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The Mobilization of the Trade Unions for the Speediest Deterioration of Hitler Germany

V. Kuznetsov
President of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions

The world trade union conference to be held in London in the beginning of February will be called upon to solve great and responsible problems. For the first time during the hard and bitter struggle for the freedom-loving nations have waged during the past years against Hitler Germany, the representatives of the organized working class of the democratic countries will meet jointly to discuss extremely important war and post-war problems affecting the vital interests of the working class. The successful solution of these problems lies in the common endeavor to find ways and means for joint action, so as to hasten the defeat of Hitlerism, the worst enemy of mankind, and to lay the foundations for a just and durable peace.

The world trade union conference will gather in the atmosphere of the concluding stage of the struggle the freedom-loving nations are waging against Hitler Germany. The brilliant victories achieved by the Red Army and the troops of our Allies have created the necessary prerequisites for the utter defeat of the enemy. As a result of the crushing blows delivered by the Red Army last year, Rumania, Bulgaria, Finland and Hungary not only left the Hitler bloc, but declared war on their recent ally. The Red Army is now battering the enemy on his own territory; it is helping the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Norway to throw off the yoke of German fascist occupation. In the West, our Allies, with the active participation of the resistance forces, have liberated from the Germans France, Belgium and a considerable part of Holland, and are now waging war on German soil. As a result of the combined operations of the Soviet troops in the East and the Anglo-American troops in the West, fascist Germany is held in the grip of two fronts and is standing on the brink of disaster.

It is with a sense of extreme satisfaction that the freedom-loving nations welcome the remarkable victories the Soviet, American and British troops have achieved as a result of the coordinated action of the Allies in conformity with the historic decisions of the Tehran Conference. At the same time, the enormous part the working class of the democratic countries has taken by its self-sacrificing efforts in ensuring these victories is absolutely obvious.

The working people of the Soviet Union can look back upon the past conscious of having honourably discharged their duty to their country and to the peoples of all the freedom-loving nations, whose existence and independence had been placed in mortal peril by German fascism. Under the incredibly difficult conditions that arose in connection with the shifting of industry to the east, the reorganization of industrial plants for the production of war material, and the influx of new and inexperienced workers into industry to replace those who had gone to the front, the working people in the Soviet rear have increased production day after day. They have ensured uninterrupted supplies to the Red Army of all that was needed in the struggle against the hated enemy. In the execution of these tasks, the Soviet trade unions have taken a most active part.

The immense labour enthusiasm that has prevailed in Soviet industry, in the transport services and in agriculture has enabled our country to achieve economic victory over the enemy. The Soviet trade unions have devoted all their attention and all their efforts to the task of fostering and developing the patriotic initiative of the working men and women and of helping them in their stupendous task, of aiding them in their self-sacrificing labours for the Red Army.

By their self-sacrificing labours, too, the workers of the United States, Britain, Canada and the other Allied countries have ensured...
uninterrupted supplies of armaments, ammunition, equipment and provisions for the armies and navies of the United Nations numbering many millions of men. The United States and Britain have been, and are, rendering the Soviet Union substantial assistance in the way of war materials and provisions, for which the Soviet people are profoundly grateful to the working class and the peoples of these countries.

In those countries which found themselves under the heel of the Hitler invaders, the working class rose to fight a heroic struggle against the hated German aggressors and the traitors who assisted them. In the occupied countries, the organized workers were the backbone of the resistance movement and rendered the Allied armies enormous assistance in fighting the Hitler troops.

The conspicuous part played by the resistance movement in France in the struggle to liberate that country is common knowledge. In that movement the French workers, led by the Confédération Générale du Travail, were a tremendous factor. The resistance forces grouped around the underground trade unions in France were able to render valuable assistance to the Allied armies which landed on French territory, and took an active and heroic part in the military operations against the German invaders.

Brilliant pages in the history of the struggle the peoples are waging against German fascism have been inscribed by the heroic people of Yugoslavia. In the armed fight they have waged against the aggressors, the Yugoslav patriots have inflicted severe losses upon the German troops. In Belgium, the Netherlands and in Greece—everywhere, the working class marched in the forefront of the national liberation movement and, waging guerilla warfare, resisted the Hitler aggressors in the most diverse ways.

The military successes achieved by the Allied troops have brought the freedom-loving nations to the threshold of victory; but the more hopeless the position of the Hitler adventurers becomes the more stubborn and fierce is their resistance. The fascist monsters are committing ever new crimes in the endeavour to postpone the hour of doom, the hour of inevitable retribution for all their misdeeds. The enemy is striving to prolong the struggle, in the hope that war weariness will creep into the Allied camp and friction arise among the Allies.

All efforts must be exerted to secure the speediest defeat of Hitler Germany. The entire military might of the Allied countries must be hurled against the enemy. All our strength must be devoted to the execution of this task. The fighting slogan of the day has been and remains: “Everything for the front! Everything for victory!”

The people in the rear must satisfy the continuously growing requirements of the front. There must not be the slightest relaxation in production effort; on the contrary, it must be still further intensified in order to hasten our victory over the enemy. All inclination to indulge in complacency, passivity or pernicious over-optimism, all the designs of hostile elements—in short, all that may in the slightest degree lead to a relaxation of the war effort of the Allies, must be most strongly combated.

It is the sacred duty and primary obligation of the trade unions of the democratic countries resolutely to combat every attempt to reduce the output of war materials for the front, for every such reduction would mean postponing victory over the enemy, prolonging the war and, consequently, increasing the number of its victims.

It is precisely for this reason that the elements hostile to the common cause of the United Nations are doing their utmost to secure a reduction of output in order to assist the enemy. While the working class in the Allied countries is making so many sacrifices for the sake of achieving the speediest victory over Hitlerism, the reactionary section of the employing classes does not shrink from resorting to acts of provocation; it violates the laws governing working conditions and wages, ignores the legal rights of the trade unions, and provokes the workers to strike.

On the workers and their industrial organizations devolves the task of rendering their governments every possible assistance in bringing to light these subversive activities of the pro-fascist and reactionary elements, and of strongly combating every attempt to hinder the fullest development of the gigantic military potential of the United Nations.

