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A YEAR HAS PASSED, replete with events of the greatest magnitude; a year that will be a memorable landmark in the history of the struggle of the United Nations against fascist barbarism. It has been a year of decisive victories of the Red Army and of the troops of our Allies over the German fascist aggressors, a year of the consolidation and expansion of the front of the anti-Hitler coalition.

The self-sacrificing struggle the Red Army has waged has resulted in the liberation of our Soviet soil from the Hitler invaders for ever. In fierce and stubborn battles, combining mass heroism with high military skill, the Soviet troops have carried their glory-enshrined colours from the banks of the Dnieper to the banks of the Danube, from Zhitomir to Budapest, from Nevel to East Prussia. The course of the war has proved in the irrefutable language of facts that Hitler Germany’s principal opponent—the Soviet Union—has surpassed her in strength. Our country has won a military, economic, and moral and political victory over a powerful and crafty foe. The whole world has witnessed the indomitable might of our Soviet system and has heard the firm footsteps of our Red Army marching to fulfil its great liberating mission.

1944 witnessed a radical change in the military and political map of Europe. The piratical Hitler bloc collapsed and, following Italy, the rest of Hitler’s satellites—Rumania, Bulgaria, Finland and lastly Hungary—turned their weapons against the Germans. The Red Army has liberated from the Germans a considerable part of Poland and Czechoslovakia and is fighting on Norwegian soil. After the Soviet Union and its Red Army had heroically fought Hitler Germany and her satellites single-handed for three years, the armies of our Allies—Great Britain and the United States—millions strong, entered the fight against the Germans. Seriously damaged by defeat on the Soviet-German front, the German war machine was unable to withstand the onslaught of the Allied troops which landed in Normandy. France, Belgium, Luxembourg and part of the Netherlands, and, in the South, considerable parts of Italy and Greece have been liberated from the German yoke. Hostilities are now being conducted on German soil and in its immediate neighbourhood. Thanks to the implementing of the historic decisions of the Teheran Conference, Germany finds herself in a pincer grip between two fronts. The key to victory lies in keeping her in this grip. Having plunged the world into the maelstrom of the most bloody and devastating war, predatory Germany is now heading for inevitable defeat.

No less important are the results achieved during the past year in the sphere of international political relations. All the hopes the Germans had placed in a rift taking place among the Allies have utterly collapsed. The three leading Powers of the anti-Hitler coalition have clearly shown that they can march together in solving military as well as political problems. The events of the past year have shown that the Allies appreciate the necessity of jointly settling questions that arise in the course of the common struggle, of eliminating differences in a spirit of complete harmony by subordinating them to the general and vital interests of the Allies.

The incoming year will be the year of complete victory over Hitler Germany. The more hopeless the enemy’s position becomes, the more furiously does he fight to save his skin. The task of finishing off the fascist beast in its own lair still calls for no little effort on the part of the Red Army and of the troops of our Allies. Everything that is likely to hinder the speedy achievement of victory must be swept aside.

Gripped in the torments of a protracted war, the peoples of Europe are waiting with understandable impatience for the day when the victorious flags of the Allies will be hoisted over Berlin. The blood of the millions of victims of Hitler’s rapacity and the ashes of the towns and villages the Germans have burnt down, cry out for relentless retribution. The vital interests of mankind demand that German imperialism shall not
survive this war; that after the military defeat of Germany she shall be really disarmed, economically as well as militarily and politically. It is strange and monstrous that even today, after the horrors of Hitler rule in the subjugated countries of Europe, after the exposure of the horrible crimes the German fiends have perpetrated in all countries where their feet have trodden, advocates should still be found to plead to the United Nations for mitigation of Germany's lot after the war. It is time to tell these advocates, irrespective of whether they carry the false passports of "Socialists," or speak under the auspices of the Vatican, that their efforts are in vain.

The incoming year must bring not only victory over the enemy, but also a solution of the fundamental problems of post-war organization. The peoples want the victory over Hitler Germany to serve as the foundation of a permanent and durable peace; they want fascism of every shape and form to be eradicated for ever; and they want the principles of democracy and progress to triumph all over world. The Hitlerites are staking their all on the possibility that democracy will fail to overcome the difficulties that confront it, and that it will betray weakness and irresolution in the struggle against the pro-fascist elements. In this gamble they must lose out.

Hitler rule has left a trail of frightful ruin and devastation in a number of countries of Europe; but great is the urge of the people towards regeneration; indomitable is their striving for liberty and independence, and unshakeable their determination to take their fate into their own hands. The political crises and difficulties that arose in some of the liberated countries of Europe at the end of 1944 testify to the fact that the peoples who have endured the horrors of German occupation cannot be satisfied with, or resign themselves to, the return of the regimes and the statesmen whose bankruptcy was proved during the years of the severe trials to which Hitler subjected Europe. The peoples are striving to restore the statehood of which the Hitlerites had robbed them on new, wider and sounder principles. The substantial flaws from which the political organization of pre-war Europe suffered are too obvious, and have cost the European peoples too dear, for them to agree submissively to the restoration of the bankrupt regimes and to giving the pro-fascist Fifth Columns a free hand after their countries have been liberated from Hitler occupation.

The inhabitants of a number of European countries fought the invaders arms in hand. The men and women who have paid for the liberation of their countries with their blood naturally do not wish the destinies of their respective countries again to become playthings in the hands of political cliques which have remained mere onlookers during these bloody battles, which have alienated themselves from their people, and virtually bear a considerable part of the responsibility for the catastrophe that has occurred. The masses of the people want to have governments which can be trusted to protect the national interests and at the same time guarantee the preservation of their democratic rights and liberties. Only a government which relies on the people and is based on a broad democratic foundation can guarantee peace and order in a country.

The incoming year brings the task of erecting the magnificent edifice of the international organization of security—the task of making the outbreak of another war impossible, if not for ever, then at least for a long time to come. The peace-loving nations have shown that they are stronger than the aggressors, that, the hopes of the international pirates notwithstanding, they are capable of acting together and of uniting their efforts for the purpose of defeating aggressors. It would be dangerous, nay, fatal, if we were to ignore the historical law that aggressive nations, which musters forces a long time ahead, are usually more prepared for war than the peace-loving nations. Hence, the peace-loving nations must, at least, set up an effective and powerful organization to protect peace and ensure security, an organization which shall possess both the powers and the necessary forces to avert aggression, or to nip it in the bud.

The guarantee of success in this matter is the unity and coordinated action of the leading Powers of the anti-Hitler coalition, and the friendly cooperation of the big and small countries. During the course of the war these Powers have shown that they are able to act together in the spirit of unity and harmony. It is obvious now that for some countries the bona fide desire for successful cooperation is not only an indispensable condition for their security, but also an important premise for the solution of a number of post-war economic problems. If the
Great Powers, which have borne the brunt of the war against Hitler Germany, continue to act in the spirit of unity and harmony, the international organization of security will prove sufficiently effective and will justify the hopes placed in it.

At the beginning of this year will be held an International Trade Union Conference, whose mission it is to lay the foundations of unity among the organized working class of the democratic countries. The importance of this cannot be exaggerated. The working class, which marches at the head of all working people, is vitally interested in a speedy victory over the enemy, in a just solution of post-war problems, and in the maintenance of durable peace among the nations. This noble aim will be served by the prestige and influence of the united trade union movement of the democratic countries.

The Soviet people welcome the year 1945 with the unshakeable conviction that it is the year in which our just cause will triumph over the enemy. The martial feats of our Soviet people on the field of battle and their labour feats in the rear will be worthily crowned by the victorious peace that will be won by the freedom-loving nations. The New Year will open for our country new pages of unfading glory. Fulfilling its great historical role of saving the civilization of Europe from the fascist pogrom-mongers, the Soviet Union will pursue the struggle to the end, and will occupy a worthy place in the post-war family of peace-loving nations.

The Formation of the Provisional Government of the Polish Republic

On December 31, 1944, exactly on the anniversary of the night on which the representatives of the Polish patriotic organizations gathered in profound secrecy in occupied Warsaw to form the united centre known as the Krajowa Rada Narodowa (National People’s Council) for combating the German invaders, that Council, at a plenary session held in liberated Lublin, adopted a decision to convert the Polish Committee of National Liberation into a Provisional National Government of the Polish Republic. This noteworthy step completes the legitimate course of the events that have been unfolding in Poland during the past year.

In this short space of time, the Polish people, fighting successfully for the liberation of their country from the Hitler invaders and for creating a free, independent and democratic Poland, traversed the great historic road from the formation of the Krajowa Rada Narodowa and the Armia Ludowa (People’s Army) to the formation of the Polish Committee of National Liberation, the formation of the Polish Army and, finally, the formation of the Provisional Government of the Polish Republic.

The idea of forming a Provisional Government naturally sprang from the ranks of the Polish masses. The activities of the Polish Committee of National Liberation, which performed enormous work in restoring Polish statehood on a democratic basis, raised its prestige within and without the country and cemented its ties with the masses. Like the Rada, the Committee came into being amidst the struggle against the German invaders. During this struggle it succeeded in rallying around itself the truly patriotic and democratic forces and organizations in Poland. The men who were promoted by the people to the leadership of the country set themselves the task primarily of continuing and intensifying the struggle against the German invaders in the interests of a strong, democratic Poland now accomplishing her own regeneration.

Under the leadership of the Krajowa Rada Narodowa and the Polish Committee of National Liberation the Polish people organized active and effective assistance to the Red Army in the war against the Germans. This assistance is being rendered both by the armed forces of the Polish people, viz., the Polish Army, and the partisan units which are successfully operating in the Germans’ rear.

The Polish Committee of National Liberation successfully grappled with the extremely complicated tasks connected with the restoration of normal life in the area which only recently has suffered the destructive and corrupting influence of the Hitler occupation. It boldly set to work to solve the problem which was so urgent for the Polish
people and had been calling for solution so long, viz., the problem of the land. The agrarian reform carried out in Poland satisfies the age-long expectations of the Polish peasants and undermines the influence and power of the feudal land magnates.

This resulted in an all-round consolidation of the position of the Polish Committee of National Liberation.

In its program declaration the Provisional Government of the Polish Republic states: “To bring nearer the liberation of the entire country and final victory over Hitler Germany is the principal task of the Provisional Government. The Government will do everything to ensure the fullest participation of the Polish people in the struggle against Hitlerism.”

The activities of the Polish Committee of National Liberation show that the deeds of the men who are at present directing the struggle for liberation of the Polish people conform to their words.

The events of the past year have revealed how wide is the gulf that separates the Polish emigrant clique from the Polish people. The recent reorganization of the Polish Cabinet in London has utterly exposed the shady game which the Polish reactionaries are playing. The claim of this group of politicians, who have alienated themselves from their country, to act as the Polish Government has not a leg to stand on. As press comments in Great Britain and the United States testify, even among those circles abroad in which, unfortunately, the intrigues of the Polish reactionaries found support, voices have been heard recently recognizing the bankruptcy of these reactionaries.

Poland is pursuing her own path, the one and only correct path, the path that leads to strength and independence. This is the path of close cooperation and friendship with her great neighbour, the Soviet Union, the path of close cooperation with the United Nations in the common struggle against Hitler. The Polish emigrant clique possesses neither the forces, the means, nor the opportunities for diverting Poland from that only correct path and plunging her once again into the vortex of reckless gambling in the sphere of foreign policy.

The formation of the Provisional Government of the Polish Republic is an event of great international importance. It is a fresh blow at Hitler Germany and her henchmen, a major victory for democratic Poland, a new gain achieved by the common cause of the United Nations.

The Provisional Government, which has been established by the will of the Polish people on the basis of the Polish Constitution of 1921, which can firmly rely for support on the popular masses and which represents the widest democratic circles is the only legitimate Government of Poland. It will enhance the aid rendered by the Polish people to the Allies in the common fight against Hitler Germany. Its mission is to carry the liberation of Poland to completion and to lay firm foundations for a strong and independent Polish State. There can be no doubt that the Provisional Polish Government will rightfully hold a worthy place among the Governments of the Allied countries and will be accorded recognition by them.

**International Trade Union Unity**

**E. VAZHENIN**

Chairman of the Central Committee of the Munition Workers’ Union of the U.S.S.R.

Every day new facts come to hand which go to prove that the idea of a world trade union conference meets with the hearty approval of the mass of the trade unionists in the democratic countries. It is now beyond question that the initiative taken by the General Council of British Trade Unions, which from the first had the full backing of the Soviet trade unions, was in response to a demand of our times that had fully matured. The organized workers and their labour unions are playing a part in this war against fascist barbarism which it would be truly difficult to exaggerate. It is only natural that the joint struggle of the working class of the democratic countries against the common enemy should give rise to a powerful desire for unity, for the coordination of efforts of the trade union organizations. This is reflected in particular in the articles written on the forthcoming international trade union conference by representa-
tives of the labour movement abroad and published in the preceding issue of the journal The War and the Working Class (No. 24, 1944, Russian edition).

