave our concerts in the evenings and in the daytime our hosts took us round and showed us the places of interest in the city. We visited the beautiful monastery with its 14th-century frescoes, the mosques, and even attended a prayer meeting of Dervishes, who in their religious ecstasy slashed their cheeks with knives. What an enormous amount of work this young country will have to do in order gradually to eliminate this backwardness and poverty, while at the same time preserving the native features of each district! The poverty in which thousands of Gypsies live on the outskirts of Skoplje is appalling. I have seen such hovels and such raggedness only once before—in Iran. Here in Macedonia it is the result of the frightful past. After all, Macedonia has only just received the right to call herself a country. Only until very recently she was eternally the slave of some other country. And yet the people are handsome and talented—their long eyebrows, large, slightly slanting eyes, well-shaped and somewhat aquiline noses; their beautifully embroidered national costumes, fine songs and dances, and the real European culture of their professional painters, sculptors and poets.

From Skoplje we travelled by car over mountain roads to Bitolj. On the way we passed overturned and blown-up German trucks and tanks. This was the work of the partisans. Great endurance and confidence in victory were needed to destroy the enemy so methodically and perseveringly amidst the conditions of complete occupation and seemingly utter
hopelessness. In one of the houses at which we stopped a German general had lived quite recently. In the town an underground partisan newspaper was published. The Germans searched high and low for the printing shop, but they failed to find it because it was in a place where nobody would have dreamed of looking for it. It was in the attic of the general's house! Every morning the mistress of the house would wrap her baby in copies of the newly printed newspaper and, ostensibly going for a walk, would take them to the secret distributing centre. She and her infant stood in danger of something worse than death. How great must have been her love for her country to have taken a daily risk like that!

On the way to Bitolj we stopped at Prilep. In the cold and snow, a veritable blizzard, we were met in the town square by several thousand inhabitants. And all shouted: "Thanks!" We had no intention of giving a concert in this town. The "thanks" were not for us individually, but for our country, for the Soviet Union.

On leaving Yugoslavia we carried away with us impressions of a beautiful country and of a fine people. Our aeroplane flew down the valley between two mountains and we found ourselves right over Sofia. A large flat city. We landed, drove to a hotel and, making a hurried toilet, we hastened out to see the town. It was already spring. The sun shone and the sky was a tender blue. In the sunlight the mutilated houses presented a particularly painful spectacle. And there were many such houses, very many. Iron beams twisted by fire, fragments of walls, gaping holes where windows had been, and impassable side streets, blocked up with heaps of broken brick. But in spite of all the city is beautiful; in spite of all the city lives. Crowds of people, lots of automobiles. Soviet girls in army uniform, shaking back their fair curls, stood at the street crossings efficiently directing the traffic. There are numerous shops. Haberdashery, ladies' handbags, pencils, fountain pens, toys and domestic utensils are sold not only in sound premises, but even under the remains of wrecked buildings. True, everything else—cloth, footwear and stockings—can be obtained only on ration cards, but for all that the town looks more prosperous than Belgrade.

A crowd was gathered in front of a large building. Everybody was gazing at the windows and waiting. Armed horsemen were riding backwards and forwards on the pavement. Inside the building traitors to the people were being tried, fascists who had helped the Germans to lord it in their country. As we were waiting one of these traitors came down the street under escort and was led into the building. An angry murmur rose from the crowd and the name of the prisoner was shouted out loudly.

Bulgaria is casting off the remnants of the disgusting garments which the fascists had forced her to wear. She is casting them off with mixed feeling of anger and rejoicing. She is sternly judging her enemies and enthusiastically welcoming her friends. Her enemies, of course, are not few. Their number is not limited to those standing in the dock and awaiting sentence. But we could not see them. We saw only the joyous faces of friends.

Yugoslavs, Czechs, Russians and Poles had arrived in Sofia for the Slav Meeting. Intoxicated by a new, hitherto unexperienced joy, the Bulgarians welcomed them with applause, cheers, posters and flowers. Demonstrations were held in the streets. There were banners inscribed with slogans, decorated automobiles, columns of trade unionists marching in serried ranks, and dances in national costume. It was the country's gala festival to welcome the Slavs, and our concerts became part of this festival.

The fascists tried, by force and fraud, to incite the Bulgarians against their liberators, the Russians. The Red Army has ejected the Germans from Bulgaria, and now the Bulgarians are eagerly reaching for the truth. Everything about us astonished them. Everything was so unexpected; everything so significant. Take, for example, the evening dress in which we appeared on the stage. "But the Germans told us that fine clothes were taboo in Russia," people said in astonishment. They heard Barsova's magnificent voice and the classical compositions played by Bryushkov and Kozolupova. "But the Germans told us that the Bolsheviks have no culture whatever," they said.

Wherever we went we were bombarded with thousands of questions.

My wife was asked: "Have you been married to Mr. Obraztsov long?"

My wife answered: "Fourteen years! But the Germans told us that there was no such thing as marriage in Russia!"
The most commonplace answer was an amazing discovery for the enquirer. It smashed a piece of the slander the fascists had spread about the Soviet Union, and this slander began to crumble.

An actor asked me: "Have you a piano of your own?"
"Of course I have," I answered.
"But are you allowed to own property?" was the next question.

And so I had to explain the elementary difference between the ownership of personal property and the ownership of the means of production, that any person in Russia may own a piano, automobile, a country house, books, pictures and even jewelry. The Bulgarian was amazed. This was an eye-opener to him.