The further mobilization of the workers for the purpose of steadily increasing the output of war material must go hand in hand with the defence of the workers’ economic interests. The working men and women justly demand that their trade unions shall make strenuous efforts to secure adherence to collective agreements, an improvement in the housing conditions of the work-
ers, an improvement in their food supplies, compulsory state insurance, an improvement in the protection of labour, an increase in real wages, equal pay for equal work for women and young persons, increase of earnings by improving their qualifications, and so forth.

Difficult and responsible tasks rise before the workers and industrial organizations of all the countries which only recently were liberated from German fascist occupation and are now striving to take an active part in the struggle against Hitler Germany. To exert persevering efforts to create an army which shall take a direct part in the common struggle against the Germans and to secure the speediest restoration of the industries that produce requirements for the front—such is the immediate task that confronts the trade union movement in those countries where the Hitlerites recently ruled. In those regions which have not yet been completely liberated from the fascist yoke, the working class takes an active part in the partisan struggle and in the underground movement in supplying the partisans with arms, ammunition and provisions.

The task of increasing output and of regularly supplying the front with arms, ammunition and provisions in the liberated countries is inseparable from that of combating the fascist agents and reactionary forces who are sabotaging the restoration of industry. In the interests of the struggle for the speediest defeat of Hitler Germany it is necessary completely to eradicate fascism and its influence from the recently liberated countries, to build up a firm rear for the Allied armies in the field and to revive the democratic principles of government, which presuppose the active participation of the masses of the workers in the political and economic life of the country.

The urgent and burning task of resolutely combating fascism and its agents also confronts the working class and the trade unions of Sweden, Switzerland and other countries which have held aloof from the war of the democratic countries against Hitler Germany. Who if not the working class and the trade unions can resolutely protest against the policy pursued by the governments of those countries which are actually helping Germany in a variety of ways? Energetic mass protest organized by the trade unions against the right of asylum accorded to war criminals; demand for the immediate cessation of all supplies of provisions and war materials to the Germans and the suppression of the activities of their spies and agents; demand for rupture of diplomatic, economic and other relations with countries like Spain, Portugal and Argentina, where fascist regimes exist, with the object of isolating those countries politically and economically—such is the immediate program which life itself presents to the trade unions.

The military defeat of fascist Germany does not by itself imply the final eradication of fascism. This cannot be achieved by a military victory alone. Moral and political defeat must be inflicted on fascism. The working class of the democratic countries is vitally interested in the creation, after victory over the common enemy has been achieved, of such close collaboration among the peace-loving nations, big and small, as will be able to prevent Germany from preparing for and launching another war. Germany must be disarmed economically and politically; the war criminals must be sternly punished. The friendly cooperation among the democratic countries must be cemented after as well as during the war. The fascists and their agents in the democratic countries are banking on the possibility of this friendship waning, on the unity and coordinated action of the United Nations being disrupted. Having sustained severe military defeat, the enemy is now placing all his hopes on the possibility of a rift appearing in the camp of the Allied Powers as a result of this or that disagreement, and on this saving Hitler Germany from defeat and destruction.

Naturally, the task of the trade unions, as representing the organized section of the working class—the most progressive section of modern society—is to frustrate these subversive efforts of the Hitlerites. We regard the cementing of the collaboration and friendship of the United Nations as a guarantee of speedy victory over the enemy and a guarantee of a firm and durable peace.

One of the most important factors operating towards cementing the collaboration and unity of the United Nations is the national and international unity of the working class. In this connection the question of trade union unity acquires exceptional urgency and acuteness.

The position of the Soviet trade unions on this question is well known to all. They have always consistently defended the unity of the
working class and the unity of the international trade union movement. We have always welcomed and supported every proposal to establish and cement the ties between the trade unions of the Soviet Union and those in other democratic countries. In 1941 the Soviet trade unions readily responded to the proposal of the British trade unions to establish contact between the Soviet and British trade unions and to set up an Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee. It should now be obvious to all that close connection and cooperation between the Soviet and British trade unions are to a considerable degree facilitating the war effort of our countries and the cementing of friendship between our peoples.

The Soviet trade unions will be glad to develop and cement in every way fraternal ties with the trade unions of France, the United States and other democratic countries. At the same time they attach exceptionally great importance to the formation of a strong and authoritative international trade union organization.

The working class of the whole world is vitally interested in the speedy establishment of a world trade union organization that will be capable of consistently defending its vital interests in the settlement of wartime as well as post-war problems.

Only with the active participation of the working class, and only if the trade unions actively assist the respective governments, will the democratic countries be able to achieve the speedy defeat of Hitler Germany and a firm and durable peace.

It is indeed difficult to overestimate the importance of the forthcoming world trade union conference in London in cementing the international ties of the working class of all the democratic countries. The formation of an effective world federation of trade unions is one of the most important and responsible tasks that confront the trade unions of the democratic countries in this last and most difficult stage of the war; for there can be no doubt that this world trade union organization can ensure a still greater mobilization of the efforts of the working class for the achievement of victory over Hitlerism.

The workers of the democratic countries whose representatives will attend the conference, and also the workers whose representatives will not attend through the fault of their reactionary leaders, place great hopes on this forthcoming conference, expecting that it will lay the firm foundations of a world trade union organization. These hopes and expectations must not be disappointed.

How to Begin

M. Evstratov

Chairman of the Central Committee of the Steel Workers Union of the Central Regions

The formation of a world federation of trade unions will undoubtedly be one of the most important questions to be discussed at the forthcoming international conference of trade unions. It turns out, however, that this question is not one that easily lends itself to solution. At all events, at present, influential trade unionists who are to attend the forthcoming conference hold different opinions as to how to begin this important task.

One proposal is that a start should be made by immediately organizing a new world federation, to which all the trade union centres of the freedom-loving nations could affiliate. This opinion was recently expressed very definitely by Philip Murray, the President of the American Congress of Industrial Organizations, who, in a statement to representatives of the press in Washington, said that the American delegation, of which he would be the head, intended to submit to the international trade union conference a proposal for the immediate organization of such a new world federation of trade unions.