Philip Murray, President of the Congress of Industrial Organizations of the United States, expressed the conviction that the forthcoming world trade union conference would "immediately establish the organization which can be labour's voice in international affairs." Will Lawther, President of the Mine Workers Federation of Great Britain, was confident that out of the world trade union conference "will come unity, which will prove of incalculable value to the trade unionists of the whole world...." Similar sentiments inspire the article of Jack Tanner, President of the Amalgamated Engineering Union of Great Britain.

Soviet trade unionists, for their part, ardently support the idea of international trade union unity. It will be the duty of the representatives of the trade union organizations of the various countries assembled at that conference in London to discuss and come to agreement as to the best method of defending the fundamental and vital interests of the most advanced and progressive class of modern times—the working class, whose interests coincide with those of all working people and of all mankind. Soviet trade unionists cherish the fond hope that the conference will successfully cope with all the difficulties that may arise and that it will lay the foundations of trade union unity of the democratic countries.

The international trade union conference will meet at a time when the world is still enveloped in the lurid flames of war. In this concluding stage of the war of the freedom-loving nations against Hitler Germany, there devolves upon the working class and its trade union organizations the highly important and responsible task of mobilizing all efforts for the earliest defeat of the enemy. The struggle is drawing to a close, but it is not yet over. The enemy is mortally wounded, but he is not yet despatched. To permit not the slightest relaxation of effort but, on the contrary, to exert still greater effort for the earliest achievement of complete victory over the enemy—such is the sacred duty of the organized workers.

One cannot fail to see that the more complete the rout of fascist Germany, the worst enemy of the liberty-loving nations, the more promising will be the condition of the labouring masses in the post-war world. Both the fulfilment of the primary task of the working class—its most active participation in the annihilation of fascist barbarism—and the furtherance of its post-war tasks make imperative the establishment of genuine federation of the trade union movement on an international scale.

This is so important and essential that even now, when the preparations for the world trade union conference are still in progress, it deserves attention and preliminary discussion on the part of trade unionists in all democratic countries. Unfortunately, it must be confessed that this question was not dealt with adequately in the above-mentioned articles. While Philip Murray noted that the chief task of the forthcoming conference was to set up an international trade union organization, the authors of the other two articles confined themselves to much less specific remarks about the necessity for international trade union unity. If this vagueness conceals the hope that the federation which before the war united the trade unions of a number of countries, the so-called Amsterdam International,* will be resurrected in one form or another, then, to speak frankly, this is bound to call forth serious apprehensions.

The future international trade union organization will be confronted with tasks of great magnitude and importance. They comprise above all the mobilization of the efforts and the energy of the working class for the continuation of the war against Hitler Germany until fascism shall have been completely and finally defeated. The worker masses cannot count on peacefully pursuing their labours, on freedom and security for themselves and their children, unless the sinister forces of fascism have been destroyed—the forces that are a deadly menace to liberty, independence and the very life of the nations. Can there be a more honourable task for trade union organizations than that of rallying the workers of all democratic countries to the banner of struggle for the achievement of this lofty aim? Furthermore, the international federation of trade unions will have to grapple with such important problems as the effective defence of stable and enduring peace after the ultimate defeat of Hitler Germany, the determined and consistent defence of the economic interests of the working class and the defence of the rights and of the very existence of the workers' trade union organizations.

* International Federation of Trade Unions.
The future international trade union federation must undoubtedly become an important factor in the maintenance of lasting peace after this war has been brought to a victorious close. The long-suffering peoples are yearning for a lasting peace. The war must not only end with the victory of the United Nations over Hitler Germany; it must also lead to stable peace for a long time to come. Will the foundations of such a peace be actually laid? This is a question which is worrying the masses of the democratic countries and, in the first place, their most conscious and progressive section—the organized workers. For the workers cannot but realize that the stability and endurance of the future peace depend upon how the war will end and how decisive and complete the defeat of Hitler Germany will be. In mobilizing the working class for the complete rout of Hitler Germany and her fascist allies, the future international trade union federation must give every assistance to the efforts made to establish a genuine international security organization, and must give constant support to the measures to be taken by this organization to ensure lasting peace.

Philip Murray expresses the most widespread opinion when he writes: “Never again must our peoples be called upon to endure the horrible sufferings which this war has inflicted upon them.”

This statement, indisputable as it may be, demands definite practical conclusions. And it is difficult not to agree with Murray when he says in the same article that after the last war no such strong representative international body came into existence capable of counteracting the forces which nourished international fascism. We know quite well that in the face of the aggression which was being hatched by Hitlerism the Amsterdam International proved impotent. This federation, whose duty one would have thought was to watch over and defend the fundamental interests of the working class, actually pursued a policy of complete non-resistance to the sinister forces of fascism, which was openly preparing for bloodthirsty aggression. And it could not have been otherwise inasmuch as the Amsterdam International pursued the same political line as the League of Nations, which had proved incapable of combating fascist aggression that was assuming ever greater proportions during the pre-war period; and it could not have been otherwise inasmuch as the leaders of this International in practice subordinated their policy to the Munichism of Chamberlain and Daladier. Naturally, the new international trade union organization, whose mission must be to justify the hopes reposed in it by the working class, will even at first blush be inherently quite different in this regard from the trade union federation that existed before the war.

Furthermore, the international trade union organization will be confronted by the extensive task of defending the economic interests of the working class. When the war ends a number of extremely difficult and complex problems will arise in this sphere—from the protection of labour and the fight for a definite standard of wages, to measures for combating unemployment, that terrible scourge of the workers in capitalist countries, the mitigation of which depends upon broad international economic cooperation. Many of these vitally important problems for the working class can be successfully solved only by means of mutual support and international cooperation among the trade unions of the various countries with a single centre to unite them.

Economic problems of the post-war period are being insistently raised and discussed in the trade union press and in the utterances of trade union leaders of various countries. The very complexity and difficulty of these problems only serve to stress the urgency of achieving trade union unity on an international scale. Both governments and employers’ organizations, as well as individual capitalist magnates who put themselves above society and the state will be the more compelled to reckon with the opinion, interests, and aspirations of the organized workers, the more solid, united and powerful is the trade union federation which represents them.

Everybody knows that as regards defending the economic interests of the workers the Amsterdam International also asserted itself very feebly. During the period of prolonged unemployment affecting millions of workers in a number of the biggest countries, the period of severe economic hardships for large masses of the working people, and of terrific international economic rivalry in the world market, the voice of organized labour was not as strong as it should have been. Clearly, in this respect too, the structure and activities of the new international trade union organization must differ from those of the Amsterdam International.

Finally, another essential task that con-
fronts the working class of the democratic countries and its international trade union federation is to defend the rights and the very existence of the trade unions. There is no need to go far afield for examples or to delve deep into history, to realize how real are the dangers which threaten the trade unions. Of course, trade union organizations which shirk their direct duty of daily and actively championing the needs and interests of the working class are not open to any particular menace from the side of the strong and influential enemies of the working class. But pre-war experience teaches that those trade union organizations which actively defend the lawful interests of the working people, display consistent firmness in doing so, possess the necessary power of resistance and exercise influence upon the masses are frequently subject to attack. Very often their rights are not properly protected by the authorities, who are all too prone to favour the moneybags. The prestige of the international organization must be utilized for a consistent and far-reaching defence of the rights of trade union organizations, both internationally and nationally.

Here too the pre-war international federation failed to grapple with the tasks confronting it. And that is not surprising when we remember that many of the leaders of the Amsterdam International, especially among the reactionary leaders of the German trade unions, deemed it far more important to weave anti-Soviet intrigues and to vilify the only country in the world where the working class was in power. It is therefore clear that in the matter of defending trade union rights, too, the future international trade union federation must adopt a new and different course.

The future international trade union organization must possess sufficient influence and prestige for the successful fulfilment of the main tasks we have briefly outlined. It can only derive strength and prestige from the unity and solidarity of its ranks.

In this respect one cannot refrain from remarking that the Amsterdam International was never an international organization in the true sense of the word. What is more, it did not even strive to become a genuine international organization. On the contrary, it set itself up against the trade union movement of the Soviet Union. In other countries, moreover, it strove to prevent the trade union movement from developing along pro-

gressive lines, from increasing its fighting preparedness to defend the vital interests of the working class.

One of the most important and valuable lessons of the present war, and of the close cooperation among the democratic powers that has risen in the course of it, is that many of the biases and prejudices which prevented even many leaders of the trade union movement abroad from seeing what was happening in the Soviet Union have been consumed in the conflagration of war. This achievement, which has at last opened the way for fruitful and beneficial cooperation between the trade union movement of the bourgeois-democratic countries and the trade unions of our socialist country, must be consolidated.

Unfortunately, there are still leaders in the trade union movement abroad who place their prejudices and bigotry above the working class interests which have been entrusted to their care. The position of the leaders of the American Federation of Labour, who refused to have anything to do with the forthcoming international trade union conference, has been condemned by all who have the cause of the workers at heart. This condemnation has also been reflected in the articles by foreign writers printed in our journal. Despite the protests of a number of unions affiliated to the American Federation of Labour, however, the position of its leaders has remained unchanged. Its president, William Green, has made repeated attempts to explain and justify his profoundly reactionary policy, which is tending to undermine the incipient international unity of the organized workers in the struggle against Hitler Germany. In the Federationist, organ of the AFL, he again cites in justification the fiction that the Soviet trade unions are not free organizations and that they are headed by government officials.

The Soviet trade unions have been and are actively and successfully vindicating the fundamental and vital interests of the working class of our country and of the whole world. Green knows perfectly well that the Soviet trade unions are headed by chosen representatives of the working class. Apparently the obvious discontent of the members of the trade unions affiliated to the AFL prompts him to keep explaining why the American Federation of Labour refuses to cooperate with other trade union organizations at an international conference. There
is no justification for this. Actually, he has no explanation to offer.

It must be assumed that the world trade union conference will not ignore the splitting manoeuvres of the leaders of the American Federation of Labour; that it will express its weighty opinion on such activities, which are detrimental to the interests of the working class.

The world trade union conference will meet in London in a few weeks' time. The masses of trade unionists in the democratic countries repose the profoundest hopes in the conference. They expect that out of the meeting of trade union representatives of all the democratic countries will arise a strong, united and effective international trade union federation that will represent the interests of the organized workers of the democratic countries. This is a big and important task. It must be successfully accomplished.

---

Freedom of the Press

A Frank Talk With Mr. Kent Cooper

N. BALTIISKY

Mr. Kent Cooper is the Associate Executive Director of the Associated Press, the largest news agency in America. As is well known, this agency is the main source of information for the United States press. In America they say that it is a machine for making thirty million people think alike at the same time. Naturally, therefore, the utterances of the head of such an influential agency cannot be ignored.

Not very long ago, Mr. Cooper, speaking at a meeting of the National Association of Editors in Chicago, referred to the importance of ensuring freedom of the press all over the world, particularly if the future organization for international security is to work successfully. Taken by itself, this idea would deserve wide support, the more so that Mr. Cooper quite correctly urged the necessity of securing freedom of the press primarily in the aggressor countries. But Mr. Cooper himself created unexpected confusion on this important practical question by asserting that after the present war nine-tenths of the nations of the world would support the principle of a free press "except the Soviet Union and China." We, of course, are not called upon to answer for China; as far as our country is concerned, however, Mr. Cooper can set his mind at ease. The Soviet Union will steadfastly maintain the widest freedom of the press.

"Russia," said Mr. Cooper, "has never known freedom of the press as we know it." If by this statement he merely meant that freedom of the press in our country differs very materially from that in America, we would raise no objection. But Mr. Cooper, on principle, recognizes only that system of freedom of the press to which he is accustomed, and he makes no attempt to conceal his desire to impose an exactly similar system upon other countries, and even upon our country. Possessed of some sense of reality, however, he doubts whether it is worth while "to begin" an attempt of this sort with the Soviet Union, as it would be "difficult to accomplish there." Yes, it is indeed not worth while entertaining such an idea; the Soviet people would never agree to change their system of freedom of the press for the American system.

Evidently Mr. Cooper is very ill-informed about the actual status of the Soviet press. He has taken at its face value one of the most absurd inventions of the detractors of the Soviet Union to the effect that there is no free press in our country. We Soviet people have sometimes met in the works of well-known American authors and publicists the assertion that there is no freedom of the press in America; but the Soviet reader is accustomed to forming a definite opinion on any question only after he has sufficiently familiarized himself with the facts. Lower down we shall endeavour, in the light of some of the main facts, to inform the Soviet reader about the kind of freedom of the press that exists in America, and Mr. Cooper about freedom of the press in the Soviet Union. The latter is extremely important for us, because it is Mr. Cooper's business to disseminate information about all countries of the world, and if we do not take the trouble
to make him more familiar with the workings of the Soviet press, who knows what rumours he may spread about us in America!