We visited Stara Zagora, Kazanlyk—the valley of roses, where the finest attar of roses in the world is produced—and the factory town of Sliven. Everywhere we were welcomed with brass bands, and seen off with flowers. We were Soviet Russians. These two words have merged into one. There is only one sort of Russians now, those of the Soviet Union. All the other sorts have gone. This war has proved to be the last chapter of the "Road to Calvary." The writing of it was completed by life itself, and this, perhaps, is most clearly evident in the Balkans, where so many White emigrés had once settled. Most of them went over to the Germans. First they betrayed Russia; now they have betrayed the countries which, to their misfortune, gave them refuge—Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Bohemia. By betraying Russia they excluded themselves from their nation; now they have excluded themselves from life.

A few of them fought the Germans and have thereby earned the right to call themselves men again.

In Yugoslavia we met an ex-Colonel of the White army, named Makhin. Before the war broke out, he published a book in Belgrade entitled *The Truth About the Red Army*, in which he did indeed tell the truth and showed that he really understood the role and importance of the Soviet Union. As soon as the Germans occupied Yugoslavia Makhin joined the partisans, experienced years of hard fighting against the fascists, proved very useful as an officer in this struggle, and is now a general in the Yugoslav army. Recently he was sent on a mission to the Soviet Union. He had earned the right to go back to his country by his deeds.

Only a miserable handful of ex-Russians have remained in emigration. The prefix "ex" fits them perfectly. I saw them in Sofia. In a restaurant where Yugoslav, Bulgarian and Soviet writers were sitting a group of people appeared wearing Russian topboots, blouses, and broad plush trousers, and carrying balalaikas and guitars. In honour of the Russians they sang "Stenka Razin" and the drinking song "Let Us Drink to Kolya." Evidently they thought that this would please us, but their topboots were down at heel, their plush trousers had bald patches like worn-out couch cushions, their blouses looked washed out, their voices were thick like those of tippers, and they sang with a foreign accent. They had lacked the moral courage to make the difficult journey back.

Although we were extremely busy—during the two months we gave sixty-eight concerts—we tried in Sofia, as well as in every other town we visited, to see all we possibly could. We visited the Ethnographical Museum, the vast Alexander Nevsky Cathedral where there are icons painted by Russian artists, and the State Theatre where we heard a very good performance of the opera *La Tosca*. When, on leaving the country, we mentally summed up our experiences, it became clear to us that the day German, Great-Serbian and Bulgarian fascism is finally destroyed the dispute between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria will end. Already the bonds of friendship have been woven; and these bonds are being strengthened by a common love for Russia, by gratitude towards the Soviet Union.

While flying towards Bucharest I tried to conjure up a picture of this city. It is called the Paris of the Balkans, but I have never been to Paris, and know that city only from pictures, photographs and books. Before the war the name Bucharest was associated in my mind with my radio set. After midnight I used to tune in until I "caught" Bucharest and heard the sounds of a violin. Bucharest was a sound city. During the war, in 1941, 1942 and 1943, it was an enemy city, as hostile as Berlin; a city which had caused so much suffering to the beloved towns of my country, the city in which the Balkan Hitler, whose name is Antonescu, resided. And here I was flying to this very city. What will it be? A sobbing violoncello or a concealed enemy?

From the aerodrome we rode to the centre of the city through a beautiful avenue. On the way we passed the wrecked and gutted
remains of Antonescu's palace. It did one good

to see that. On the whole, however, the city

is scarcely damaged. Few of the houses have

been wrecked. We put up at a splendid hotel

in the Palace Square. Headed by a band, a
detachment of the Royal Guard marched

through the square, their uniforms glittering

with gold and silver, and with white plumes

on their helmets. No, this was nothing like

Belgrade or Sofia. The city was teeming with

life. Dashing through the streets, apparently

ungoverned by any traffic regulations, were

automobiles of the most diverse types, from

the very latest models to quite antediluvian

types. Newspaper vendors ran past shouting

the news at the top of their voices. In the

newspapers sensational headlines take up more

space than the news itself. Bare-legged Gypsy

girls pestered pedestrians, trying to wheedle

them into buying a bunch of violets or carnations.

They whined to the ladies and tried to

shame their male companions into buying

flowers for them. This was in the beginning

of April, but it was already summer. The trees

were green and the sun hot. The ladies wore

cobweb stockings and shoes with cork props.

They had black hair and vermilion lips, and were

accompanied on leads by poodles or wire-haired fox terriers clipped in

the latest style: bare bodies and legs in shaggy trousers. Organ grinders ground out music

and told fortunes printed on slips of paper

picked out by a parrot. True, the parrots have
degenerated since the war, and instead of

pink cockatoos and grey Jacoques tiny "loving

birds" were perched on the boxes. The

organs usually ground out old waltzes, but

suddenly we heard one of them play our

"Katyusha." Evidently, somebody had already

managed to put in a new roller.

At 11 o'clock at night the town becomes

silent and is plunged in gloom. I too closed my

eyes in sleep, having as yet learned nothing

about the town. Was it enough to have seen

it? Who were these people? Who were those

women in those amazing hats? Who were

those men, of whom there seemed to be such

unusual numbers? When our concerts start

and those invisible waves of which only ac-

tors are conscious roll towards us from the

audience we will perhaps understand. Such

were the thoughts that passed through my

mind as I fell asleep.

The large cinema theatre in which we gave

our concert was packed. People stood in the

aisles, cheering and applauding. Before the

curtain could be drawn the people in the

front rows made a dash for the stage armed

with fountain pens poised like spears, with

notebooks, programmes and scraps of paper,

and demanded our autographs as a souvenier.

I found that writing your signature a hundred
times in one evening is a strenuous job.