Another plan which has now, on the eve of the London conference, suddenly emerged from the clouds is that a start should be made by reviving and reconstructing the pre-war Amsterdam International, the so-called International Federation of Trade Unions. The workers of all countries have for many years regarded this old notorious firm as defunct, for it vanished without leaving a trace on the outbreak of the war and has given no sign of life since. Now, however, the Belgian Schevenel's, the Secretary of the Amsterdam International, informs the world that the
General Staff of this organization is still alive and well. It transpires that all through the period of the war, the General Council of the Amsterdam International has been living in safe refuge in England, holding hole-and-corner meetings and waiting for the war to end. This unobtrusive and extremely queer way of life for the directing staff of an international organization is now to be changed. On learning that a world conference of trade unions is being convened in London, the General Council of the Amsterdam International resolved to leave its cellar, hold a full meeting on the eve of the conference, and present its claim to the leadership of the world trade union movement.

This “event” would not have been worth mentioning had the likelihood not arisen, suggested by Reuter’s report, that the plan and claim of the resurrected General Council of the Amsterdam International may be supported by certain British trade union leaders. If this is true then serious efforts must be made to convince the leaders of the British trade unions that this plan is inexpedient from the point of view of the general interests of the working class and of the trade union movement of all democratic countries.

It is common knowledge that during the present war all the trade unions of the United Nations have been taking a most active part in the war effort of their respective countries. The only exception is the leadership of the so-called International Federation of Trade Unions, which has done nothing to assist the liberation struggle against Hitler Germany and her satellites. In this respect it proved to be the only “unemployed” member of the trade union movement. Even Schevenels, the Secretary of the Amsterdam International, who in the journal The Trade Union World tried hard to prove that, after all, the Council of this organization had done something during the past four years, can tell us absolutely nothing about the part it played in the struggle against the common enemy of the freedom-loving nations. He can only tell us with a curious smugness that the Council of the Amsterdam International “held many meetings” and that its Secretariat issued “two reports,” one of which is the “product of nearly two years’ work” and contains a scheme for the reorganization of the International Federation of Trade Unions, while the other is “a tentative program of post-war demands.” That is all. But is this not palpable proof of the utter bankruptcy of the Amsterdam International and its leadership in face of the extremely important task that confronts the international trade union movement at the present time? How, after this, is it possible to call upon the masses of the workers and their industrial organizations, who have appreciated and have performed their duty during the anti-Hitler war, to place any confidence in the Amsterdam International, which utterly failed to understand this vital task and failed to fulfil its elementary duty?

But was not this virtual desertion of the leadership of the Amsterdam International from the struggle against the fascist aggressor during the war a logical result of the position it occupied in the pre-war period? Even after the 1936 Congress of the Amsterdam International itself had demanded that “all means at the disposal of the International Federation of Trade Unions be utilized for active resistance” to the fascist aggressors, its Secretariat and General Council systematically sabotaged every action taken against the growing danger of war. It is appropriate to recall here the sharp criticism that was levelled at the next Congress of the Amsterdam International, in July 1939, against the policy of its leaders by Léon Jouhaux and several other delegates. Jouhaux stated that by its passivity the Amsterdam International had facilitated the Munich capitulation, and demanded that empty words be transformed into organized action against fascism. Nevertheless, as a result of the pressure of Schevenels, Mertens, Watt, of the American Federation of Labour, and others, all attempts on the part of individual delegates at the Congress to work out a definite program of action in support of collective security and to secure the adoption of a definite resolution urging the necessity of Anglo-Franco-Soviet agreement were thwarted.

The same stubborn political passivity characterized the position of the Amsterdam International on other questions too. While claiming to champion the interests of the workers, it actually did nothing to help the trade unions to do so. If anything, it restrained them from taking effective action.

How then can an incarnation of inactivity like the Amsterdam International now serve as the core of an effective and efficient world federation of trade unions? All its traditions run counter to the needs of the present time. The Amsterdam International has no future. The times demand the formation of a world
trade union organization of a different type. If we ponder over the question of radically reconstructing the Amsterdam International, which, perhaps, some British trade union leaders are doing, we shall find that it is a much more complicated and difficult task than that of organizing a new international federation. Philip Murray quite rightly pointed to the complexity of such a task when he said:

"Under the rules and constitution of the I.F.T.U., any effort to reconstruct it by securing the affiliation of those trade union centres that are at present excluded would entail prolonged delays and deprive labour of the instrumentality for making its full influence felt in world affairs at the very moment when the creation of such an instrumentality is most important."

Philip Murray is quite right in stressing the "immediately urgent need for an organization which can speak authoritatively for the world labour movement." His proposal that a new federation of the trade unions of all the democratic countries should be formed, of course, deserves every support. Nevertheless, in my opinion it must be supplemented in an important particular. It must be borne in mind that even if the February conference decides to proceed immediately to organize a world federation, a certain amount of time will be required to carry out this great task. Firstly, the decision will have to be ratified by the respective national federations of trade unions, and secondly, it will evidently be necessary to convene a world trade union congress for the purpose of adopting the rules and program of action, and also of electing the permanent leading body of the world organization. All this can and must be speeded up to the utmost, but it is hardly likely that it can be accomplished earlier than, say, the autumn, or the end of this year. It is clear, however, that international trade union activities must be developed without delay. This cannot be postponed to the autumn, or to next year, unless we wish to follow the tradition of passivity and inactivity of the leadership of the Amsterdam International.

How should the start be made? In my opinion the start should be made with action, not rules.

Irrespective of the decision the February conference adopts regarding the form and date of organizing the world trade union federation, it will be necessary to convince the delegates at the conference of the urgent necessity of undertaking without delay ener-getic, concerted action on the part of the trade unions of the United Nations in the struggle for their common object, and also of drawing the trade unions of the other democratic countries into this scheme of international cooperation. For the purpose of directing this work it will be necessary to form a sufficiently authoritative international organ; and this must be done at once by a decision of the February conference. The main thing is that this international centre should be a really efficient organ, which will set to work without losing even a week.

If the conference agrees with this proposal it will formulate in broad outline the tasks of the international centre. We have in mind, primarily, not new tasks, but the intensification and international coordination of trade union activity in connection with those common tasks upon which the workers’ organizations of the United Nations are already engaged during the war, i.e., of uniting and augmenting the efforts of the working class with the object of securing the speediest and complete military, moral and political defeat of German fascism, and also of effectively promoting international cooperation for the establishment of lasting peace.