Does Mr. Cooper really believe that the Soviet people are opposed to freedom of the press? No. He does not seriously believe such nonsense. In the speech referred to above, he himself quoted an example which proved the very opposite, *viz.*, the well-known declaration of the Moscow Conference of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Three Great Powers concerning Italy, urging the necessity of ensuring freedom of the press in that country. In citing this example, Mr. Cooper admitted that, in this case, the Soviet Government championed the cause of freedom of the press. He then went on to say, literally the following:

"Russia is willing to have a free press throughout the world except Russia!"

This curious utterance of Mr. Cooper's is a classical example of how a man who tries to be too clever becomes so confused in his judgement that he sees things topsy-turvy. According to Mr. Cooper, we Soviet people attach so little importance to freedom of the press that we do our utmost to dispose of every ounce of it abroad and do without it ourselves. But had Mr. Cooper not tried to be too clever, and had he attempted, without prejudice, to ascertain the real history of the rise of the Soviet State and the real state of affairs in our country, he would have seen that the situation is quite different. It is precisely because we in our country won and put into practice the widest freedom of the press that we, quite naturally, attach great value to freedom of the press in other countries and, as Mr. Cooper said, are "willing to have a free press throughout the world."

This does not mean, however, that we wish to thrust our Soviet form of freedom of the press upon other countries. For present-day Italy, for example, we think that the bourgeois-democratic and not the Soviet form of freedom of the press is expedient. Why? Because there is no social and political system in Italy that would make it possible for the Soviet form of freedom of the press to be introduced.

What a pity Mr. Cooper is not familiar with our Soviet Constitution! Strictly speaking, the head of a large news agency should be familiar with the Constitutions of all important countries. Had he made himself familiar with the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. he would have realized that the wide freedom of the press that is enjoyed by the citizens of our country can be secured only under Soviet conditions, under a socialist system. It is one thing to register by law the formal right of citizens to publish newspapers and magazines to serve their interests, but it is another thing to ensure for the people the opportunity to enjoy that right. It is well known that in most of the countries of Europe and America the main factor which restricts the freedom of the press is not that this freedom is not the recognized right of all citizens, but that broad strata of the people, and their organizations, lack the wherewithal to publish newspapers and magazines. In the Soviet Union alone, where all power belongs to the working people of town and country as represented by the Soviets of Working People's Deputies, is the legal right of the citizens in this respect ensured by the fact that they and their organizations have at their disposal printing plants, paper, public buildings, means of communication and other requisites. All these are guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution.

This gave a tremendous impetus to the growth of the press in our country. In 1913, the total number of newspapers published in Russia amounted to 859, with a total circulation of 2,700,000. In 1939, however, we had about 9,000 newspapers, with a total circulation of 38,000,000. Thus, the number of newspapers increased tenfold, and their circulation fourteenfold. The quantitative growth of the press is not the only point, however. The main point is that in old Russia the entire legal press, with the exception of a few shortlived publications, served the interests of a handful of tyrants who oppressed the people, whereas in the Soviet Union the press belongs to the working people and serves their interests. This also explains why not only professional journalists but also innumerable members of the public at large—workers, collective farmers, scientists, salaried workers, authors, etc., etc., are found among the contributors to Soviet newspapers.

From the very outset, the establishment of the Soviet regime enlarged the opportunities for the majority of the people actually to enjoy the benefits of freedom of the press on a scale unprecedented anywhere in the world; and we are profoundly convinced that Soviet democracy ensures the most progressive form of freedom of the press: We Soviet people, however, far from deny the impor-
tance of other forms of freedom of the press. In countries where the social and economic system that formerly existed in our country now prevails, other forms of democracy are useful and important. This does not mean, however, that only the American newspaper system is suitable for all those countries. We cannot understand why France, Italy, Yugoslavia, or any other European country, should be obliged to import its model of freedom of the press from across the Atlantic. We can fully appreciate Mr. Cooper's fondness for the American method, but if we examine this method more closely we shall scarcely find it possible to recommend it as a universal model for the entire bourgeois-democratic world.

Let the reader judge for himself.

* * *

In America a large newspaper is primarily a privately owned commercial enterprise. It is owned by its publisher. The well-known American publicist, W. A. White, of the Emporia Gazette, has observed, not without mortification, that journalism was once "a noble calling, but is now an eight-percent investment and an industry." Many other American specialists in the same line have emphasized the fact that it is possible to start a large newspaper in the United States today only if one possesses a large amount of capital, or connections with big capital.

True, there are numerous small newspapers in the United States which are not owned by big capital; but the circulation and influence of these hundreds of small newspapers put together are less than those of any single large newspaper. The competition of the rich newspapers kills the circulation of those newspapers which fail to obtain the support of big capital. The former have ten times as many pages as the latter, but they are all sold at the same low price. The price of any large American newspaper is much below its cost of production, but in spite of its cheapness it brings its owner a substantial and regular profit. How is this miracle to be explained? The answer is very simple. The newspaper publisher obtains his main revenue not from subscriptions or sales, but from advertisements. For example, according to Mr. Bent, the cost of producing The New York Times is fourteen cents a copy, but it sells for two. The advertisers pay the difference.

The annual expenditure on advertising in the United States amounts to the enormous sum of over 1,500,000,000 dollars, and although, undoubtedly, not every advertisement published in the press is a bribe, nevertheless, one cannot ignore the utterances of American publicists and of men prominent in public affairs who point out that in the United States advertising has become one of the principal channels of newspaper corruption. For example, the well-known journalist George Seldes, who has written a number of popular works on the American press, stated in his book The Facts Are..., published in 1943, that he had checked up on the firms which had done most advertising in 1940 and had found that each of them had spent on advertising during that year sums ranging from 6,000,000 to 15,000,000 dollars. Many of these advertisements were subsequently vetoed by the Federal Trade Board as misrepresenting the truth and misleading the consumers. But the newspapers which accepted these advertisements did not print the announcement that they had been vetoed, preferring to keep the consumers in ignorance so as not to fall out with the firm which had paid so generously for the advertisements. In those cases in which the political complexion of a firm was exposed, emphasized Seldes, when, for example, there was talk of General Motors sabotaging the war output program, of the Alcoa sabotaging the output of aluminium in secret collusion with the Hitler aluminium trusts, of the role played by Nazi capital in Stirling Products, etc., the newspapers interested in these firms' advertisements persistently hushed up even the results of the official enquiries.

Unwholesome facts of this kind cannot possibly occur in the Soviet Union, where the entire press is controlled by workers' organizations and is not in the least dependent upon revenues from advertisements. No one in the world can, or ever could, accuse the Soviet press of being corrupt. Our press can justly pride itself on the fact that it unswervingly represents the public conscience and ethics and helps the state to expose every kind of abuse, or any selfish action committed against the public interest.

In the U.S.A. as in a number of other countries, advertising, although the most widespread, is not the only form of bribing the press. The big banks and trusts have other means of influencing the press to the detriment of the veracity of the news and views it publishes, the more so that many of them have acquired large blocks of shares in newspaper concerns.
One can understand the profound indignation at this state of affairs expressed by the best champions of public morality, such as Upton Sinclair, but they often, somewhat one-sidedly, blame the publishers personally for this. They fail to take into account the fact that like all other businessmen in America, newspaper publishers have a legal right to obtain a good profit from the enterprise in which they have invested their capital. Such is the system; and under such a system, naturally, many good intentions are inevitably overshadowed by the dominant aim—to raise profits. The trouble is, however, that publishing enterprises do not manufacture machines, or canned meat, but newspapers, the contents of which are easily damaged by contact with the profit motive.

The sufferers are not only the newspaper readers, but also honest journalists who, being entirely dependent on the publisher, are often compelled, in his interests, to hush up or garble the truth. Many of them speak of this in tones of deep chagrin. For example, many years ago John Swinton, when editor of The New York Tribune, speaking at the New York Press Association on the freedom of the press stated:

"There is no such thing in America as an independent press, unless it is in the country towns. You know it, and I know it."

"There is not one of you who dares express an honest opinion.... I am paid 150 dollars a week for keeping my honest opinion out of the paper I am connected with. Others of you are paid similar salaries for doing similar things. If I should permit honest opinions to be printed in one issue of my paper... before twenty-four hours my occupation would be gone.... We are the tools and the vassals of rich men behind the scenes."

This sounds like an exaggeration, but George Seldes, who has over thirty years of American newspaper service behind him, agrees with it; and he concludes his book Freedom of the Press, which is written on the basis of an exceptionally rich collection of concrete facts, with the following statement: "We have a very few liberal, fearless newspapers; but we have never had a free press."

According to Mr. Cooper the opposite is the case. He would have us believe that the United States is a Paradise as far as freedom of the press is concerned. This contradiction puts us in a dilemma. Whom shall we agree with—Mr. Cooper or Mr. Seldes? We would like to agree with Mr. Cooper, because he, one would think, should know all about this subject. But Mr. Seldes quotes numerous facts, and as everybody knows, facts are stubborn things. Evidently, the position is that while not in the least challenging the correctness of the facts quoted by Mr. Seldes, we can draw a different conclusion from the one he draws, viz., that freedom of the press does exist in the United States, but it is not enjoyed by everybody to an equal degree. Even Mr. Seldes cannot deny that Americans who own enough capital enjoy freedom of the press to the full. On the other hand, many Americans admit that the less capital one possesses the less freedom of the press he enjoys, and those who have no capital at all possess very little opportunity of enjoying freedom of the press, even though the law recognizes their right to do so.

It is well known that freedom of the press is totally absent only in fascist countries. Compared with such tyranny even the most restricted freedom of the press is undoubtedly of some value and deserves being defended from the encroachments of the fascists.

But Mr. Cooper is obviously mistaken when, as is evident from his statement, he identifies freedom of the press with absence of all control or guidance of the press. For example, he tries to prove the correctness of his assertion that there is no freedom of the press in the Soviet Union by arguing that "the Soviets retained control of the news agency" and the press. Yes, in our country the press is controlled and guided, but anyone who thinks that freedom of the press precludes all control and guidance is mistaken. To be honest, one must admit that there is not a single newspaper or news agency in any country which is not controlled and guided. Hence, the issue is not whether control and guidance are exercised, but who exercises them, and how, and in whose interests.

In our country control and guidance of the press are exercised by the Soviets of Working People's Deputies, also by various public organizations, and primarily by the Bolshevik Party. This control has fully proved its value as a means of promoting the interests of the working people, in general, and of securing for them the widest enjoyment of the freedom of the press in particular. Thanks to this, the press in our country is of incalculable importance as a factor promoting the cultural and the moral and political aspects of the education of the popular masses.
In America, however, control and guidance of the press are, as a rule, exercised by the private owners of the respective newspapers—the publishers and principal shareholders of the newspapers or news agencies. In stating this fact we neither praise nor blame the American system; but in so far as Mr. Cooper wishes to impose the American newspaper system upon the European countries, we cannot refrain from observing that from the democratic and progressive point of view this would not be expedient at all. The European countries which are rehabilitating their democratic systems can undoubtedly find more democratic forms of freedom of the press. If, for example, the democratic anti-fascist organizations and parties in those countries, even with all the weaknesses and shortcomings they suffer from, exercise control and guidance over the press, this would be preferable from the point of view of social progress to the present American system, under which so many newspapers are controlled by private businessmen who pursue, primarily, their own narrow interests.

This peculiar feature of the American system explains why the press, instead of being a medium for the education of the masses, rather, by its feverish quest for sensation, stultifies and blunts the moral consciousness of its readers, as for example, when the exploits of a slick and successful gangster like Al Capone, are described in sensational articles at great length for many weeks and even months. Moreover, the American system of guiding the press determines the political complexion of many of the newspapers in the United States.

A psychological explanation of this phenomenon has been provided by Nelson Crawford, who has been editor of many publications, Secretary of the American Association of Teachers of Journalism and the author of *The Ethics of Journalism*. He wrote the following:

> "Closely related to ignorance and inertia, but even more powerful in its influence against complete and impartial truth-telling by newspapers, is fear . . . It is not physical fear . . . It is rather intellectual and spiritual fear . . . Fear in journalism begins with the reporter and permeates every part of the newspaper organization . . . Fundamentally it is fear on the part of the reporter and employees immediately above the reporter . . . He believes that the publisher wants only stories with a conservative bias and that if he writes an important political or economic story showing no bias, or showing radical or liberal bias, the story will not be printed and he may be fired . . ."

During the past decade many American journalists have been fighting for the right to organize in order to liberate themselves from this humiliating position, but most of the publishers and the Associated Press have stubbornly opposed this. And I am afraid that Mr. Cooper is displeased with the example set by Soviet press workers in this respect, for all of them belong to their trade union.

An integral part of the American newspaper system is the well-known tendency of many big newspapers to combat progressive legislation promoted with the object of protecting the interests of the broad masses of the people. How many times in the history of the past and present centuries have presidents of the great Transatlantic republic, from Thomas Jefferson to Franklin D. Roosevelt, been subjected to furious attacks by big newspapers for promoting such legislation? Just as Jefferson was accused of having connections with the Jacobins, so Roosevelt has been repeatedly obliged to refute the accusations of the press that he was an agent of . . . Communism.