Gradually we became acquainted with peo-

dle. Crowds gathered behind the scenes, and

newspaper correspondents, students, authors

and schoolchildren came to visit us. Before

the violin city, the sound city had been

pushed out by the war; now the enemy city

was being pushed out by people and meetings

with people. What had happened to Rumania

in less than six months became palpable and

clear. On August 23, 1944, the Rumanian gov-

ernment declared war against German fasc-

icism. On February 28, 1945, the people of

Rumania declared war on Rumanian fascism,

and in this new war they are seeking and are

eager to obtain our friendship. They need this

friendship as ground which for the first time

will be firm under their feet. Does this

mean that all the people strolling around the

town are seeking this friendship? Of course

not.

On one of our free evenings we went to

see a musical comedy. Women, almost nude,

their entire bodies painted an orange colour,
danced on the stage. From under the neck-

lace of one of them peeped a tiny cross.

Whether this was the fashion or a sign of

piety it was difficult to say, but it was also
difficult to reconcile the cross with the wo-

man's motions and her costume, or rather,

the absence of one. Another scene seemed to

me to be even more amusing. From the box

in which we were sitting we could look

down into the orchestra, and we noticed that

during the long intermissions the players gath-
ered round the kettle-drum and played cards,

while the conductor quietly read a book.

I would have been quite pleased with this

visit to the theatre had not the lady sitting

next to me in the box said to me, pointing to

the tenor:

"He is a fascist, a real fascist. He was the

cause of the death of many people in Bucha-

rest, and he instigated the persecution of

Jews. Everybody in this town knows this,

but you see, he goes on singing as if nothing

has happened."

Yes, the people have still a great deal to

do before they can achieve victory in the

struggle they have commenced. For all that,

however, I have no grounds for doubting the
sincerity of the numerous people we met and with whom we became friends. The actors of the State Theatre demonstrated their art to us and were happy to tell us that, following the example of the Soviet Union, they were sending the first concert party to the front. We were introduced to Petre Groza and to many of the members of his Cabinet. Mme. Patrascu took us to an interesting museum in the park near a lake. Among the trees there stood huts surrounded by wattle fences, wells, shrines and even churches brought from different parts of the country. Inside these huts we found domestic utensils, stoves, embroidered towels and people from the respective districts in their national costumes. It is very interesting to be able to tour a country in the course of several hours, but this was not the most important of the impressions I carried away from this visit. In one of the huts there was a wounded soldier. We wanted to withdraw, but the wounded man beckoned us to come to his bedside. He was eager to see Soviet people. He had only recently been wounded on the Rumanian-German front. He was an enemy of our enemies and was proud of it.

Here I found the clue to what I had so much wanted to know when I met the four passengers at the Bucharest aerodrome. If there is to be peace in the Balkans, if the Balkan peoples are to live in friendship, they must first of all unite in hostility towards fascism—German, Italian, Great Serbian, Great Bulgarian, Rumanian, and Greek; hostility towards fascism of every brand. It must be cut at the roots. No, that is not enough. The roots can produce new shoots. It must be uprooted. The fascists must be weeded out of Europe as a field is cleared of weeds. Only then will the peoples be able to look into each other’s eyes calmly. This was the most important impression we carried away with us in the aeroplane on our return to Moscow. It was not a new impression, but it had become palpable and concrete, because we had gained it from our meetings with people in three countries, with people of the Balkans, the region which was once called “the powder magazine of Europe.”
BOOK REVIEWS

Instructive Pages of History

D. Petrov

THE PUBLICATION in Russian of the fourth volume of The Intimate Papers of Colonel House—although rather belated—will attract the attention of the reading public. The book is of undoubted interest, and not only from the standpoint of the history of American foreign policy; it is also of interest from the standpoint of present-day problems arising in this concluding phase of the war in connection with the creation of an international security organization. The diaries, memoranda, and documents selected from the papers of Colonel House, President Wilson's personal adviser, and commented upon by Prof. Charles Seymour of Yale University, contain material of value for an understanding of Wilson's diplomatic activities and throw light on the birth of the Versailles Treaty and the League of Nations.

A perusal of the fourth volume of the Papers convinces us once again of House's profound knowledge of affairs and sober approach to international problems, and at the same time affords a glimpse into the laboratory in which the methods of ensuring peace were at that time compounded.

Even before the United States entered the war House understood what Germany represented. In a letter to Wilson from Berlin, he wrote: "It is militarism run stark mad." (Vol. I, p. 240.) When the First World War was drawing to a close he was unwavering in the belief that the German aggressor had to be crushed to such an extent that he would never be able to rise again. Those who shared House's views reposed ardent hopes in international co-operation and the creation of a League of Nations. But even while its constitution was still being drafted difficulties were revealed, arising out of the contradiction between a formal understanding of certain principles and their practical application. A letter he wrote to the President on July 14, 1918, definitely indicates that House believed that the League should be confined to the Great Powers. Commenting on this letter, Seymour pays tribute to House's "practical idealism," and defends him against the accusation that his proposal ran counter to President Wilson's constant plea for the recognition of the smaller nations as having equal rights with the Great Powers. Seymour writes:

"House evidently based his argument upon the practical consideration that control must go with responsibility and upon the assumption that the smaller states would be actually safer under the protection of the large than under a regime of rivalry among themselves." (P. 25.)

Time and again House reverts to the question of the small nations. In a diary entry of August 14, 1918, we find the following note of a conversation with Wilson:

"In our discussion I stated that in my opinion it seemed impracticable to think of the smaller nations as members of the League on equal terms with the larger ones... There are fifty odd nations, and of these there are not more than twelve at the outside that would do any serious fighting in the event of a great war, or be of service in financing it, and yet the forty, under the plan which we have drawn up and to which we both agree, could overrule and direct the twelve." (P. 49.)