It goes without saying that this international trade union centre will have other tasks too. It will be its function to make preparations for the formation of the world trade union federation and to convene the inaugural world trade union congress. It may also be authorized, before the international trade union federation is formed, to demand and secure trade union representation at the future peace conference and on the various preparatory commissions and conferences. Nevertheless, of paramount importance is, undoubtedly, the first task of the international trade union centre, viz., that of intensifying the active participation of the trade unions in the effort to defeat the common enemy of the freedom-loving nations. It is upon this that the success of the international trade union movement entirely depends. The more actively and effectively the trade unions, now, during the next few months, help to bring about the final defeat of German fascism and its accomplices, the easier will it be for them to champion the interests of the masses of the workers after the war, and the more will the influence of the trade unions in national and international affairs grow. It is precisely in the course of and by the struggle
for the speediest achievement of victory for the United Nations in the war against Hitler Germany that the most favourable opportunities will be created for successful trade union action in the interests of the working class and of the whole of progressive mankind.

Thus, the international trade union centre will be called upon to play an extremely important role this year. This circumstance alone is a sufficient motive for forming a special organ for this purpose. At the same time, the importance of the role that this organ will play determines the importance of its composition. There is no need to go into the details of this question at the present stage. It will be sufficient to note the importance of two points concerning this matter. If the trade union centre is to be a really international and authoritative organ, it must consist of, firstly, the representatives of a sufficient number of national trade union federations, and not only of the European countries, of course; and, secondly, the trade unions of all the principal United Nations must be represented in it.

There are few trade union leaders left now who would dare to challenge the right of the Soviet trade unions to a place in the leadership of the international trade union movement. The last of the Mohicans of this type will inevitably become isolated, if they are not already isolated, from the broad, living stream of the working class movement. Perhaps even the Council of the Amsterdam International, which has now returned from the realm of shadows, is, at last, beginning to understand how barren must be all efforts to secure the isolation of the trade unions of the Land of Socialism. It looks, however, as though the Schevenels group has not yet abandoned its claims to predominance in the leadership of the world trade union federation with the object of utilizing this leadership, in one way or another, to counter-balance the influence of the Soviet, American, French and certain other trade unions within the world federation. It must be said, however, that these claims of the Amsterdam group are utterly groundless and incompatible with the principle of trade union democracy.

We representatives of the Soviet trade unions claim only democratic equality in the leadership of the world trade union organization that is to be formed. A very queer impression was created upon us by Reuter's report of January 9 to the effect that most of the leaders of the British trade union movement "fear that in the absence of the American Federation of Labour, the Russians and those other unions in which Communist influence is strong would carry decisive weight in the new body." We can scarcely believe that the British trade union leaders, who usually display such sound common sense, are troubled by such fears. They know the situation perfectly well. As for the Soviet trade unions, we demand no privileges whatever in the leadership of the world federation. Moreover, one would have thought that the British trade union leaders would have understood as well as we that if the work of the leadership of the international movement is to be successful, all its members will have to strive earnestly and consistently for mutual agreement and unanimity. That is the main thing. The attempt of any group to achieve predominance will spoil the whole business.

As regards the program of the world trade union federation, the fears, real or imaginary, of the British trade union leaders expressed by Reuter's observer concerning the "definite political program" of the Russians and the C.I.O. are obviously groundless. It goes without saying that the program of the world federation must be adopted by a perfectly democratic method. Whoever is afraid of this method has either a bad program to offer or an uneasy conscience.

We Soviet people are not afraid of trade union democracy. We regard it as the most important condition of success in the fulfillment of the tasks that confront the trade unions of the democratic countries.
Rehabilitation of the Trade Unions in the Liberated Countries of Europe

B. Leonidov

In a number of the countries liberated from the German fascist invaders, the democratic liberties of which the people had been robbed under the occupation are being restored. One of the most striking indications of the revival of democracy is the rapid rebuilding of the free, democratic trade unions.

The part played by the trade unions, wide organizations of the working class, in the fight of the freedom-loving nations against Hitlerism, is truly immense. It is not for nothing that the Hitlerites regarded the free trade unions as a constant menace to their “new order” and had them demolished not only in the occupied, but in the vassal countries as well. Notwithstanding the dissolution of the democratic trade unions and the arrests and shooting of their leaders, the invaders failed to stifle the free trade union movement. In many of the countries seized by the Hitler marauders, the trade unions went underground and continued to wage a vigorous struggle against fascism.

The trade unions of Yugoslavia displayed exemplary staunchness and fortitude in the fight against fascism. Even before Hitler Germany attacked the country, when the military dictatorship in Yugoslavia tried to suppress the free trade union movement, the workers set up trade union committees in the factories and offices. According to incomplete data, in April 1941, these committees embraced 150,000 workers by hand and brain. When the Germans invaded Yugoslav territory the entire working class of the country united in the fight for liberation. The trade unions in the provinces went underground and helped in every way to promote the unparalleled national unity which sprang up in Yugoslavia.

The workers of Britain, in particular, learned of the activities of one of these organizations in September 1943 when the Chief Committee of Workers’ Unity of Slovenia sent the following message of greeting to the Trade Union Congress:

“We should like the British working class to know the truth about our struggle and to realize under what difficult conditions we have been, for over two years already, waging a life and death struggle against the invaders.”

Quite a number of facts are known about the underground activities of the trade unions in Norway. They went underground after the Germans arrested Jens Tangen, Ljøner, Ødegård and Hansen, leaders of the Trade Union Federation, arrested and shot Wickstrøm, its secretary, Hansten, its legal adviser, and others. The Hitlerites tried hard to fascize the Norwegian trade unions and to impose the notorious fascist “labour front” upon the workers. This, however, encountered organized resistance. In September 1942 Quisling issued a decree setting up a “labour front” and making trade union membership compulsory. The workers retaliated by wholesale withdrawal from the trade unions; two-thirds of the members of the Trade Union Federation announced their resignation. An underground federation of free trade unions systematically exposed every new machination of the Hitlerites and Quislings, engineered sabotage at industrial plants and fostered unity in the ranks of the liberation movement of the Norwegian people.