Ten or eleven years ago, when Roosevelt began to introduce certain measures to reduce the working day, raise wages, restrict the exploitation of children, and so forth, with the object of reducing unemployment, which was so rife at that time, the newspaper industry took up an attitude that was more reactionary than that of other industries and flatly refused to submit to the new labour code. The chairman of the publishers' committee stated that "the freedom of the press would be abridged by any law passed by Congress that would unreasonably raise the cost of production." Indeed, on the pretext of "protecting freedom of the press" the reactionary publishers launched a raging, tearing newspaper campaign against the Government's new labour code. Roosevelt was obliged to lecture the American press and to explain that freedom of the press did not mean "freedom to work children, or to do business in a fire trap, or violate the laws against obscenity, libel and lewdness." General H. Johnson, Roosevelt's right-hand man, who had predicted that the publishers would begin to throw "dead cats," subsequently stated that most of these "dead cats" were not honest and substantial, but synthetic, and that "the biggest imitation dead cat is the one about the freedom of the press."

This last expression was of course an
overstatement uttered in the heat of controversy and we do not approve of it, because it cannot be said that freedom of the press, if correctly interpreted as a demand for giving the people more opportunity for its actual enjoyment, has lost all virility and justification under American conditions. It is no accident that the progressive, liberal and labour press in the United States is so feeble, not only compared with the American press as a whole, but even with the reactionary and out-and-out pro-fascist Hearst, Patterson and McCormick press.

** **

The American system of freedom of the press has often been responsible for the wrong attitude adopted by the biggest American newspapers towards international events in general, and towards the policy of the fascist states on the one hand and that of the Soviet Union on the other, in particular.

It is common knowledge that during the entire interval between Mussolini’s seizure of power and Italy’s war with Abyssinia, the most influential organs of the American press made scarcely any pronouncements against Italian fascism. G. Seldes attributes this to the fact that the House of Morgan and other international banking houses in the United States had granted Mussolini loans amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars.

"The American press," he writes, "began to tell the truth about Italian fascism and the German situation only after the Morgan loans had been repudiated in both countries, or had slumped beyond hope of profits."

Those American manufacturers and traders who were engaged up to the present war in exporting munitions to Hitler Germany and to Japan exercised no little influence among the leading groups of the National Association of Manufacturers, and this organization maintained close contact with the American Newspaper Publishers’ Association. The Hitler clique utilized all the economic connections which the big German concerns (I. G. Farbenindustrie and others) continued to maintain in America for promoting their political propaganda. Moreover, the Hitler government spent vast sums of money in the United States for the purpose of influencing public opinion.

All this left visible traces in the columns of many American newspapers. The clearer it became in Europe that Hitler was preparing for war, the bigger became the head-
leged to have been achieved by Kolchak, Denikin, Wrangel and other Whiteguard generals. All in all, according to The New York Times, these “liberators” took three or four times more Red Army men prisoner than there were in the whole Soviet army.

This was the fantastic light in which the history of our country was presented in the columns of The New York Times, and this newspaper was by no means the worst of the distorting mirrors of that day among the big American newspapers. On the contrary, already at that time it had the reputation of being a serious newspaper, and in most cases it utilized information it received from such a reputable news agency as the Associated Press.

The American newspapers were equally ruthless in their treatment of the truth in 1929-40, during the three months of the Finnish-Soviet war. Day in and day out they published the sensational stories their correspondents in Finland sent them about mythical “feats” and “victories” of the Finnish forces. Subsequently, many of these correspondents, like Walter Kerr of The New York Herald-Tribune, for example, admitted that they were far behind the firing line all the time, and that “no correspondent has ever seen the troops in action.” In the summer of 1940 the well-known Institute for Propaganda Analysis issued a digest of the American press on the Finnish campaign, and summed it up with the statement that “in the Russo-Finnish war there was a total blackout of truth.”

The year 1941 witnessed a sharp change. Since then, the reputable American newspapers have shown ever so much more regard for the truth about the Soviet Union and, on the other hand, far from boosting Hitler Germany, they have been exposing her. True, the pro-fascist newspapers in the United States continue to slander us and do their utmost to help the fascists, but even they are now doing this more discreetly and in a more veiled form than before. The American press is sounding a different note today. The degree of truth and honesty of this press has grown considerably owing to the participation of the United States in the common struggle of the freedom-loving nations against fascist Germany.

This is an important change and marks enormous progress.

In his speech on the necessity of ensuring freedom of the press all over the world, Mr. Kent Cooper referred to the enormous progress made in the Soviet Union. We are very pleased to hear that Mr. Cooper now refers to us in terms of praise, but his explanation shows that this praise is undeserved. He said: “Russia has already adopted the technique of the press of the democracies in many things.” We, of course, are always willing to adopt the advanced technique of other countries; but apart from a certain number of printing machines, it can scarcely be said that we have acquired anything of value for our press from abroad. On the other hand, America has indeed made very considerable progress in raising the political level of her press during the past four or five years.

Strangely enough, Mr. Cooper has failed to note this progress. If he had even cursorily compared the information which the American newspapers now receive from the Associated Press with the tendentious material they obtained from that news agency as recently as 1938-40, he would have seen the enormous difference in its degree of impartiality at once. But this is not all. During the past few years many of the influential American newspapers have completely freed themselves of the incubus of isolationism. Formerly they flirted with the fascist aggressors, but today they often urge mutual understanding and cooperation with the Soviet Union in bringing the war to a successful conclusion, and also in ensuring peace after the war. Is this not enormous progress?

If only we could consolidate this valuable achievement so that it may not be lost when the war comes to an end! This is extremely important as a guarantee for a durable peace, for, as even Mr. Cooper observed, the success of the future international organization for ensuring security on the basis of the unanimity and harmony of the leading Great Powers will depend to a large extent upon the collaboration of the press.

Mr. Cooper is mistaken, however, in thinking that the American system of freedom of the press can by itself guarantee the stability and permanence of the progress achieved. It is common knowledge that in the period between the First World War and the Second the Soviet press alone consistently called upon the peace-loving nations to unite their efforts to protect world security, whereas most of the American press served to cause disunity in the camp of the peace-loving countries. Hence, it is not the Ameri-
can but the Soviet system of freedom of the press which, in this respect too, guarantees that the press will steadily pursue a progressive line.

Mr. Cooper, however, sees things topsyturvy. He even gave utterance to the “forecast” that “in future the Soviet Government will be sufficiently strong to be able to well afford to grant the boon of a free press.” Oh, Mr. Cooper! We have had a strong government for ever so long! The trouble is that there is something wrong with your eyesight!

Last year an American physiologist made the following experiment on his organs of vision: he began to wear a pair of spectacles through which he saw everything upside down. After strenuous exercise during the course of several weeks, he succeeded in training his eyes to see things through these spectacles in their normal positions. Then he discarded these spectacles, and everything seemed upside down. He was obliged to exercise his vision very strenuously before he could restore it to normal.

Mr. Cooper wore anti-Soviet spectacles for a long time, evidently since 1917. Now at last, judging by the general tone of his utterances, he has cast them aside. But it looks as though he is experiencing the same trouble as that experienced by the above-mentioned physiologist and now sees many things upside down. He too will have to exercise his vision very strenuously to restore it to normal.

---

The Foreign Press On Polish Affairs

M. Berezansky

THE FOREIGN PRESS and radio continue to devote considerable attention to Polish affairs. The sensational journalists obtain most of their material from the isolated little world of reactionary Polish emigrés who have built a nest for themselves in London. This little world is continuously swept by “storms,” although only storms in tea cups.

Only very recently the columns of the British and American newspapers teemed with headlines such as: “Mikolajczyk Brings Satisfactory Proposals From Moscow,” “Mikolajczyk Has Established Relations With Russia and the Lublin Committee,” “Mikolajczyk Is to Return to Moscow Soon to Conclude a Final Agreement,” and so forth.

But Mikolajczyk did not return to Moscow. His colleagues in the emigré government threw off their masks by spurning the very idea of an agreement, and Mikolajczyk resigned. “President” Raczkiewicz entrusted the task of forming a new emigré government to Kwapiszki. This caused a stir among most diverse British and American circles. Montgomery, the diplomatic observer of The News Chronicle, wrote that Kwapiszki “is known to hold strongly anti-Soviet views, and any government he might be able to form from among Poles in London would almost inevitably reflect his attitude. That being so ... the British Government would have to consider most carefully whether it could continue to give such government its recognition and support.”

Kwapinski was compelled to abandon the attempt to form a cabinet. Raczkiewicz then pushed into the foreground Arciszewski—Kwapinski’s political double. In this connection the influential Yorkshire Post wrote that “it is hard to see how Arciszewski can be better than Kwapiszki.” Nevertheless, Arciszewski formed a cabinet.

Mikolajczyk and his group refused to enter the new government. Commenting on the character of this government The Tribune wrote that it “confirms the worst fears,” and emphasized that it is men of the type of Berezowski, representing the right fascist wing of the National Democrats, “who determine the character of the new government.” As regards the program of the Arciszewski Cabinet, The Sunday Pictorial formulated it briefly and succinctly in the words: “It wants to fight the Russians.”

When deciding to go all out, the Polish emigré clique must have been aware that, by the very logic of things, its gamble would gravely imperil the, so to speak, status of the emigré government. But this did not restrain the reckless gamblers. Even such an old champion of Polish reactionary circles as the London Observer wrote:

“The members of the new Polish Government are prepared for the possibility that the other Allied Governments may eventually withdraw recognition of the new Polish Government. But they are resolved to take risks, and one of their preoccupations at the present time is to secure financial means for carrying on their political activities if this should take such an undesirable turn.”
Strictly speaking the American radio commentator, Steele said nothing new when in describing what was behind the intractable attitude of the Polish reactionaries he said that Polish emigrant circles in London simply do not want an agreement with the Soviet Union, for they understand that the ruling landlord class cannot remain in power in Poland.

In the opinion of some well-informed foreign correspondents, the Polish reactionaries are aware that the people of liberated Poland will never consent to the restoration of the totalitarian Constitution of 1935 and will undoubtedly reject the claims of the bankrupt emigrant politicians to power in their country. Having lost hope of an immediate return to Poland, the pro-fascist elements have decided to adopt an uncompromising attitude, and to build up in Great Britain, the United States and other countries an extensive organization for the purpose of disrupting the new democratic state system of Poland, and also for fomenting intrigues with the view to undermining the unity of the Allies. The reactionary Polish emigrés make no secret of the fact that their only "chance" lies in provoking a conflict between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers. The emigrant "government" is to serve as the legal centre which is to coordinate the subversive activities of groups operating far removed from the light of day. These groups are headed by Sosnkowski, Anders, Chodacki, Bielecki, Gantowski, Matuszewski, and others. With the aid of the Polish intelligence service, the notorious Second Department of the Polish General Staff, which represents the principal organizational weapon of these reactionary groups, the Polish emigrés intend to establish a base of operations in Canada. They are already transferring funds to that country, depositing them in various banks under different names. Polish spies are energetically establishing connections with pro-fascist groups in different countries. Their secret organization is plotting and, as far as it is able, is already committing terrorist acts against groups and individuals in Poland who stand for a democratic system of government and support the policy of establishing good-neighbourly relations with the Soviet Union. At the same time, the reactionary Polish land magnates are looking around with longing eyes in search of foreign bayonets which might undertake to protect their vast estates.

In their criminal fascist activities, the reactionary Polish emigrants and their agents in Poland naturally receive the wholehearted support of the Hitlerites. In an appeal to the soldiers of the Polish Army issued in leaflet form by the German Command we read the following:

"If the situation prevents you from crossing the line to come over to the side of the Germans, try to join one of the partisan units of the Armia Krajowa operating in the rear of the Bolsheviks."

The German Command must have good reason for conducting propaganda in favour of the Armia Krajowa, which is operating under the orders of the Arciszewskis, Berezowski and Sosnkowski. The German General Staff must have good grounds for claiming certain rights in relation to the leadership of the Armia Krajowa. We learn some very interesting details about this business from the statements, published in the Lublin Glos Ludu, of Polish partisans, who quite recently fought their way through the enemy's lines and joined the Polish Army. Here is one of these statements:

"The Germans are behaving like wild beasts. They are robbing and killing the inhabitants. But the Germans are not alone in this. The same applies to those who have sold themselves to the Germans—the gentlemen from Narodowe Sily Zbrojne (the organization which is directly subordinated to Berezowski, the present Minister for the Interior in the Arciszewski cabinet) and from the Armia Krajowa... They have thrown off their masks and are openly swaggering about in the uniforms of the SS. They boast that General Bór is forming an army and a Polish Government in Cracow. They flaunt German newspapers containing portraits of Bór and his Staff and pictures of officers and soldiers of the Armia Krajowa marching past Germans in parade. These illustrations show the 'leaders' of the tragic Warsaw rebellion in uniforms and side-arms. They laud to the skies the 'generosity' of the Germans, of those very Germans who are daily exterminating thousands of our compatriots. When they capture partisans they hand them over to the Germans..."