Of great interest are not only House's own diaries and letters, but also the letters of other public men who had a close hand in the creation of the League of Nations. Many of them were alive to the difficulties which would arise in the League's practical activities; they feared that its façade would be very far from conforming with the practical foundation upon which so broadly conceived an international organization should be based. Lord Robert Cecil, who was one of the active champions of the League, was definitely alarmed by the imperfections of its draft covenant. In a letter to House dated July 22, 1918, he wrote:

"I am convinced that unless some form of coercion can be devised which will work more or less automatically no league of peace will endure." (P. 40.)

Seymour contests the opinion that Wilson came to Europe without any definite plan for the formation of the League of Nations. The
book quotes a statement by Sir William Wiseman of August 16, 1918, to the effect that Wilson had “two main principles in view: There must be a League of Nations and it must be virile.” (P. 52.)

Many difficulties stood in the way of the creation of the League: then, as now, the opponents of an international organization to ensure lasting peace held up the bogey of a “world state” and tried to stifle the very idea of such an organization in its inception. But the biggest obstacle was the lack of a clear idea of what to do with vanquished Germany, as well as a tendency not to reduce Germany to the state of a completely vanquished country. Most dangerous of all—and this is particularly clear now, when we take a retrospective glance at the past—was a tendency to underrate the significance of the economic base of German imperialism, without the destruction of which military victory over Germany would have been futile. In the period when the First World War was drawing to a close the political leaders of the victor countries were the prey of fatal illusions on this score. The book quotes the following testimony of Wiseman:

“He [the President] viewed with alarm the rising feeling among the Allies, which was being communicated to the United States, that Germany should be crushed economically. Wilson and House foresaw the futility and danger of this policy, which was not realized until much later by the Allied leaders.” (P. 62.)

The lessons of the Second World War and what we know of the preparations made by the German aggressor for that war eloquently testify to the erroneousness of Wilson’s and House’s views on this question, upon the correct settlement of which the stability of peace largely depended. This lesson of history is of no little importance today, and it is now appreciated by nearly everyone, except those who are still unaverse to playing the Germans’ cards.

The documents collected in this book throw light on the views which fostered the anxiety not to weaken vanquished Germany too much. In a cablegram to the President of October 30, 1918, House wrote:

“I pointed out the danger of bringing about a state of Bolshevism in Germany if the terms of the Armistice were too stiff, and the consequent danger to England, France, and Italy.” (P. 121.)

It was views like these that provided the setting for the “Bolshevik bogey,” with which the German imperialists, especially those of the Hitler brand, played so skillfully, and—after!—so successfully, to the detriment of the peace-loving powers.

Lack of clarity over the aims of the war, as well as over what to do with Germany, was a serious handicap to the realization of the plans for the assurance of lasting peace.

In House’s papers we find references also to other factors which hampered the realization of Wilson’s plans and which rendered the efforts to realize them a truly Sisyphean labour. Noteworthy in this respect are House’s repeated complaints of a “hostile [to Wilson] and influential junta in the United States and the thoroughly unsympathetic personnel constituting the Entente Governments.” (P. 194.) In a cablegram to Wilson of November 20, 1918, House insisted that the Republican Party and if possible the Senate be appropriately represented in the peace delegation. But Wilson, who on his own admission had a “one-track mind,” was incapable of grasping all the basic problems that arose in connection with the scheme to set up a League of Nations. One cannot help agreeing with Seymour when he says:

“The great fault of the political leaders, who began to gather at Paris at the beginning of the second week of January 1919, was their failure to draft a plan of procedure.” (P. 282.)

It should be borne in mind that in the period of the liquidation of the First World War the desire to guarantee the world against a repetition of war was often expressed in very vigorous forms. The book quotes the following passage from a memorandum of December 10, 1918, on an interview with the President:

“With great earnestness he [the President] emphasized the point that, unless the Conference was prepared to follow the opinions of mankind and to express the will of the people rather than that of their leaders at the Conference, we should soon be involved in another breakup of the world, and when such a breakup came it would not be a war but a cataclysm.” (P. 321.)

But the discussion of the armistice terms, and later of the peace treaty and the covenant of the League of Nations, encountered many submerged rocks, which were ignored by the Versailles pilots. The very course of the peace conference, the necessity of constantly bearing in mind the situation in the United States, which, as House complained, was “a deterrent to free action by our delegates” (p. 372), the endless discussions of
naval rivalry between Britain and the United States and the Americans' insistent demand for freedom of the seas, etc.—all this gradually filled House with dejection and pessimism. On March 3, 1919, he makes the following note in his diary:

"It is now evident that the peace will not be such a peace as I had hoped, or one which this terrible upheaval should have brought about. There are many reasons why it will not be one...

"I dislike to sit and have forced upon us such a peace as we are facing. We will get something out of it in the way of a League of Nations, but even that is an imperfect instrument..." (P. 372.)

Analysing the course of the peace conference, Seymour holds that it would be wrong to describe it as a duel between Wilson's ideas and Clemenceau's ideas.

"In reality," he writes, "the Peace Conference... was not so much a duel as a general mêlée, in which the representatives of each nation struggled to secure endorsement for their particular methods of ensuring peace." (P. 392.)

However, one must not conclude from this that each side came to the conference with a clear-cut plan. House, at any rate, admits on July 26, 1919, in his diary that it was a mistake that the Slavic peoples, who numbered over two hundred millions, did not have a single representative in the Council, whereas Belgium, France, Spain, Italy and Brazil (the Latin peoples) were represented. He writes:

"This was a stupid blunder for which I am largely responsible. The oversight comes from not having planned in advance." (P. 501.)