The workers of Poland have made no small contribution to the fight of the United Nations. Summing up, as it were, the results of their participation in this struggle, the Lublin Związkowiec, organ of the Polish trade union movement, wrote on October 28, 1944, that “the unity of the Polish working class was forged in the flames of the struggle against the German invaders and native reactionaries.”

It is this unity, which has stood the stern test of the war, that serves as the foundation for the rapid revival of the free democratic trade unions in the countries liberated from the enemy. This conclusion is confirmed by events in a number of countries whose territories have been wholly or largely liberated from the German fascist invaders.

In Yugoslavia marked success has been achieved in the rehabilitation of the legal democratic trade union movement. On December 11, 1944, a conference of workers’ representatives of districts, factories and workshops was held in Belgrade which elected a city trade union committee. In the same month, as the Free Yugoslavia radio station reported on January 2, a mass meeting was called by the district trade union committees of Belgrade.
which was attended by workers' delegations from Užice, Cačak, Niš, Kraljevo, Kragujevac, Valjevo, Leskovac, Smederevo and other towns. The 20,000 persons who attended the meeting approved the initiative taken by the Belgrade workers in forming a Yugoslav trade union federation and elected an organization committee. The committee includes such well-known national trade union figures as Đura Salaj, a trade union leader since 1919, Lazo Stefanović, former General Secretary of the Central Workers' Alliance of United Yugoslavia from 1919 to 1929, Tone Fajfar, a member of the Slovenian Committee of Workers' Unity mentioned above, and others. The meeting instructed the organization committee to get into contact with the workers of the other regions of the country with the object of forming a united Yugoslav trade union movement.

The organization committee has been very active. A number of trade union conferences have already been held in Belgrade, at which organization committees were set up for various trades. Transport workers', office employees', textile workers', garment workers' and other organization committees have been formed and are working energetically.

Amidst the conflagration of war, the Yugoslav working class is rebuilding the united free trade unions in order to intensify the country's efforts to hasten the victory of the Allied Nations over Hitler Germany and rapidly to restore the economic life of Yugoslavia.

Efforts to rebuild the free trade unions have assumed wide dimensions in the liberated territories of Poland. Trade unions had already been restored in Chelm and Lublin at the end of July 1944. The initiators in this work of restoration were the old trade union leaders who had survived the terror of the occupation, as well as new forces which had taken part in the armed struggle against the Germans. Old trade unions began rapidly to be restored and new organizations formed in the towns and voievodships of all the liberated territory: district councils, each embracing the trade unions of a whole voievodship, were set up in Lublin, Belostok and Rzeszów. Complete trade union unity is the underlying principle of all these organizations.

The trade unions of liberated Poland are displaying vigorous and all-round activity. They are taking an active part in rehabilitating demolished industrial plants and railways, in combating profiteering, in carrying out the agrarian reform and in building up the armed forces of the country.

The growth of the trade unions and the new tasks that confront them have made it necessary to centralize and coordinate their activities throughout the liberated territory. In October 1944, the Lublin District Trades Council recommended the formation of a Provisional Central Trade Union Commission. Delegates to this commission were elected that same month at a conference of the trade unions of the Lublin voievodship, representing 65,000 organized workers. Similar conferences were subsequently held in Belostok and Rzeszów, and somewhat later in the Warsaw and Kielce voievodships, which also elected delegates to the Provisional Central Trade Union Commission. The inaugural meeting of the commission was held in November in Lublin. In this way a central leadership has been set up for the united trade union movement of Poland, which now has a membership of over 100,000.

The rehabilitation of the legal democratic trade union movement in France has a significance all its own. The struggle and revival of the French trade unions is a theme so broad and important that it is impossible to deal with it in the present article.

The facts we have cited, whose number could be multiplied, testify to a legitimate urge on the part of the trade union organizations of the territories liberated from the enemy to unite and weld the workers as quickly as possible for the most effective defence of the vital interests of the working class. The reviving trade unions and their leaders fully realize that the working class can defend its interests only by uniting the democratic organizations and establishing close ties with the trade unions of the other democratic countries. Expressions of this urge are the decision of the inaugural meeting of the Provisional Central Trade Union Commission of Poland and the statement of the leadership of the Norwegian Trade Union Federation on participation in the world trade union conference in London. It would be strange indeed, to say the least, if the trade unions of the liberated countries did not express such a wish, inasmuch as it is the mission of the forthcoming international trade union conference to mobilize the forces and efforts of the working masses of all democratic countries for the complete and final destruction of fascism and for the creation of conditions which will en-
The cardinal tasks of the international trade union movement are to unite the working masses of all the democratic countries to strive for the earliest victory over the dark forces of fascism, and for a stable and prolonged peace after the war. It should further be borne in mind that the victories achieved by the Red Army and the armies of our Allies have likewise made possible the return to the path of democratic development of those countries which, not because the working class wished it, but in face of its resistance, found themselves in the camp of the enemy as a consequence of the criminal game played by the ruling cliques.

Led by the underground trade unions the working class of Bulgaria waged a stubborn strike struggle against the rule of the Hitlerites in its country, for its economic and political rights, and against the persecution of the trade unions and the arrest of their members by the fascist authorities. This struggle reached its climax in September 1944, when the Pernik miners' strike broke out and served as the signal for a mass political strike in Sofia, Plovdiv and other towns. When the Patriotic Front Government took over the guidance of the country the democratic organizations began rapidly to revive. The newspapers were full of reports of the rehabilitation of trade unions and of the formation of new provisional leaderships for some of them. A Provisional Central Committee of the General Workers' Alliance of Bulgaria was set up which proclaimed the dismissal of the fascist trade union officials and the restoration of the democratic rights of the Bulgarian workers.

The twenty-three trade unions united in the General Workers' Alliance embrace all branches of industry. Seventeen of the trade unions, including those of the railway workers, metal workers, building workers, and agricultural workers, already have their central leaderships.