The bandits from the Armia Krajowa who are operating in liberated territory have proved no less worthy of the confidence of the German Command. In an order issued by a District Commander of the Armia Krajowa to the scoundrels under his command we read the following:

"I order you to shoot the militiamen down like dogs, otherwise it will go hard with us..."

And the bandits from the Armia Krajowa do really shoot Polish militiamen and hurl grenades at Polish peasants.
The reckless policy of the miserable clique of reactionary emigrants in London is repelling even those sections of the public in the Allied countries which supported the Mikolajczyk Cabinet.

Reviewing the conduct of the Polish emigrant clique, the foreign editor of The Chicago Sun stated that

"the emigrant Polish Government, which represents the interests of the land magnates, had chosen the tactics of prolonging the conflict in the hope of compelling the Soviet Government to yield."

In the opinion of a number of English, American and French newspapers, these tactics call for a thorough revision of one's attitude towards the Polish emigrant clique. The New York Post strongly condemns the intractability of the Polish emigrant government which, in its opinion, was fostered by the previous attitude of the United States and Great Britain towards it, and calls upon these Powers to withdraw their recognition. The Ottawa Evening Citizen stated in a leading article that the emigrant government can no longer be regarded as representing the Polish people.

In the opinion of Mr. Bell, the observer of the Overseas News Agency, Mikolajczyk's resignation completely eliminates the emigrant government as a political factor and there are now no grounds whatever for any of the leading United Nations to recognize the new Cabinet, which is striving only to perpetuate the fascist Constitution of 1935, and is resisting the strivings of the Polish people.

The observer refers in this connection to Mr. Eden's statement in the House of Commons in the beginning of 1944 that Great Britain would recognize the Polish emigrant government as long as Mikolajczyk remained Prime Minister.

All the more surprising, therefore, are the views expressed by certain English newspapers and members of Parliament during the debates on the Polish question in the House of Commons, which, in the present situation, can only encourage the Polish reactionaries in their stubbornness. When the reactionary Raczkiewicz-Sosnkowski clique began to steer a course that led to Mikolajczyk's resignation and to the formation of the Arciszewski "Cabinet," The Times wrote that such conduct was probably prompted by the fatal conviction of certain Polish circles that by staving off an agreement with Russia they would be able to obtain more favourable terms for Poland. This conviction, which is so paradoxical and runs counter to all facts and possibilities, can be attributed only to one thing. Those who share it hope that they can obtain the backing of the Western Powers and incite these Powers against Russia. Needless to say, The Times concludes, the British Government is not guilty of stimulating such hopes.

All the more regrettable, therefore, is it that certain English newspapers and members of Parliament should undertake the ungrateful task of stimulating such hopes among the clique of reactionary Polish emigrés.

Obviously, utterances like these in the press and in Parliament, running counter to the policy on the Polish problem proclaimed by the leaders of English politics, can only cause considerable harm. By stimulating the hopes of the reckless adventurers in the camp of the reactionary Polish emigrés, utterances of this kind can only serve to deprive these adventurers of the last remnants of reason and sense of reality.

** * **

The self-exposure and utter bankruptcy of the Polish emigrant clique have naturally prompted public opinion in many quarters abroad to pay increasing attention to the activities of the Polish Committee of National Liberation, which is guiding the entire life and struggle of the Polish people in the liberated areas of Poland.

The progressive Polish journal Glos Ludowy, which is published in Detroit, U.S.A., and represents democratic American-Polish circles, makes the following comparison between the reactionary policy of the Polish emigrants in London and the constructive activities of the Polish Committee of National Liberation:

"While the tragi-comedy is being played in London, the Polish people, under the leadership of the Polish Committee of National Liberation, are rehabilitating the devastated areas, reviving Polish culture and training in the ranks of the Polish Army hundreds of thousands of patriots for the decisive battle for the liberation of Poland. The bulk of the members of the Polish political parties have united to support the Polish Committee of National Liberation and not the miserable clique of reactionaries... A new era is being ushered in in Lublin, the era of democracy! The Polish reactionaries will not bamboozle the world this time."

André Fougère, the French radio observer, commenting on Mr. Churchill's speech on the Polish problem, stated:
"After Sikorski's death, the Polish Government in London devoted itself more to personal squabbles and petty strife than to serving the real interests of the Polish people. As a result of the recent changes in the Polish Cabinet in London, the emigre Government has become such that Churchill publicly stated that he does not approve of it."

André Fougère went on to say that the question now arises of recognizing the Polish Committee of National Liberation in Lublin as the Provisional Polish Government.

"Opinion in favour of the Polish Committee of National Liberation," he says, "is spreading among wider and wider circles in that part of Poland which has been liberated by the Red Army... In France, too, public opinion is turning in favour of the Polish Committee in Lublin."

The exchange of representatives between the Provisional Government of France and the Polish Committee of National Liberation has evoked lively interest in the foreign press. Commenting on this event, the diplomatic observer of The Manchester Guardian stated that

"the de facto recognition of the Lublin Committee has obviously its broad political sides. At the least, it will increase the isolation of the Polish Government."

According to the reports in a number of English newspapers, the Czechoslovak Government is conducting negotiations with the Polish Committee of National Liberation for the conclusion of a pact of mutual assistance. The same newspapers report that the Polish Committee of National Liberation is establishing trade relations with Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Rumania.

The London Observer was obliged to state that

"The French Government's decision marks an important departure from the undivided recognition which all the Allied Governments except the Russian have given the Polish Government until now. The Czechs, and possibly the Norwegians and other Allied Governments on the Continent, will follow the French example."

Such is the convincing power of facts. And the facts are that under most trying conditions, in a country that has been devastated by war and German occupation, the Polish Committee of National Liberation has already achieved great progress in restoring Polish statehood. The emigrant Pythians prophesied that the Committee would fail. Their agents have been and are doing all in their power, which, happily, is very restricted, to create additional difficulties for the Polish patriots who are fighting to liberate their country and to build up a strong, independent and democratic Poland. But the Polish Committee of National Liberation is successfully overcoming the difficulties and obstacles.

The Committee of National Liberation is backed by the formidable Polish Army, which numbers several hundred thousand men. The Polish Army is not only a bulwark of the independence of Poland, but also a factor which cannot be ignored even in the international arena.

The Polish Committee of National Liberation is backed by a coalition of all the influential democratic parties and groups, who are united on a common platform of struggle for a democratic Poland, viz., the Stronnictwo Ludowe, the Polish Workers' Party, the Polish Socialist Party, the Democratic Party, the trade unions, the cooperative societies and business circles. It enjoys the support of wide Polish circles abroad.

By its wise and realistic foreign policy, the Polish Committee of National Liberation has secured for Poland the friendship of her mighty neighbour, the Soviet Union, and has laid the foundations for friendship with the neighbouring Slavonic peoples and the great Western democracies—France, Great Britain and the United States. It has won the confidence and support of the Polish people—wide sections of the workers, peasants and intellectuals. The demand is now rising from the ranks of the people that the Polish Committee of National Liberation be converted into a Provisional National Government of Poland. This demand is legitimate and intelligible.

The people judge their government by its deeds. They regard the Committee of National Liberation as the champion of their vital national interests. The transformation of the Committee into a Provisional National Government marks a new stage in the process of building up Polish statehood, and of creating a strong, independent and democratic Poland.
INTERNATIONAL LIFE

NOTES

A CARD-SHARPER EXPOSES HIS HAND

Like Gogol's Nozdrev, the Turkish journalist Cahid Yalçın is in some respects a historical personage. He never opens his mouth but what he puts his foot in it. But unlike the versatile Nozdrev, who sometimes lied merely for the love of it, Cahid Yalçın tells lies with a very definite object. His main object is to impute the existence of and foment discord among the Allied Powers, and he pursues it with extraordinary zeal, if not with intelligence.

Excessive zeal and unscrupulousness recently landed Yalçın in a mess. This time he decided to choose as his butt the Treaty of Alliance and Mutual Assistance concluded between the U.S.S.R. and France in Moscow. Reading the text of the Treaty Yalçın found nothing in it to his liking; the document undoubtedly testifies to the strengthening of the anti-German coalition. This annoyed but did not daunt this journalistic war-horse: after all, if there were no clauses in the Franco-Soviet Treaty to his taste, he could always invent some. So Yalçın boldly took up the pen and concocted an article for his newspaper Tanın under the title "The Franco-Russian Treaty," in which without the least qualm of conscience he asserted that Article 2 of the Treaty "provides for measures to be taken to combat danger likely to arise from America, and especially Great Britain." And then, giving rein to his imagination, he writes that the Treaty "alienates France from England, Moscow can now use France as a trump card against the Anglo-Saxons."

Card-sharpers are usually cautious so as to avoid what often happened to Nozdrev: "He was either heartily kicked, or his fine bushy side-whiskers were plucked so thoroughly that sometimes he returned home with only one, and that sadly depleted." But this time the political card-shaper Yalçın threw all caution to the winds, forgetting that the Franco-Soviet Treaty has been published and that Article 2 of that document, which Yalçın falsifies, reads as follows:

"The High Contracting Parties shall not agree to enter into separate negotiations with Germany or to conclude without mutual consent any armistice or peace treaty either with the Hitler government or with any other government or authority set up in Germany for the purpose of continuation or support of the policy of German aggression."

The whole text of this Treaty, from the first line to the last, and its whole spirit give the lie direct to the imputations of the journalist of the Tanın. Yalçın could not help feeling that he had gone too far, and that the untruth he told was too gross and stupid. So next day he tried to withdraw by publishing in the Tanın a "correction" in which he excused himself on the grounds that he had "employed for his article the text of the Treaty as incorrectly translated by the Anatolian Agency."

A clumsy excuse. But as luck would have it, the Anatolian Agency distributed the text of the Franco-Soviet Treaty in French and Turkish without a single mistranslation. By resorting to this "correction" Yalçın merely exposed his hand. His procedure, as well as the fact that his sleight of hand called forth no public protest from his colleagues, deserves to be noted. Evidently Turkish journalists treat the whiskers of political card-sharpers with respect.

★

THE CATHOLIC HERALD CARVES UP EUROPE

"A Plan for Carving up Europe" is the sensational title of an article which appeared the other day in the London Catholic Herald. Evidently, the demand for the shoddy goods the gentlemen of this publication trade in is dwindling, and they have therefore decided to win back their customers by offering them goods in an original wrapper. Whose interest would not be roused by a "plan for carving up Europe?"

Charging his subject like a bull at a gate, the author of the article in question writes: "So now we know that Europe is to be re-carved between Britain and the U.S.S.R. after all."

The source of this sensational information is wisely kept a secret by the newspaper, but in its "plan" it carves up Europe with truly amazing free hand. For example, Britain is assigned Italy, Greece and the Near East... As for the Soviet Union's "share," the newspaper is more vague, inasmuch as "the ex-
tent of Russian interests has not yet been made clear.

After recarving the map of our sinful continent with fingers as light as a dream, the editors of the Catholic Herald considered their labours in “carving up Europe” at an end. The dazzling wrapper is cast aside and the newspaper begins to treat its readers to spicy dishes. As has become the custom in these circles, the first course is the “Polish problem.” The newspaper—how many times already?—makes the discovery that “Russia and no one else is responsible for the Polish problem.” The hypocrites are vexed because nobody else has noticed that the Soviet Union “is responsible” and that no honest person agrees with them. They even complain that Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden tried to disguise the truth about the Polish problem.

The editors of the Catholic Herald need the “Polish problem” only as a goad; Polish affairs interest them only in so far as they can serve as a pretext for an extensive crusade against the Soviet Union. Brandishing their pens like swords, they go so far as to declare that “if the world is turning its back on the idea of collective security and international cooperation between adult peoples, the chief culprit is that regime which is idolized by so many ... Soviet Russia.” Here we clearly detect a hope that the war has blunted readers’ memories. For who does not know that the Soviet Union was the first and most consistent champion of the idea of general security? And who does not know that those who stand behind the Catholic Herald did their best to support German aggression, encouraged Hitler to unleash the world war, and blessed the German hordes in their “crusade” against the Soviet Union? One will have no difficulty in finding in the files of the Catholic Herald for recent years dozens of articles openly calling for support of Hitler Germany.

There is no need to look back into the past, however, for the present activities of this worthy newspaper are by no means directed against the German bandits. It makes no secret of the fact that it regards the Soviet Union as Enemy No. 1. The article quoted concludes with a reminder to the British Government that “it might ostracize and denounce Soviet Russia just as it did Nazi Germany, and thereby precipitate another war.” Could anything be clearer?