The story of Wilson's visit to Europe is given in the fourth volume of the Papers in authentic documents and in the commentaries to them. But the book is not a scientific treatise, and at times it rather resembles a tragic narrative of a vain search for the Golden Fleece. The concluding chapter of the book breathes pessimism and gloomy foreboding. On July 30, 1919, House wrote to Wilson:

"The world is in a belligerent mood, and the next ten years will be the most dangerous to its peace... At present, the world is a long way from being safe..." (P. 513.)

These views of a man who in his time had his finger on the pulse of world affairs should have served as a voice of warning. And not only then. They should have been remembered much later.

---

**The Post-War Arrangement of the World Through a Distorting Mirror***

*V. BORISOV*

THE PUBLICATION, last October, of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for the formation of an international security organization evoked wide comment abroad. In addition to the numerous comments in the periodical press, a number of books and pamphlets appeared on the subject.

The work done at Dumbarton Oaks was regarded by democratic public opinion all over the world as an important contribution to the post-war co-operation of the freedom-loving nations. Concurrent with this favourable comment, however, there was no lack of criticism of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. This criticism came, in the main, from two quarters. Firstly, from the sceptics, or "realists," as they are sometimes called, who, recalling the sad experience of the League of Nations, assert that it is impossible to create an effective organization to maintain peace and security, that the idea should be abandoned, and that each country should rely entirely on its own armed forces. The Dumbarton Oaks recommendations, however, show that, given certain definite conditions, it is quite possible to form an organization that will be capable of taking swift and effective measures to prevent or suppress aggression. Evidently, this is exactly what the second category of critics, who are often described as "idealists," do not want. The latter usually

---

complain about the “dictatorship” of the Great Powers, and, in the name of “law” and “justice,” advance proposals that would deprive the future organization of all the conditions necessary for its effectiveness. Donning the toga of champions of the small countries, these “idealists” are in fact trying to kill the proposed organization even before it is born. Realizing that downright opposition to the formation of an international security organization is hardly likely to receive effective support at the present time, these “champions of justice,” who are really enemies of the cause of peace, want to reduce this organization to impotence at the very outset.

But the peoples have paid too heavy a price for the failure of previous attempts to ensure international security not to profit by the lessons of the past, and so the hypocritical utterances of the advocates of abstract “justice” are fairly often exposed in the press. The other day, the London Times, for example, after observing that the “idealists” constitute no little danger, as they are striving to “amend” the Dumbarton Oaks plan to bring it into harmony with the legal forms of the League of Nations, went on to say:

“Should that [Dumbarton Oaks] constitution be so amended at San Francisco as to put the predominance of the Great Powers in jeopardy or doubt, the result would merely be to reduce the principal agency of the new organization to the same impotence as the League Council... The advantages of making the new organization a real as well as formal source of decisions are patent... But if these advantages are to be earned it is essential that the predominance in fact of the Great Powers should find formal recognition in the constitution.”

Pointing out that the unity and stability of international society are far inferior to the unity and stability of the most unorganized national communities, the newspaper expresses astonishment at the fact that “serious politicians” continue to recommend that highly contentious political issues, which in national politics can be solved only by means of bargaining and compromise, should in international politics be submitted to the “pure” processes of law and equity. The newspaper points out that these are precisely the good intentions with which the road to hell is paved. In conclusion, the Times observes that one of the most important tasks of the chief delegations in San Francisco will be to resist the attempts of the “perfectionists” to improve the Dumbarton Oaks plan by introduc-

ing such changes as will convert the new organization into a useless ornament.

A fairly lively debate has been going on lately in the columns of the foreign press on the place and role of the different countries in the future security organization. From this aspect the book by William Fox entitled The Super-Powers, which was recently published in New York, deserves attention. Its author, who is a research associate at the well-known and influential Yale Institute of International Studies, points to the difference in the actual status of the small and big countries. This is shown by the epigraph at the head of Chapter I of the book, which reads:

“Even after you give the squirrel a certificate which says he is quite as big as any elephant, he is still going to be smaller, and all the squirrels will know it, and all the elephants will know it.”

Fox is of the opinion that in the future “well-ordered world” there will be room for both elephants and squirrels, and that it will be impossible to reach such a world by ignoring the differences between the elephants and the squirrels of international politics.

How does Fox picture this “well-ordered world”? It must be confessed that he looks at the world through the spectacles of a definite conception, and one that is extremely dangerous to the future of the nations at that.

Briefly characterizing the relation of forces in the international arena after the First World War, he arrives at the conclusion that after the present war the first-rank powers will be the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union. He does not think that France and China will be strong enough. True, he concedes that these countries will become stronger, but they will remain considerably weaker than the first-rank powers. As regards Germany and Japan, the author is of the opinion that in time these too may enter the ranks of the Great Powers, but, at best, they will be only “regional powers.”

Fox thus arrives at the conclusion that in the post-war world there will be no less than three and no more than seven Great Powers, of which three will be “world powers” or “super-powers.” The distinguishing feature of the “super-powers” will be: great power plus great mobility of power. They will possess bases and good communications in the East and the West, and will be able to throw their armed forces into any theatre of war.