In the first three months of legal activities the affiliated membership of the Bulgarian General Workers' Alliance rose to 200,000. The first issue of the weekly organ of the Alliance, the Zname na Truda, of October 20, 1944, printed the directives of the Central Committee of the Alliance, in which it was stressed that the primary task of the democratically constituted trade unions is to assist in every way the defence of the daily economic and spiritual interests of the entire working class of Bulgaria.

The Bulgarian trade union masses fully support the Patriotic Front Government, which has resolutely placed itself on the side of the United Nations, has mustered the economy and armed forces of Bulgaria for the purpose of accelerating the defeat of Hitler Germany and is guiding the country along the path of democracy. The new Bulgaria has cemented with the blood of her sons her alliance with the anti-Hitler coalition of the freedom-loving nations and is demonstrating by deeds her readiness to make any sacrifice for the earliest and complete defeat of Hitlerism.

The working class of Bulgaria and its trade unions are anxious to take a share in the creation of an international trade union federation. This desire was expressed in a letter to Walter Citrine, General Secretary of the British Trade Union Congress, the contents of which were broadcast by Radio Sofia on December 15, 1944. The letter announced the creation of free trade unions, which are taking "an active part in the fight against fascism and for the creation of a new democratic Bulgaria," and which have taken their place in the front ranks of those who are working for fraternal understanding with the great democratic nations, and, in the first place, with the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the United States. The letter concluded with the request that a Bulgarian delegation be permitted to attend the international trade union conference in London.

A similar statement was made over the radio on January 7, 1945, by Brătășeanu, the chairman of the organization committee of the united trade union movement of Rumania. Declaring that in Rumania there were now trade unions with a total membership of 500,000 and having several thousand factory committees, he dedicated his speech to the tasks of the forthcoming Rumanian trade union congress. The congress is to discuss the formation of a General Confederation of Labour, the country's economic situation, labour legislation, means of increasing the national war effort, the extirpation of the fascist ideology in the country, and so forth. Brătășeanu then went on to say:

"The Rumanian trade union movement does not wish to remain isolated within the borders of its country and is anxious to establish ties with the trade unions of other countries, and accordingly representatives of the trade unions of Britain, France, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Italy and the Soviet
Union have been invited to the trade union congress.

"The united trade union movement of Rumania will send delegates to the forthcoming international trade union conference in London.

"All Rumanian workers are animated by the desire to make their contribution to the war against Hitlerism and to create a free, democratic and independent Rumania."

Thus we see that in Rumania, too, substantial success has been achieved in rehabilitating the free trade unions. The working class of Rumania has resisted the fascist regime for many years. The trade unions began to display activity particularly after the events of August 23, 1944. The armed workers immediately formed detachments to fight the Germans. When the German army was hurled back from Bucharest, a conference was called on the initiative of the National Democratic Bloc to discuss the formation of united trade unions. An organization committee was set up under whose direction energetic work was begun to rehabilitate the trade union organizations in the factories. Trade unions were formed on the basis of genuine workers' democracy from below to fight for the workers' demands. Factory committees were elected at general meetings of the workers.

The work of creating trade union committees in the factories of Rumania has now been completed. Trades councils embracing all the trade union committees of the given locality have been formed in the towns. Central organs are being elected at conferences of the respective industrial unions, and the All-Rumanian Congress of Trade Unions to be held on January 20-26 will set up a General Confederation of Labour.

The trade unions, organizing the workers, as they do, on the platform of the National Democratic Front, are an important factor in the democratic revival of Rumania. They mobilize the masses behind the demand for the punctilious fulfillment of the terms of the armistice and for increasing the national effort in the war against Germany; they fight for an improvement in the conditions of the workers by hand and brain, and take an active part in purging government offices and the industrial enterprises of fascist and pro-fascist elements. In all these spheres the trade unions are already able to register a number of successes. They secured, for example, the adoption of a decree for increasing wages and are exercising control over production and productivity of labour in plants whose products are essential for the successful conduct of the war against Hitler Germany. The newspaper Scânteia reported on December 17 that as a result of this latter measure, the miners of the Vala-Trotuș collieries increased productivity of labour 25-30 per cent, while the miners of Comănești and the Petroșani collieries considerably increased output.

We thus see that the efforts of the resurrected democratic trade unions of Rumania, which represent the largest section of the organized working class in the country, are contributing their share to the efforts of the working class of all the democratic countries in their fight against Hitler Germany.

A highly important role is being played by the resurrected trade unions of Italy, accounts of whose activities have already appeared in previous issues of our journal.

The rehabilitation of the democratic trade unions in countries liberated from fascist rule is, of course, in the interests of the working class and of the people in general, for it helps to strengthen the front of the freedom-loving democratic countries in the fight for the earliest achievement of complete victory over the forces of fascist barbarism and for the establishment of enduring peace. The future international trade union federation will serve as a centre for coordinating the efforts of the working class in this direction. It is to be presumed that the rehabilitated democratic trade unions of the countries which have resolutely come over to the side of the Allied Nations and have cemented their ties with them with blood will be worthy members of this federation.
The Indian Problem

A. Dyakov

INDIA, one of the most ancient and greatest countries in the world, has always attracted the attention of the whole of civilized mankind. So vast is this country that, although the largest colony that ever existed, she is rightly called a sub-continent. She is extremely rich in the most diverse natural resources. With her nearly 400,000,000 population she is an inexhaustible reservoir of human energy. For many centuries she was regarded by Europeans as being fabulously rich; she was the object of the avaricious designs of adventurers from all European countries, and upon her has been directed the enquiring gaze of thinkers who have sought in the Orient the key to the riddle of the universe. Already in remote antiquity the peoples of India had developed a very high culture of their own, which exercised no little influence on the mental development of all civilized nations. Despite all this, however, India is not playing a role in the life of modern mankind commensurate with her place in history, her human and natural resources and her potentialities. It is an indisputable fact that this vast country, with her vast potentialities, occupies a very humble place in present-day world politics, economics and culture. This discrepancy is particularly glaring during the present war, which the forces of aggression have thrust upon the freedom-loving nations. Undoubtedly, this discrepancy lies at the basis of the discussion of Indian problems which has been occupying an extremely prominent place in the columns of the British and American press, in parliamentary debates and so forth, since the very beginning of the war.