History cannot be turned back in its course—the good times for the “crusading” cham-

pions of Hitlerism have long passed. By its heroic fight against Germany, the Soviet Union has saved mankind and civilization from the fascist plague and, together with its Allies, will not only consummate the defeat of Hitler Germany, but will also do everything necessary to create an enduring system of international security after the war. The millions of Hitlerites clad in the uniforms of the German army cannot prevent this; still less can it be prevented by Hitler’s supporters in frocks and surplices.

★

SWEDISH HOSPITALITY

The commotion raised in the Swedish press over the proposal to allow Soviet representatives to visit the camps for Baltic refugees indicates that the Swedish reactionaries are very much afraid of the exposure of the unscrupulous measures they, in conjunction with the German occupation authorities, undertook in the Baltic regions at the time of the Red Army’s offensive. They are definitely averse to Soviet representatives visiting these camps. The Swedish newspapers so grossly distort the picture that it is essential in the interests of truth to recount the real facts of the case.

As we know, Balodis, Seinius, Rey and other Hitler agents and adventurers who fled from the Soviet Baltic Republics have long found an asylum in Sweden. The Swedish authorities were gracious enough to grant not only refuge to these people, but also wide opportunities for subversive activities to organizations hostile to the Soviet Union. All the threads of these organizations lead to the Gestapo, a fact, however, which does not disturb the Swedish police.

The reception which the Swedish authorities accorded to Soviet citizens who in the terrible years of the Hitler terror managed to escape to Sweden was quite different, however. They were punished for the least attempt to establish contact with the Soviet consulate. Those who did succeed in doing so subsequently vanished without leaving a trace.

Shortly before the Red Army ejected the Germans from the Baltic regions the Swedish authorities started negotiations with the Nazi occupants for the evacuation from Estonia of Soviet citizens of Swedish nationality. The Swedish Government did not even deem it necessary to consult the Soviet Government concerning these Soviet citizens about whose fate
it was negotiating with Hitler Germany. According to eye-witnesses, in a number of places this evacuation was effected by force. When it became clear that the Nazis could not retain their hold on the Baltic regions, the Swedish authorities came to an agreement with them and arranged for the removal of the traitors who had cooperated with the occupation authorities and who now feared punishment. At the same time they began to deport civilians whom the Hitlerites had not yet succeeded in carrying off from the Soviet Baltic Republics to hard labour in Germany.

The Hitlerites favoured this evacuation. At the beginning of October the Swedish newspaper Stockholms-Tidningen reported that the Germans had stopped a ship carrying so-called “Baltic refugees,” but learning that it was bound for Sweden, allowed it to proceed unmolested. According to the Swedish press, armed German soldiers and officers arrived in Sweden on vessels, carrying refugees, on which they had served as escorts. Officials of the Swedish Defence Staff, the governor of Gotland and other officials took part in organizing the deportations from the Soviet Baltic Republics.

The Red Army’s swift advance foiled the Hitlerites’ criminal plan for the wholesale deportation to Sweden of Soviet citizens from the Baltic Republics. Nevertheless, some 30,000 Soviet citizens from these regions are now in Sweden. The overwhelming majority of them are anxious to return to their country, now liberated from the German invaders. The Swedish authorities are aware of this and, in fact, do not deny it.

Among these refugees, who are kept in separate camps, a libellous anti-Soviet campaign is being conducted, in which certain official persons, in abuse of their positions, have taken part. In the Söderköping camp, for example, Jungberg, the “camp chief,” is in the habit of making anti-Soviet speeches. He has collected a group of anti-Soviet propagandists and spies from among Hitler’s henchmen. He has categorically forbidden the refugees to speak in Russian or to talk about life in the U.S.S.R.

Letters from the refugees testify to the outrageous regime prevailing in the camps, with the knowledge and approval of the Swedish authorities. The gates of the camps are thrown wide open to Balodis, Rey and other Hitler agents. Their underlings are given special privilege to reside in Stockholm and its environs. The police have even recommended some of them to change their names in order to avoid undesirable publicity. On the other hand, Soviet citizens who remain loyal to their country are consigned to special camps situated in remote and sparsely populated localities.

It is significant that leading Swedish newspapers are extraordinarily unanimous in publishing appeals and letters from German agents. One cannot help wondering whether all this music is not being directed by some conductor’s baton.

The zeal of the bankrupt supporters of Swedish cooperation with Hitler Germany and of the protagonists of the Russophobia that is traditional in Swedish reactionary circles is not abating. In defiance of facts and common sense they persist in their old course, a course which may cause serious and irreparable damage to Sweden’s national interests.
Italy in the Autumn of 1944*)

M. TARASOV

October 2

At 8 o'clock in the morning we visited a tobacco factory, one of the largest in Rome, which now employs about 800 workers. The factory is not running to full capacity and its output could be doubled. At present it is turning out 250,000 cigarettes per shift. Women's wages are very low, ranging from 20 to 40 liras per day.

In the factory yard the workers set up a platform and decorated it with red cloth and flowers. Here a meeting was held. There were continuous cries of greetings to Comrade Stalin and the Red Army. We were presented with flowers, and people came up to shake hands with us.

... A telephone apparatus factory. In many of the shops the machines are idle owing to the absence of spare parts. Many of the machines have been taken away by the Germans. Only the foundations on which the machines stood remain. Telephone apparatuses are made to the order of the Allies.

We then visited the Tramway Depot which has suffered very much from air bombardment. We were met by a vast crowd of workers carrying streamers with slogans, posters and portraits of Comrade Stalin. Accompanied by representatives of the administration and the local trade union organizations, we toured the shops and then addressed a large meeting.

A platform was hastily erected out of packing cases. Some of the speakers spoke from the roof of a tramcar. The speeches were often interrupted by cries of: "Give us arms! We want to take part in liberating Italy from the Germans!"

An old worker read some verses of his own composition on the heroism of the Soviet people.

October 6

We left for Naples on two American army cars. In driving through the streets of Rome

* Extracts from the diary of the head of the Soviet trade union delegation which visited Italy in September-November 1944. The first part of this diary was published in No. 24, 1944, of the Russian edition of The War and the Working Class.

we noticed that portraits of Comrade Stalin had been posted on the tramcars. It transpired that after yesterday's meeting at the Tramway Depot the workers decided to mark the visit of the Soviet delegation in this way.

October 7

In the morning we visited the port of Naples where 770 workers are employed. The workers proudly showed us the pumping station which they had restored by their own efforts.

Nearly all the port structures are wrecked. Several scores of machines are standing in the open air. Naples, in general, has suffered very considerably from air raids and street fighting.

The workers complained about the restrictions that were imposed upon them, about the unsatisfactory conditions of labour and their low pay. We asked an old fitter who was working on one of the machines how things were and he answered:

"I have been working here for 48 years and I must say that the situation at present is such that if urgent measures are not taken we shall all die from starvation."

An open air meeting was held. Every now and again the workers interrupted the speakers with loud greetings to Comrade Stalin and the Soviet people.

... An engineering works at which machines are repaired and various spare parts are manufactured. Here about 1,000 workers are employed. Formerly the plant employed from 5,000 to 6,000 workers. The wages range from 80 to 100 liras per day.

The walls of the factory, and even the ceilings in the shops, are inscribed with slogans greeting the Red Army, the Soviet people and Comrade Stalin. Where there was no place to write slogans the workers drew a sickle and hammer and a Red star. In addition to slogans there were blackboards on which was inscribed in big letters with chalk: "We have no bread. Our wages are low." One blackboard bore the inscription: "There are many enemies among us. Our chief enemy is the fascist engineer Cartase."

In every shop the delegation was stopped by groups of workers who shouted as if by
common consent: “We have been waiting for you, representatives of the Land of Soviets, for twenty-seven years! We want you to see us as we really are!” And with they pointed to their bare feet, torn footwear, ragged trousers and greasy shirts. They complained that working over twelve hours a day they received no more than 200 grams (less than half a pound) of bread per day.

At the meeting, when Di Vittorio said that the Confederation of Labour had secured a rise in wages to meet the high cost of living, everybody shouted: “That’s all right, but let the bosses take the rise and give us a little more bread!”

Then we visited a textile mill, which before the war had employed over 6,000 workers. The mill is partially demolished and the main buildings are being used as stores and garages. Only one half-wrecked shop is being restored by the workers themselves. They are also repairing the looms. Here only about 150 men are at present employed.

The workers who gathered round us said that they had cleared a small building of debris and had fitted it up as a small workshop for repairing looms.

All these people have but one cry: “Give us work! We want charity from no one! We can earn our own bread and be useful to the common cause of defeating the enemy!” This was expressed with exceptional eloquence by a young, dark-eyed girl, whose father and brothers are fighting in the ranks of a partisan unit in Northern Italy.

A middle-aged working woman complained with tears in her eyes that the factory is being used for storing rope and scrap iron, whereas the looms could be repaired and the production of fabrics needed by the armed forces could be started.

“But nobody pays any attention to this,” she said. “And we weavers are losing our skill and are dragging out a miserable existence of poverty and starvation....”

We asked the representatives of the administration of several factories why they allowed the workers to stop work and hold meetings during working hours. The answer we received was that it was impossible to restrain the workers anyhow, and the administration preferred to give official sanction to stop work, as they were confident that the workers would more than make up for the time lost at the meetings.

This evening a meeting of active trade union members was held. Over 600 persons attended. At the end of the meeting representatives from different factories crowded round us, pressing invitations on us to visit their plants.

October 8

Sunday. Yesterday the newspapers announced that special suburban trains would be run for the meeting to be held at ten o'clock this morning. All last night and this morning, rain came down in torrents. In spite of the rain and the thunderstorm, however, the workers of Naples gathered to hear the Soviet delegation. The meeting, which, in addition to us, was addressed by the Secretaries of the Confederation of Labour, passed off with great enthusiasm.

At one o'clock we left for Sorrento, where Maxim Gorky lived for several years. We travelled over a splendid motor road, lined on each side with lemon and orange groves. Vegetables are cultivated between the rows of trees.

We dined at the restaurant which Maxim Gorky often visited. The restaurant keeper, an old man of sixty, told us that he had frequently seen Alexei Maximovich.

After dinner we visited Gorky’s villa, which is fifty or sixty paces from the restaurant. The gates of the villa were closed. We knocked, but nobody answered. We went into a neighbouring back garden and gained entrance to the villa through a hole in the brick wall. A scene of desolation presented itself to our eyes. The place was dilapidated and heaps of rubbish lay around everywhere. To find the house where our great writer had lived so long, and in which everything was connected with his name in such a state was extremely disappointing.

October 9

The meeting at the steel plant was attended by about 2,000 people. I counted twenty-eight slogans written by the workers of the plant. Many of them were in Russian, written in the old spelling.

...Castellammare, not far from Sorrento. On the road we were met by a motor truck decorated with posters, which accompanied us all over the town. At the shipyard, which the Germans have severely damaged, 1,900 workers are now employed. Last year 2,500 were employed. The staff was reduced as a consequence of a shortage of materials.

The hulls of sunken vessels, blown up
of the most active members of the Communist and Socialist Parties...

We are all so busy that we scarcely have time to collect our thoughts, let alone jot down a few notes for our next speeches....

October 10

We left Naples at noon. It is a hot sunny day. We passed through several small towns, which were, in fact, nothing more than small market places, where there was little trade, but there were numerous idlers. Signs of shocking poverty were visible everywhere.

In the evening we arrived at Foggia and went straight to the Camera del Lavoro. The Secretary informed us that they had a membership of 40,000, of whom 21,300 had uniform membership cards. Christian trade unions with a membership of 3,000 were now affiliating. Numerous agricultural labourers, share croppers and semi-skilled workers belong to the trade unions.

The working conditions for agricultural labourers are extremely hard. For grape picking they get 50 to 60 liras per day for a 16-hour day. The agricultural labourer is employed on the average for 200 days per year. Their wages are insufficient to purchase food: meat costs from 200 to 250 liras per kilogram, fish from 160 to 170 liras, and beans 120 liras. For many of them boots and clothes are a luxury. A pair of boots costs 4,000 liras, and a worker's blouse costs 1,000 liras.

There is no large-scale industry in this district.

In Foggia we were told that the Labour Exchange had been established by the employers, who drew up arduous conditions of labour for the agricultural labourers. In addition a "Department of Labour" was set up, at which all the workers were compelled to register. Those who failed to register in time were threatened with dismissal.

In this way a new organization was formed in opposition to the existing trade unions. The Department of Labour handles all matters concerning insurance, pensions, etc. The chief of the department is an ex-fascist who receives a salary of 18,000 liras a month.

Among the crowd waiting for us at the entrance to the Camera del Lavoro were some lads of ten to sixteen years of age. Their fathers had brought them here to see the Soviet delegation. One boy impatiently tugged his father by the arm and kept on asking: "Where are the Russians?" When we
were pointed out to him he exclaimed in surprise: "Why, Papa, they are just like us!"
There were no suitable hotels in this town so we were put up with a railway clerk, who placed his room at our disposal while he, his wife and children went to spend the night with some friends.