The author then goes on to examine the relations between the “super-powers.” First
of all he analyses Anglo-American relations. Observing that in the past for various reasons relations between Great Britain and the United States at times became entangled and strained, he states that ultimately Britain made a number of concessions which opened the way for Anglo-American collaboration. Among these concessions he includes the withdrawal of the British from the Caribbean Sea, the dismantling of the fortifications in that region and in Canada, the re-negotiation of the Panama Canal question to permit the United States to build the canal alone, the settlement of the dispute about the Venezuelan frontier, and the withholding of support from Canada in the Alaskan boundary dispute. Relations between Britain and America became rather close during the First World War, and the author is of the opinion that after the present war the average Englishman will support Anglo-American collaboration. For various reasons, however, opposition to Anglo-American collaboration is met with more often in the United States, but this, according to Fox, is due to all sorts of minor disputes, prejudice, false rumours, and so forth.

Enumerating the factors which hinder Anglo-American collaboration, as, for example, the position of India, antagonism in the sphere of commercial policy, the problem of Palestine and of the Arabian world, etc., the author expresses the opinion that none of these sources of friction can be described as a fundamental conflict of interests between Great Britain and the United States. On the other hand, Fox sees great advantages in close collaboration between these two countries, but he depicts this collaboration in a very peculiar manner.

After several remarks concerning the similarity between the British and American democratic systems, similarity in ideology and habits of life, the author goes on to deal with more palpable factors. First of all he rather candidly observes that Britain is of value to the United States only in so far as she has the dominions at her side.

"Without the support of the dominions," he writes, "Britain's declining political role would be even more sharply emphasized. She could hardly claim to be more than a regional European power of the same order of importance as the larger states across the Channel."

But will the dominions always support Britain? The dominions also count on Britain's support. The fall of Singapore, however, proved, in the author's opinion, Britain's weakness, particularly in the Far East, and her inability to defend Australia and New Zealand.

"The war has demonstrated," he writes, "that United States help is indispensable in the protection of these isolated dominions. Only a Britain which can with certainty count upon American support in case of renewed general war can continue to evoke the spontaneous collaboration of Australia and New Zealand."

The situation is no better, according to Fox, with a large dominion like Canada. Canada's territorial integrity practically depends on the United States, from which British sea power cannot protect Canada. Canada's ties with the British Commonwealth of Nations could not long survive a failure of Anglo-American collaboration. Summing up the postulates he enunciates, the author arrives at the following conclusion:

"Britain's status as a first-rank power is contingent upon support from the self-governing dominions and from the United States. The support of the former can be counted on only if the support of the latter seems assured; therefore Britain's position is doubly dependent on American good will."

As regards the United States it, in the author's opinion, is interested in Britain primarily as an island base.

"If it is a valid objective of American policy to keep war out of our own continental homeland," he writes, "then an ally whose territories furnish bases from which any new European aggressor could be kept within Europe is indeed a valuable ally... The United States is finding it necessary to 'borrow' parts of the British Empire..."

After painting Britain's position in such gloomy colours, denying her all independence, and reducing her role to that of a country entirely dependent upon "American good will," Fox asserts that it is possible to speak of "these Western democracies as if they constituted a single power-nucleus." Although, evidently, the author has no doubt that Britain has no alternative but to resign herself to the rôle thus apportioned to her, he, nevertheless, considers it necessary that this collaboration be "registered in some form," irrespective of motives or objectives.

Thus, according to Fox, a powerful Anglo-American bloc should be formed to control the vast area of the Pacific, the Atlantic, the New World, the Mediterranean, the Middle East, South-East Asia, Indonesia and the Indian Ocean. In order, once and for all, to define the place each of the partners in this bloc is to occupy, the author strongly empha-
sizes that Washington should assume "a central position of leadership."

The author then goes on to deal with the relations between the Anglo-American bloc and the Soviet Union. He does not deal with the relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union. He is of the opinion that "common traditions and the greater similarity of objectives" will make collaboration between Britain and the United States more intimate than collaboration between these two powers and the Soviet Union. At the same time he dogmatically asserts that America will determine "the way in which the Soviet and Anglo-American concentrations of power accommodate themselves to each other's existence." In other words, he would deprive Great Britain of the right to pursue a foreign policy independently of Washington. In the opinion of Fox and of those who share his views, Great Britain should simply follow the way of the United States. What this way will be, the author does not openly say, but he points out that Anglo-American collaboration ought not to lead to the formation of an anti-Anglo-American coalition. For, he says:

"The reactions of the Soviet Union and of the small countries would vary according to the slogans used to justify Anglo-American co-operation."

He utters the warning that it would be dangerous if, for example, Anglo-American collaboration developed in the name of "preserving Western democracy from communism," or on the plea of the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race. If, however, continues Fox for the instruction of his more candid and less adroit friends in the camp of the avowed imperialists who copy the methods and even the words of Hitler, collaboration between Britain and America develops and is justified by reference to their joint interest in something impersonal like "freedom," for example, "the dangers of counter-colaboration against Britain and America would be reduced."

Thus, according to Fox's scheme, there will be "two centres of power" in the post-war world: the Anglo-American and the Soviet. He graciously concedes that there should be a "Soviet security belt" to the West of our country consisting of "regimes friendly to the Soviet Government."

"Beyond the belt of friendly regimes," he writes, "is Germany. Here Allied pressure from the West and Soviet pressure from the East will reach some type of equilibrium."

It is easy to see that Fox is very niggardly towards the Soviet Union, but extremely generous towards the Anglo-American bloc: the orientation of the rest of the world, he says, "will be more towards the British and American power-nucleus."