The opinion has been repeatedly expressed in the British and American press that India must serve as the principal, Allied, military and economic base in the East. Lately, however, the British, and particularly the American press, have been commenting with increasing frequency on the fact that the war has sharply revealed the utterly inadequate development of India's economy.

The low level of development of the country's productive forces prevents the utilization of her human and natural resources to any considerable extent either under peace or war conditions. The weakness of India's economy is revealed primarily in the field of industry. To characterize the state of heavy industry in India it is sufficient to recall that with a population of 400,000,000, India's output of iron and steel is on the level of that of Canada, whose population does not exceed 12,000,000. The production of steel has grown to some extent during the war, but even today India produces much less steel than was produced before the war by Belgium, which had a population of less than 9,000,000. Machine building, which is the backbone of modern industry, hardly exists in India as a separate branch of industry. Even the textile industry, which is the most developed branch in India, is unable to meet the extremely limited demand of the population. True, during the war certain branches of industry in India have increased output. The production of armaments of various types, explosives and ammunition has been organized. India supplies the Allied troops with clothing, footwear, tents, sacks, etc. A chemical industry has sprung up, and an aircraft assembly plant has been erected. But as the Indian and American press points out, India cannot manufacture her own aircraft, tanks and automobiles because she does not manufacture engines.

A striking illustration of India's low level of industrial development are the respective proportions of value of output of industry and agriculture to total value of output. According to the London Economist of December 18, 1943, industrial output accounted for one-fifth and agricultural four-fifths of the total value of output.

India has remained to this day an agrarian country, with industry scarcely developed. Agriculture is the source of livelihood of the overwhelming majority of the population. Fettered by the survivals of feudalism, however, agriculture in India bears the impress of extreme primitiveness. It has long been in a state of stagnation. An index of this state is the fact that, according to official Indian statistics, for the ten years from 1929-1930 to 1938-1939, the sown area of India, far from expanding, had actually shrunk from 228,161,000 acres to 209,400,000 acres. Particularly marked has been the shrinkage of the rice area (from 79,424,000
acres to 69,918,000 acres); and rice is the staple food crop in a number of the most important provinces such as Bengal, Bihar and others. The area of such important industrial crops as cotton and jute has also shrunk. The yields of the staple agricultural crops in India have remained on a totally inadequate level.

The stagnation in India's agriculture cannot be attributed to fortuitous causes, such as drought or floods, or to unfavourable climatic conditions. India's climate is favourable for agriculture; it is extremely varied and permits of the cultivation of nearly all the known agricultural crops. In many provinces it is possible to gather two harvests per annum from the same plot. Mighty rivers ensure water for irrigation where that is necessary. The stagnation and deterioration of India's agriculture are due, of course, to the extreme primitiveness of the productive relations that still prevail in the Indian rural districts. Over nine-tenths of the total sown area of the country are cultivated by small and very small tenants, many of whom own no draft animals and have no hope of improving their methods of cultivation, of using fertilizers, or of employing up-to-date implements. Very often the Indian peasant is obliged to pay so large a share of his income to the usurer and the landowner that he must borrow again from the usurer in order to be able to keep body and soul together until the next harvest.

It is not surprising under these circumstances that India's agriculture failed to stand the test of war. It has not only proved incapable of supplying the Allied armies in the East with provisions, but has also been unable to provide food for the inhabitants of the country. Owing to the extreme backwardness of agriculture, the reduction of imports of rice and other food grains led to famine in many of the most important provinces of the country, particularly in Bengal. The famine in India is causing understandable alarm in Great Britain, but it is evident that the measures proposed to combat it are, as a rule, only palliatives; they do not touch the fundamental cause—the primitiveness of the entire economic system of the Indian countryside.

In the field of culture, too, India does not occupy the place in the civilized world that it could claim, considering her vast population and her cultural traditions. We have in mind not only the extremely low standard of literacy in the country, but also the fact that after having played such an important role in developing world culture in the past, India today is unable to make anything like a fitting contribution to civilization. It cannot be regarded as an accident that this vast sub-continent is less represented in the field of modern literature than the small European countries, such as Norway and Denmark. A similar state of affairs is observed in all other spheres of culture, science and art. India has produced very few poets, authors and scholars of world repute.

What is retarding the economic and cultural development of India in the present period?

Every sincere democrat must, of course, rebuff all attempts to attribute the economic and cultural weakness of modern India to the specific national composition of the Indian people, to any feature of their national spirit, their mentality and so forth.

All impartial observers quite rightly regard the extreme political backwardness of this country, which has remained in the position of a British colony up to the middle of the twentieth century, as the fundamental and main cause of her strikingly tardy economic and cultural development. Everybody knows that the Indian people are living under political conditions that no nation in Europe lived under before the war. Naturally, these primitive forms of political life have been hampering the development of the Indian people for a long time past. As a result of these abnormal conditions the struggle between the stagnant forms of social life, which are fostered from outside, and the nascent progressive forces and trends is proceeding in a manner very much different from that in other countries. Moreover, political backwardness influences even the progressive movements and trends which are striving to remove the causes of India's tardy development and to lead the country on to the highway of free development.

As a consequence of the peculiar political situation in India we have the very peculiar system of parties and political organizations that exists in the country. The largest and most influential party is, undoubtedly, the Indian National Congress. Before the war it had about 6,000,000 members. The Indian National Congress is not a political party in the ordinary sense of the term, because to it are affiliated nearly all the political groups and organizations which aim at achiev-
ing the complete independence of India. These groups and organizations formerly bore a very heterogeneous social complexion. To the Congress affiliated organizations which represented the working class and the peasantry, and also groups which represented the interests of the manufacturers and merchants. Another political organization, having no connection with any of the religious communities, is the Liberal Federation, which differs from the Right, the most moderate wing of the National Congress, only in that its aim is to achieve dominion status and not complete independence.

The two other large all-Indian political parties are built on the religious community principle. The two main religions in India are Hinduism and Islamism. The largest organization, which represents the interests of the Hindu bourgeoisie and partly of the landlords, is the Hindu-Mahasabha (the Great Hindu League); and the largest Muslim organization is the Muslim League. These organizations are fighting for political privileges for their respective religious communities. In 1940 the Muslim League advanced as the main plank of its platform the demand for the partition of India into two states, i.e., a Muslim state—Pakistan—and a Hindu state—Hindustan.