October 11

We went over the wrecked railway depot, workshops and station. Formerly 2,000 men were employed at the workshops, where medium repairs to passenger and freight cars were effected. Most of the workers complained of lack of footwear and clothing.

The workers of the paper mill at Foggia had, on their own initiative, set to work to restore the electric power station. We ourselves saw them excavating the ruins of the buildings and extracting from the debris machine and motor parts, cleaning and repairing them and assembling them. They were very proud of their work and tried to show us every detail.

We left for Lucera. At about one and a half or two kilometres from the town we were met by a vast crowd, mostly agricultural labourers, with red flags and streamers inscribed with slogans. The road was flooded with people, and scores of motor trucks were obliged to wait until the demonstration had filed past to the meeting place. We went with, or rather, were carried by the crowd. Everybody shouted words of greeting to us, tried to shake hands with us or pat us on the shoulder.

After the meeting we had dinner at the house of a worker employed at a cheese factory. The crowd waited outside the house, singing songs. When we reappeared in the street they again lifted us shoulder high.

We started out for San Severo. Here, too, about two kilometres from the town, we were met by a demonstration of 15,000 people. The same scene occurred all over again—embraces, handshaking and so forth.

In the square where the meeting was held, 20,000 people gathered. A meeting of the active trade union members was held at the Camera del Lavoro.

Here we again heard complaints about the Department of Labour of which ex-fascist leaders were in control. We were told that through the agency of the Department of Labour soldiers were sent to this district to work, as a result of which there was a further increase of unemployment.

October 12

At 9 o'clock this morning a delegation of women attended the Camera del Lavoro to convey greetings to the women of the Soviet Union. A beautiful little girl of five or six years of age handed us a bouquet of flowers. We went on to Serra Capriola. Here, too, we were met by a large crowd before entering the city. The meeting was attended by over 3,000. I have jotted down several of the slogans that were carried by the demonstrators. They were written in Russian, in the old spelling and with curious mistakes. The slogans were as follows:

"The oppressed peoples place their hope only in Soviet Russia!"
"Long live the Soviet trade union delegation!"
"Vivat the victorious Red Army!"
"Glory to the people who have abolished the exploitation of man by man!"

Manfredonia. The same scene as everywhere else. There is a regular scrimmage around us. Everyone wants to say something to us, ask us something, get a better view of us, and come close to us. As we pass through the town many inquisitive eyes are turned in our direction, trying to pick us Soviet people out of the crowd. But it is almost impossible to do so, for the people crowd so closely around us that we cannot be distinguished from the Italians.

As we were getting into our cars an elderly woman wailing loudly pushed her way through the crowd towards us. Efforts were made to restrain her, but we stepped up to her and enquired what was the matter. Sobbing loudly, she told us that the local fascists had killed one of her sons and had kept two others in prison for several years. The fascist who was responsible for all this still held an important post in the city. The woman vehemently demanded that the criminal should be punished....

October 17

Brindisi—a large port. Outside the town we were met by a huge crowd. The meeting held in the local theatre was a very turbulent one, especially when Di Vittorio spoke.
audience was enraged at the fact that all the former heads of the fascist party in Brindisi still held their jobs and were continuing their despicable work. One elderly worker was continuously shouting from his seat the name of one of these fascists who assaulted him several days ago.

Every now and again different coloured leaflets containing greetings to the Soviet Union, the Red Army and Comrade Stalin, and calling for trade union unity were scattered from the upper circles and gallery.

The local leaders told us that they had never seen such an enormous meeting, to which the people had come without any special invitation.

We were unable to leave Brindisi at the appointed time as we were taken to the port, after all, to address the dockers. We also had to speak at a meeting at the aircraft factory.

October 19

We arrived in Taranto twenty-four hours late.

...We visited the Arsenal Shipyards, where 13,000 workers are employed. We were accompanied by a British officer and by representatives of the Taranto trade unions.

Evidently orders had been issued not to suspend work and, consequently, not to arrange an official celebration to welcome us. But the workers tried to evade these orders by every possible means. As we passed from one shop to another groups of eight to ten workers came into the yard carrying some machine part, solemnly marched past us, greeted us, and then, when we had passed on, threw their burden to the ground, waved their hands to us and went back to their shop. In the shops we did not visit the workers stopped work and ran to the shop where we were.

Later, in a comfortable government cutter, accompanied by five large cutters decorated with red flags and carrying workers' representatives, we crossed the bay to inspect other plants.

On the way back our caravan was surrounded by numerous fishing boats. The local fishermen had come out to greet our delegation. They escorted us all the way back to Taranto.

A town's meeting was held in the large square. Over 30,000 persons were present. The speeches were broadcast by radio.

After the meeting we found it impossible to get to our cars. We were all picked up and tossed in the air—again and again.

November 10

We are at Gorky's villa in Sorrento again. We affixed a memorial tablet to the wall. In spite of the rain, a large crowd gathered at the meeting.

November 12

A mass meeting was held in Rome to celebrate the 27th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. From 80,000 to 90,000 persons took part in the demonstration and meeting organized by the Communist and Socialist Parties.

November 13

We attended a session of the National Congress of Railwaymen at which we learned that the Railwaymen's Union had affiliated to the Confederation of Labour. The discussion and vote on this question took place yesterday and the decision to affiliate was adopted unanimously.

November 14

The concluding meeting with the Confederation of Labour at which we are handed an address to the Soviet working people and a letter to the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions. We are given a warm and cordial send off. They say: "Non addio ma arrivederci."
BOOK REVIEWS

The Japanese Version of the Genesis of the War in the Pacific

Kosaku Tamura: Genesis of the Pacific War. Tokyo, 1944.

E. ZHU KOV

December 7, 1944 marked the third anniversary of the opening of the war in the Pacific. The book by the Japanese author Kosaku Tamura on the genesis of this war, recently published in English under the auspices of The Institute of the Pacific in Tokyo, recalls still another anniversary. In 1854, i.e., ninety years ago, permanent relations between the United States and Japan were established for the first time. As late as 1934, Hirota, the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs, sent an extremely friendly message to Cordell Hull, U.S. State Secretary, noting the remarkable date on which the eighty years of uninterrupted treaty relations between the two Pacific powers commenced. In Tokyo, the foundation stone was even laid of a monument to Commodore Perry, who in 1854 opened the doors of Japan for western civilization.

But times change. Today the Japanese author Kosaku Tamura begins his book with sharp attacks upon Commodore Perry. Tamura asserts that the entire history of Japanese-American relations is the history of America’s preparation for aggression against peace-loving Japan; that Commodore Perry, who arrived on the shores of Japan for the first time in 1853, was the harbinger of the same American menace to the “freedom and independence” of Japan that led to war in December 1941. He writes: “A war which was to have been waged in 1853 has only been delayed till 1941” (Introduction, p. XVIII).

If we are to believe the author, in writing this book he set himself the praiseworthy object of revealing the truth regarding the trend of Japanese-American relations, and of exposing the real culprits responsible for the present war in the Pacific. The book bears the subtitle “A Documentary History of Japanese-American Relations.” Indeed, the author is not sparing of documents and has deliberately loaded his book with them to make it as convincing on the surface as possible. More than half the book consists of quotations. Lengthy excerpts are quoted from books, documents and speeches. The entire arrangement of these documents, however, is definitely tendentious. Utilizing the files of the Japanese Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Tamura tries to create the impression in the reader’s mind that it is sufficient to quote the “documentary” pronouncements of this or that diplomat giving the Japanese version of international events to prove one’s case up to the hilt. By this simple method the author tries to conceal the real nature of numerous facts and phenomena of international life which depict Japan as being something far different from a downtrodden angel of peace. To prove how “unbiased” he is, Tamura copiously quotes excerpts, suitable for his purpose, even from the American press, utilizing the critical utterances of American newspapers and magazines on questions of foreign policy.

In the course of over four hundred pages we get a consecutive analysis of the most important international events in the Pacific in which Japanese and American interests came into conflict in one way or another. Concentrating his attention mainly on the pre-history of the Pacific war, the author devotes more than half of his book to a relation of events up to the beginning of the so-called “Chinese incident,” i.e., up to Japan’s attack on China in 1937. This relation, however, is extremely biased. Tamura dilates on America’s actions in the field of foreign policy; as regards those historical facts in which Japan has been the principal actor, he, as a rule, is silent.

Whatever events Tamura may deal with—the consequences of the Russo-Japanese war, events in the First World War, or the Washington Conference—he, with exceeding mo-
notony, presents us with tendentiously chosen quotations with the object of presenting Japan as an outraged angel of peace. The activities of the most outstanding American statesmen from the times of McKinley to the present day, the author depicts as a continuous chain of anti-Japanese intrigue. Tamura is particularly "indignant" at the fact that Americans regard imperialist Japan as an old and dangerous enemy of the Chinese people. Polemics against this American view constitute a considerable part of the book.

Tamura repeats the threadbare thesis refuted long ago that Japan took part in the First World War exclusively out of loyalty to her obligations to her ally, Great Britain. The object of this assertion is to conceal the traditionally aggressive character of Japan's policy towards China. The author has diffidently entitled the chapter devoted to Japan's policy in the period of the First World War: "The So-called Twenty-One Demands." He wishes to assure his readers that Japan presented not twenty-one, but only fourteen demands. As for the other seven, which were definite encroachments on China's sovereignty, they, according to the author, were only "wishes," the significance of which was exaggerated by American propaganda. It is common knowledge, however, that Japan renounced the secret so-called "Fifth Group" of the twenty-one demands and converted them into "wishes" only as a result of the rebuff she received from and the indignation expressed by Chinese public opinion.

One cannot ignore the chapter devoted to Japanese intervention in the Soviet Far East. In this chapter, which is entitled: "The Siberian Expedition," the author, by means of evasions and downright falsification, tries to gloss over the fact that for four years Japanese imperialism plundered and devastated Soviet Far Eastern territory with extraordinary persistence. He depicts Japan as the devoted servant of the Entente Powers who unselfishly undertook the "burden" of intervention for the alleged purpose of preventing the spread of "German influence in Bolshevik Russia." It is difficult to restrain one's astonishment at the coolness with which Tamura quotes Japanese diplomatic notes and other "documents" containing this long-exposed falsehood.

A large part of Tamura's book consists of a tendentious survey of the Washington Conference of 1921-22, of the events that led up to the annulment of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, and of the Naval Conferences of 1927 and subsequent years. In all these cases Japan is invariably depicted as the unhappy victim of America's insatiable striving towards world hegemony.

Strangely enough, the author's eloquence deserts him when he approaches the critical dates of recent history connected with the activities of Japanese imperialism. Primarily, we have in mind the dates most immediately connected with the genesis of the war in the Pacific: September 18, 1931 (the beginning of the Japanese invasion of Manchuria); July 7, 1937 (Japan's military attack on China); and December 7, 1941 (Japan's attack on American and British possessions in the Pacific).

How is Japan's occupation of Manchuria dealt with in this book? The reader will find almost nothing at all about it! The chapter bearing the high-sounding title: "America, Policeman in the Far East" begins with the statement: "On September 18, 1931, the Manchurian Incident broke out." And then the author goes on for several pages to elaborate the charge that America had no grounds for interfering in what he claims were the internal affairs of Asia.

Of Japanese aggression in China, which commenced on July 7, 1937, the author speaks in the terms of the official declaration of the Tokyo Government containing assurances of "Japan's peaceful motives."

Tamura devotes a special chapter of his book to the "New Order in East Asia." This short chapter is replete with excerpts from Japanese speeches and documents, the value of which can be judged by the specious argument mainly advanced in favour of establishing this "new order," namely "protection from Communism."

In this connection one cannot help noting the following circumstance: in none of the documents quoted by Tamura in justification of the "new order" do we find any reference to the so-called "lands of the South Seas" (the Philippines, Indonesia, etc.) as a constituent part of "Great East Asia." The author quotes only the documents of 1938, which contain merely references to the necessity of the closest allied relationships between Japan, China and Manchukuo. The question involuntarily arises in one's mind: does Japanese propaganda already regard it risky to repeat the pompous declarations of 1941-43 regarding the immutability of "the great sphere of the East Asian Commonwealth" which covers
a vast area stretching from the Hawaiian Islands in the East to Tibet in the West, and from the Kuril Islands in the North to the Sunda Archipelago in the South? After all, Tamura's book is written in English and, consequently, is not intended for home consumption. The markedly defensive tone of the whole book is evidently calculated to appeal to foreign public opinion and is an attempt to convince it that Japan is the innocent victim of American policy, and that she has never pursued, nor pursues now, any aggressive aims whatever. It goes without saying that such an attempt is doomed to failure. There can be no doubt, however, that this attempt was prompted by the unfavourable turn the war in the Pacific has taken for Japan, and will probably be repeated with greater vehemence.