Having carved up the world in this fashion Fox permits the Soviet Union to join the Anglo-American bloc which is to be dominated by the United States "if the appetite of the Russian bear... proves to be strictly limited," evidently meaning: if the Soviet Union agrees to accept Fox's scheme. If, however, the Soviet Union refuses to accept it, "Security will lie," says the author rather vaguely, but very expressively for all that, "along a road which the Soviet Union was not travelling also." After some general remarks about the desirability of collaboration between the Soviet Union and the Anglo-American bloc, the author bluntly enquires whether a third world war between these two "centres of power" is to be expected. Pointing to the probable rapid growth of the population of the U.S.S.R. Fox says that if a country's might is to be regarded purely from the point of view of statistics, one would have to say that "at a certain future date the Soviet Union would become stronger than an Anglo-American combination." Therefore, says Fox, Americans might be tempted to try to break up the Soviet power-nucleus "before it is too late."

"Victorious generals and admirals," he says, "have a way of casting a speculative eye upon their partners in victory in order to discover their probable opponents in the next war.... They will be less preoccupied with Germany than with each other. They, and the civilian policy-makers whom they advise, may develop a habit of thinking of the Second World War as a possible preliminary to the final bout in which the opposing forces of Soviet Russia and an Anglo-American bloc, of communism and free enterprise, of dictatorship and democracy, are locked in mortal conflict."

This passage would perhaps be sufficient to characterize the position actually taken up by this author, who conceals his imperialist objects behind the screen of "democracy." But we shall deal with a few more of the author's arguments.

The United States and Britain, continues the author, "deny opportunities for imperial expansion to themselves as well as to others," and he goes on to say that a third world war between the Anglo-American bloc and the Soviet Union may arise if either side
attempts to establish its “sole hegemony in non-Russian Europe or Asia.”

We already know what interpretation is put upon the word “hegemony” in certain definite quarters. Having this interpretation of “hegemony” in mind it will become clear that Fox is proposing nothing more nor less than that the Soviet Union should refrain from pursuing an independent policy, and he accompanies his proposal with an unambiguous threat.

It is time, however, that Fox and those who share his views understood that it is utterly useless resorting to threats in talking to the great Soviet power.

As the reader may have observed, Fox’s conceptions are not distinguished for their originality. They are akin to the views advocated in England, for example, by Liddell Hart, whose utterances have been analysed in the columns of our journal (see issue No. 5 of this year). Utterances in the same spirit, but with still greater candour, are made by the American ex-diplomat William Bullitt, whose open call for preparations for a new war against the Soviet Union some time ago caused quite a stir in America and earned the strong condemnation of extremely wide circles of the democratic public.

Fox, of course, is not as outspoken as Bullitt. He does not come out so openly as a fomenter of a new war; but in substance he is advocating the same ideas, so disastrous for the cause of peace, although he presents them in a slightly more disguised form.

Fox, Liddell Hart and Bullitt, and the reactionary circles behind them, want a reversion to that bankrupt policy which has once already brought civilization to the brink of doom. Their aims have nothing in common with the interests of the freedom-loving nations, with the assurance of a lasting peace. Hence, naturally, Fox spurns the idea of forming an international security organization.

“It might perhaps be better,” he says, “if the powers of the first rank developed strictly inter se, and therefore outside the general international organization, the procedures for arriving at joint decisions.”

He agrees, however, that the world needs a general security organization if only to symbolize the real world-wide community of interest in checking aggression... This universal organization could be used to validate whatever direct action the super-powers take... Such a validation would make it clear that the super-powers were not acting exclusively in their own interests. This, then, is Fox’s conception of a “well-ordered world.” One must indeed be a “super-realist,” in other words, an avowed imperialist, to propose a scheme of this kind. It appears that, in addition to ordinary elephants and squirrels, there must also be a super-elephant whom all elephants and squirrels must implicitly obey and whose actions they must approve after the event “to symbolize community of interest.”

Now that the war of the freedom-loving nations against Hitler Germany is drawing to a triumphant close, exceptional vigilance must be displayed towards all the intrigues of the reactionary forces who are striving to thwart the aim of ensuring durable peace among the nations. These forces come out now under the mask of “idealists” and now in the disguise of “super-realists,” but the aims they are actually pursuing must be utterly exposed, no matter what disguise they assume.
April 16

The announcement was published that, on the invitation of President Truman and Secretary of State Stettinius, V. M. Molotov, People’s Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., will visit Washington and head the Soviet delegation at the Conference of the United Nations in San Francisco.

—

Marshal Josip Broz-Tito, President of the Yugoslav Council of Ministers, and the persons accompanying him, left Moscow.

—

President Truman addressed a joint session of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

April 17

Red Army troops captured Zistersdorf, Austria’s oil centre.

A TASS communiqué was published stating that the Soviet Government continued to insist on the absolute necessity of Poland participating in the Conference of the United Nations in San Francisco, through representatives of the Provisional Polish Government.

—

An agreement was signed in Ottawa between the U.S.S.R., Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom providing for delivery of supplies for the Soviet Government during the period from July 1, 1944, to June 30, 1945, with the object of rendering assistance in conducting the war against the common enemy.

—

Demonstrations and mass meetings were held in a number of towns in Poland to demand the conclusion of a Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Post-War Collaboration with the U.S.S.R.

—

A new Finnish Government headed by Paasikivi was formed.

Bayat, Prime Minister of Iran, handed his resignation to the Shah.

April 18

Diplomatic and consular relations were established between the Soviet Union and Bolivia.

April 19

B. Bierut, President of the Krajowa Rada Narodowa of the Polish Republic, E. Osobka-Morawski, Polish Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, W. Gomulka, Deputy Prime Minister, and others arrived in Moscow.

—

Diplomatic relations were established between the Soviet Union and Guatemala.

April 20

General Dentz, formerly Military Governor of Paris and Supreme Commissar of Syria and Lebanon, was sentenced to death for aiding the German invaders.