Another peculiar feature of the book we are reviewing is the almost complete absence of anti-British utterances. It is common knowledge that the Pacific war commenced with Japan's attack on American and British possessions. Japan's policy in China during the past ten to fifteen years has borne a markedly anti-British character. Tamura seems to have forgotten all about this in his book, which is entirely of an anti-American character. Probably this interpretation of Pacific problems corresponds to the degree to which the United States is now taking part in the Allies' common war effort in the Pacific. It is likely, however, that Tamura's reserve in regard to Great Britain is a reflection of the revival of the plans long harboured by Japanese diplomacy to play upon the assumed divergence between the Far Eastern policies of Great Britain and the United States respectively.

* * *

Tamura's book cannot serve as a handbook for one who desires to study the genesis of the Pacific war. It can serve merely to give one an idea of the arguments that are advanced by Japanese official circles to justify their aggressive actions. The reader who attempts to utilize this book as a guide in investigating the causes of the war in the Pacific will learn to his astonishment that for the past decade Japan has been engaged in nothing else than "defending herself," most often against the Chinese and the Americans. She "defended herself" when she seized Manchuria in 1931-32, encountering scarcely any resistance. She "defended herself" when she attacked poorly protected China in 1937. She "defended herself" when she occupied French Indo-China in 1940-41 with the blessing of the Vichy "government." And in relating all this, the author shows extreme reluctance to explain what it was that menaced Japan in these and in many other cases.

In the concluding chapter Tamura contrived to say nothing about the wanton attack of Japan's armed forces on Pearl Harbour on December 7, 1941. Adroitly quoting an official American document, the author seems to have set out to induce the uninitiated reader to believe that the first act of war was committed not by the Japanese on December 7, but by the Americans on December 9, 1941, when they sank a Japanese submarine (p. 425). But the author obviously overdid it. It is common knowledge that the initial successes achieved by Japanese arms in the Pacific war were due to the fact that Japan, being the aggressor, was far better prepared for war than the United States and Great Britain. It was this advantage, which the aggressor enjoys, that enabled the Japanese armed forces to inflict palpable losses on the Americans in Pearl Harbour on the very first day of the war.

The genesis of the war in the Pacific is an important subject which must be discussed. It is undoubtedly waiting to be explored. The peoples of the world must learn the true causes of military conflicts, and know who bears responsibility for them. They must learn to distinguish between the aggressive and non-aggressive forces in the war in the Pacific. The book we have just reviewed, however, is as far removed from a truthful investigation of this subject as heaven is from earth.
The German Counter-Offensive in the West

QUESTION

I, like many of my fellow officers, would like to know the following. Certain foreign military observers are comparing the German counter-offensive launched on the Western front on December 17, 1944 with the offensive operations conducted by Ludendorff in March 1918. Is that correct? Can a historical parallel be drawn here? I would like the Editors of this journal to deal with this question, as the proper understanding of the lessons of military history helps us to strike harder and more effective blows at the enemy.

Major A. Krotov
Leningrad

ANSWER

It is true, of course, that past military history enables us to understand the nature of present-day military operations. A comparison of past and present events facilitates an analysis of them. When, however, in their quest for historical parallels, military commentators try to compare events which have only superficial resemblance, they cannot avoid drawing wrong conclusions. This is precisely the case with those foreign military observers who compare the German December counter-offensive in Belgium with the offensive operations the Germans conducted on the Western front in the spring of 1918.

The fallacy of such a comparison is obvious. The general strategical position of Wilhelm Germany in March 1918 and that of Hitler Germany in 1944 are entirely different. At the beginning of 1918 Germany still retained all her allies, and the military position of the Central Powers had become considerably more stable after the 1917 campaigns. The young Soviet Republic had not yet got firmly on its feet. Rumania, one of Germany's enemies, had dropped out of the war, while Italy had suffered severe defeat. Thus, Germany was able to concentrate all her attention, and the overwhelming part of her forces, on the Western theatre of war.

But Hitler Germany today finds herself under entirely different conditions. For over two years the Red Army and the armies of our Allies have been inflicting defeat after defeat upon her, as a result of which she has lost all her satellites. No less than two hundred German fascist divisions are on the Soviet-German front, while part of Hitler's forces are being held by the fighting that is going on in Italy. Does this bear even a remote resemblance to the situation that prevailed in the West in the beginning of 1918?

The difference between the offensive operations the Germans waged on the Western front in March 1918 and their counter-offensive in Belgium in 1944 will become absolutely obvious if we compare the objectives which Hindenburg and Ludendorff pursued with those now pursued by the Hitler Command, and if we further compare the forces and resources at Germany's disposal then and at the present time for the achievement of these objects.

In the beginning of 1918 the German Command was aware that although Germany's position was then favourable, it would steadily deteriorate with every further arrival in France of large contingents of American troops. Consequently, Ludendorff decided to shatter the Anglo-French forces by one mighty blow (or several, if necessary) before the arrival of the American forces, and thereby bring the war to a victorious conclusion. Thus, the basis of the German plan of campaign in 1918 was offensive strategy; and the method adopted to execute it was an offensive operation, or several successive offensive operations.

At the present time, on the threshold of 1945, when the general situation precludes all possibility of Germany achieving victory by force of arms, the adoption of offensive operations by the German forces pursues other and much more limited objectives. The Germans today are striving at all cost to stave off the inevitable débâcle and to play for, time in the hope that some new and unexpected political situation will arise which will enable them to avoid utter rout by the conclusion of an "honourable peace." It is common knowledge that in this respect the Hitlerites are placing all their hopes on a
rift occurring among the Allies, on the subversive activities of their friends in the Allied countries. Furthermore, the German Command was prompted to pass over to active operations by its desire to disrupt the Allies' plans for a general offensive against Germany in the West. Consequently, in the present case we have not an offensive which aims at securing a decision, but offensive operations with defensive objectives at a time when the hour of retribution for the Germans is inexorably drawing near.

It will not be difficult to see that the forces which the Hitler Command now has at its disposal in the West cannot possibly be compared with the forces the Germans had concentrated on the Western front in 1918. At the beginning of Ludendorff's first offensive in March 1918 the Germans had in France and Belgium 13 armies, which contained 193 infantry divisions and 15,700 guns, i.e., 80 per cent of their total infantry divisions and 90 per cent of their artillery. The Allied troops at that time numbered 171 infantry divisions, 9 cavalry divisions and 15,439 guns. Thus, at that time the Germans on the Western front enjoyed general numerical superiority in both manpower and artillery. At the present time the Germans in the West have at their command approximately 75 to 80 divisions, with a total strength, apparently, not exceeding 1,000,000 men. The Anglo-American armies have two or three times more men, enjoy unquestioned superiority in artillery and tanks, and overwhelming superiority in aircraft. In view of the large forces he had at his command, Ludendorff was able to hurl into his offensive 62 divisions on a line of 70 kilometres. Today, on a line of approximately the same length, the Hitler Command has sent into battle only about 15 divisions.

At the time the Germans were preparing for the offensive of March 1918, the Soviet Republic had withdrawn from the war. Nevertheless, the attempt of the German High Command to seize the western and southern regions of Russia led to the development of hostilities in the Baltic, Byelorussia and the Ukraine. The struggle against the small and poorly armed Soviet detachments held 50 German and about 30 Austro-Hungarian divisions. This grave depletion of the forces on the Western front, where the decisive blow was being struck, was a grave strategical blunder on the part of Ludendorff.

But while in 1918 the German Command had every opportunity of drawing its forces to the West if it so desired, in 1944 this opportunity is totally lacking. On the contrary, today the German Command is compelled to augment its forces on the Soviet-German front, which at the present time is holding 200 German divisions, i.e., Hitler Germany's main forces. It is well known that during October and November 1944 alone, the Germans transferred from other fronts to the Soviet-German front 32 divisions.

German strategy has reached an impasse. It was no accident that in his radio review on December 13, i.e., only four days before the German counter-offensive was launched, the Hitlerite General Ditmar recalled Ludendorff's statement that "tactical demands stand above purely strategical demands." Military science long ago revealed the absurdity of this concept, and there is no need for us to polemize against it. It is characteristic, however, that through the mouth of Ditmar the Hitler Command confirmed its renunciation of broad strategical objectives in favour of minor tactical interests, thereby admitting that Germany's further struggle has no prospect of success. This perhaps is the only analogy that can be drawn with the military events of 1918, which involuntarily arise in one's mind when analysing Germany's present position.

The conclusion to be drawn from this is clear. Commentators who try to draw a historical analogy between the "buffalo charges" which Ludendorff launched in 1918 with the Germans' counter-offensive in Belgium today are obviously mistaken. Neither the general situation, the relation of forces, nor the objectives pursued in these totally different operations give any ground whatever for comparing one to the other. Such a comparison does not help one in the least properly to understand the events now taking place. And everything that serves to hinder the proper understanding of present-day events must naturally hinder the successful development of the common efforts of the United Nations towards securing the speedy rout of Hitler Germany.

Colonel M. TOLCHENOV
December 15
Mr. Churchill made a statement on the Polish question in the House of Commons.

The first peasant congresses were opened in Lublin and other liberated Polish towns at which resolutions were passed calling for the transformation of the Polish Committee of National Liberation into the Provisional Government of Poland.

December 16
United States troops landed on Mindoro Island, in the Philippines.

The joint Soviet-Finnish Commission for the demarcation of the boundaries of the district of Porkkala-Udd, leased to the Soviet Union by Finland, finished its work.

December 17
Announcement was made that the Soviet Government had accepted the Government of Nicaragua's offer to establish diplomatic and consular relations.

The German troops commenced a counter-offensive on the front occupied by the 1st and 9th United States Armies.

An agreement between the Governments of the U.S.S.R. and Finland was signed in Helsinki on the goods to be supplied by Finland in compensation for the damage inflicted upon the Soviet Union in the course of hostilities and the occupation of Soviet territory.

December 18
The text of the Treaty of Alliance and Mutual Assistance between the U.S.S.R. and France was published in the Soviet press.

December 19
The Extraordinary State Commission for Establishing and Investigating the Atrocities of the German Fascist Invaders and Their Accomplices issued a communiqué on the crimes the Hitler invaders perpetrated in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The United States Senate approved the appointment of Grew as Under Secretary of State, and Clayton, Dunn, Holmes, Rockefeller and MacLeish as Assistants to the Secretary of State.

December 20
The trial commenced in Sofia of the culprits responsible for involving Bulgaria in the war on the side of Hitler Germany.

The Soviet newspapers reported that on the invitation of the Comintern the first congress of peasants was held in Moscow on December 10, 1944.

The Provisions Government of France adopted a decision to nationalize the Renault plants.

December 21
A conference was opened in Athens attended by Mr. Churchill, Mr. Eden, delegates of the E.L.A.S. (the military organization of the National Liberation Front) and other persons invited by the Greek Prime Minister Papandreou. The United States Ambassador in Greece and Colonel Popov, the Soviet military observer, visited the conference.

The American troops established complete control over the Island of Leyte, Philippines.

The 86th session of the Japanese Parliament was opened.

December 22

In the region of Cremona, Italian patriots executed Roberto Farinacci, one of the chiefs of the Italian fascist party.

December 23
The Provisional National Government of Hungary declared war on Hitler Germany.

December 24
The German troops commenced a counter-offensive on the front occupied by the 1st and 9th United States Armies.

An agreement between the Governments of the U.S.S.R. and Finland was signed in Helsinki on the goods to be supplied by Finland in compensation for the damage inflicted upon the Soviet Union in the course of hostilities and the occupation of Soviet territory.

The text of the Treaty of Alliance and Mutual Assistance between the U.S.S.R. and France was published in the Soviet press.

The Extraordinary State Commission for Establishing and Investigating the Atrocities of the German Fascist Invaders and Their Accomplices issued a communiqué on the crimes the Hitler invaders perpetrated in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The United States Senate approved the appointment of Grew as Under Secretary of State, and Clayton, Dunn, Holmes, Rockefeller and MacLeish as Assistants to the Secretary of State.

The trial commenced in Sofia of the culprits responsible for involving Bulgaria in the war on the side of Hitler Germany.

The Soviet newspapers reported that on the invitation of the Comintern the first congress of peasants was held in Moscow on December 10, 1944.

The Provisions Government of France adopted a decision to nationalize the Renault plants.
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In the region of Cremona, Italian patriots executed Roberto Farinacci, one of the chiefs of the Italian fascist party.

The Provisional National Government of Hungary declared war on Hitler Germany.

The Germans in the region of Budapest maliciously killed two Soviet parlementaires.

TASS announced the handing over to the Bulgarian Government of the principal Bulgarian war captives for trial.

The first congress of peasants of the liberated areas of Poland was opened in Lublin.

The Krajowa Rada Narodowa (National People's Council) resolved to convert the Polish Committee of National Liberation into the Provisional Government of the Polish Republic.

The King of Greece appointed Archbishop Damaskinos Regent of Greece.
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