April 21

A Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Post-War Collaboration between the Soviet Union and the Polish Republic was signed in Moscow. At the signing of the treaty J. V. Stalin and E. Osobka-Morawski delivered speeches.

—

Allied troops occupied Bologna.

April 22

Red Army troops captured Opava (Troppau) in Czechoslovakia.

V. M. Molotov, People’s Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., arrived in Washington. Comrade Molotov was received by President Truman, after which conversations were opened between the Foreign Ministers of the Three Powers.

—

French troops occupied Stuttgart.

April 23

The troops of the First Byelorussian Front, launching an offensive from their bridgeheads on the western bank of the Oder, breached the strongly fortified and deeply echeloned German defences covering Berlin on the east, advanced from 60 to 100 kilometres and captured Frankfurt on the Oder, Wandlitz, Oranienburg, Birkenwerder, Hennigsdorf, Pankow, Friedrichsfelde, Karlsbord and Köpenick, and fought their way into Berlin, the capital of Germany.

—

The troops of the First Ukrainian Front, launching an offensive, breached the strongly fortified and deeply echeloned German defences on the Neisse and, advancing from 80 to 160 kilometres, captured Kottbus, Lübchen, Zossen, Beelitz, Luckenwalde, Treuenbrietzen, Zalina, Marienfelde, Trebbin, Diedersdorf and Teltow, and forced their way into Berlin from the south.

—

Simultaneously, in the Dresden direction, the troops of this front occupied Essen, Kirchhain, Falkenberg, Mühlenberg and Pulsnitz, and reached the Elbe northwest of Dresden.

—

On behalf of all the United Nations J. V. Stalin, H. Truman and W. Churchill issued a warning to all German commandants, guards and Gestapo men that they will be held responsible for the treatment of Allied prisoners of war.

—

Yugoslav troops captured Banja Luka.

April 24

The Eleventh Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. opened in Moscow.

—

B. Bierut, President of the Polish Krajowa Rada Narodowa, and E. Osobka-Morawski, Polish Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, left Moscow.

—

TASS denied the rumours circulated by a certain section of the foreign press alleging that the Crimea Conference had adopted a decision to the effect that only representatives of the reorganized Polish Government could be invited to attend the San Francisco Conference. In this denial TASS stated that this question was not even discussed at the Crimea Conference.

April 25

Striking from the east and west, the troops of the First Ukrainian Front and Allied Anglo-American troops split the German front and effected a junction in the region of Torgau, in Central Germany.

In connection with this historic event J. V. Stalin, H. Truman and W. Churchill addressed greetings to the Red Army and to Allied troops.

—

The troops of the First Byelorussian Front severed all roads
leading from Berlin westwards, and northwest of Potsdam, formed a junction with the troops of the First Ukrainian Front, thereby completely surrounding Berlin.

The troops of the Third Byelorussian Front captured the town and fortress of Pillau, the last stronghold of the German defenses in the Samland Peninsula.

The Conference of the United Nations convened to draft the charter of the International Organization for the Maintenance of Peace and Security was opened in San Francisco. President Truman addressed the conference by radio from Washington.

April 26

The troops of the Second Byelorussian Front forced the East and West Oder south of Stettin, breached the strongly fortified German defenses on the western bank of the Oder and advanced 30 kilometres. In the course of the fighting the troops of this front captured Stettin, an important maritime port and principal city of Pomerania, and Gartz, Penkun, Kasekow and Schwedt.

The troops of the Second Ukrainian Front captured Brno (Brünn), a large industrial centre in Czechoslovakia.

E. Stettinius, V. M. Molotov, A. Eden and Soong Tzu-wen, heads of the delegations of the four sponsor countries, addressed the plenary session of the Conference of the United Nations in San Francisco.

A press conference of American and other correspondents addressed by V. M. Molotov was held in San Francisco.

The Governments of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics each sent a memorandum to the Conference of the United Nations in San Francisco expressing their desire to join the International Security Organization and to take part in the Conference.

Patriotic and partisan forces in Northern Italy liberated Milan, Genoa, Parma, a large part of Turin, and other towns. Allied troops operating in Italy captured Verona.

April 27

Red Army troops captured Ratthenow, Spandau, Potsdam, Pretz­lau, Angermünde and Wittenberg.


The Conference of the United Nations in San Francisco unanimously approved the recommendation of the Steering Committee to invite the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Republics to become initial members and founders of the proposed International Organization for the Maintenance of Peace and Security.

In the vicinity of Lake Como Italian patriots arrested Mussolini, Pavolini, Farinacci, Buffarini and Graziani. These fascist criminals were executed.

A Provisional Government of Austria, headed by Karl Beuer, was formed in Vienna.

April 28

The troops of the Second Byelorussian Front captured Eggesin, Torgelow, Pasewalk, Strasburg and Templin in Pomerania.

April 29

A TASS communique was published stating that Himmler had expressed Germany's readiness to surrender unconditionally to Great Britain and the United States, the Governments of which replied that they would accept unconditional surrender only to all the Allies, including the Soviet Union.

Troops of the Second Byelorussian Front captured Greifswald, Treptow, Neustrelitz, Fürstenberg and Gransee.

Troops of the Fourth Ukrainian Front captured Moravská Ostrava in Czechoslovakia.

The Conference of the United Nations in San Francisco approved of the recommendation of the Steering Committee immediately to send an invitation to the Ukraine and Byelorussia to take part in the Conference.

Allied troops occupied Milan. Organized resistance on the part of the German army in Italy ceased.

E. Herriot, ex-Speaker of the French Chamber of Deputies, who was liberated from a German concentration camp by the Red Army, arrived in Moscow.
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