The political backwardness of India is reflected in the platforms of the political parties and organizations and in their ideology. This applies also to the Indian National Congress, which, in general, is undoubtedly a progressive organization. Gandhi, who is the most influential and popular leader of the Indian National Congress, has services to his credit which even his political opponents inside and outside the country do not deny. He has earned great popularity by his efforts to rouse the most backward masses of the Indian peasants and artisans to conscious political life, by his efforts to improve their material conditions, by his ability to speak to the masses in the language they understand, and by his staunch behaviour. It is characteristic, however, that the organization of which he is the head has failed to work out a clear political program, and act as big political parties do in modern states. Moreover, one cannot help noting that the philosophy of Gandhi-ism fails by a long way to understand the big political problems of the present day, for it bears the strong imprint of the backwardness that is characteristic of the political life of India. Gandhi’s philosophy of non-resistance is nothing but a reflection of India’s subordinate status, and is totally out of harmony with the fundamental tasks of the present day, particularly in the present war against the forces of aggression which are striving to subjugate the freedom-loving nations. Another paradoxical feature of Gandhi-ism, also due to the specific features of Indian reality, is its hostility towards modern machinery and large-scale industry. It is sufficient to recall that in the European countries “machine-wrecking” movements have not been witnessed for more than a hundred years. Only in the peculiar conditions under which the Indian people are living could a movement, which, on the whole, is progressive, and the object of which is to achieve the independence of its country, accept a philosophy that rejects large-scale industry, without the development of which no country can be independent, either politically or economically.

To a still greater degree is the political backwardness of India reflected in the ideology of such of her political organizations as the Muslim League and Hindu Mahasabha, with their religious community exclusiveness and striving to subordinate national interests to religious distinctions. The division of the inhabitants of India into castes has resulted during the past ten years in efforts to form and activate the political organizations of the “lower” castes, particularly of the “untouchables.”

Lastly, one of the bulwarks of India’s political backwardness is the large number of feudal and semi-feudal principalities which still exist in India and are in vassal dependence upon Great Britain. The Indian princes play an important, although not independent role in the political life of India. Their aim is, as far as possible, to preserve their feudal or semi-feudal rights and privileges and, therefore, they come out as a conservative force imitational to progress and the democratization of the country.

* * *

India passed through periods of great political tension even before the war. The partial introduction in 1937 of the so-called “new constitution” (the Government of India Act, 1935), which brought about scarcely any material change in the political status of the country, still further intensified the struggle. For different, sometimes quite opposite,
reasons, the political organizations and groups in India, representing the most diverse sectors of the population, were dissatisfied with this constitution.

When the war broke out the proclamation of India as a belligerent was differently reacted to by the different political parties and social groups of India.

Despite its hostility to fascism, the Indian National Congress declared that it would not support Great Britain in the war unless the British Government proclaimed the independence of India and set up during the war a National Government responsible to the elected section of the Indian Legislative Assembly. Other organizations, including the Muslim League and the Hindu-Mahasabha, although expressing themselves in favour of supporting Great Britain in the war, nevertheless made a number of reservations. Only the above-mentioned Liberal Federation and the Indian princes declared their unreserved support of Great Britain.

As a consequence, the British Government felt obliged, through the Viceroy of India and the Secretary of State for India, to state its willingness to grant India dominion status at the earliest possible date after the war. During the war it has enlarged the Viceroy’s Executive Council by adding to it a number of Hindus. Nevertheless, even the Indian political organizations most friendly to Great Britain, such as the Liberal Federation, regarded these measures as totally inadequate. As for the National Congress, it expressed its protest by instructing the Congress Ministers in the provincial governments (in eight out of the eleven in India) to resign. Thus arose the situation which the foreign press described as a political deadlock.

In the beginning of 1942, in connection with the advance of the Japanese troops through the territory of the Indo-Chinese Peninsula towards the frontiers of India, the British Government tried to reach a compromise with the social and political groups in India. With this object Stafford Cripps was sent to India as a representative of the British War Cabinet with proposals drawn up by that Cabinet for discussion with the leaders of the most important political organizations. These proposals were summed up in the following points:

1. The creation of a new Indian Union which shall constitute a dominion.

2. The right of any province or principal-ity to remain outside the Indian Union, to form a separate dominion or retain its present relations with Great Britain.

3. During the war all responsibility for the government of India and for her defence is to rest on the Viceroy, while the political parties of India could take part in the work of mobilizing the resources of the country through their representatives on the Viceroy’s Executive Council or by cooperating in various voluntary public measures.

It is well known that Cripps’ mission failed and India remained in the position of a colony. On various grounds the British War Cabinet’s proposals were rejected by the most important political organizations of India. The Indian National Congress stated that it demanded a declaration granting India complete independence, objected to the point which granted provinces and principalities the right to remain outside of the Indian Union on the ground that it was a menace to India’s unity, and demanded the immediate formation in India of a full-powered National Government that would bear full responsibility both for the government of the country and for its defence. As Cripps subsequently stated, the disagreement on the latter point was the decisive cause of the rejection of the British War Cabinet’s proposals by the Indian National Congress.

Thus, Cripps’ mission failed to settle the political troubles in India. On the contrary, the political situation became more tense. The gulf between the Government and the Indian National Congress became wider. The Congress persistently demanded the formation of a responsible Cabinet and refused to support the Government’s war efforts until this was granted. At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Congress held on August 8, 1942, it was resolved to launch, at the end of August, a campaign of civil disobedience if the British Government failed to satisfy the Congress demands.

Immediately after this decision was adopted the Government arrested all the prominent leaders of the Indian National Congress, including its Muslim Chairman, Abdul Kalam Azad, Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and others. The arrest of the Congress leaders evoked a mass protest movement, and in some places open collisions with the police. The movement assumed a spontaneous, unorganized character, of which, undoubtedly, the agents of the Axis powers took advantage. As a result of the activities of provocateurs, railway stations were wrecked in a number of places and
strikes broke out at several munition factories. Many trade unions, labour leaders, and a number of political organizations protested against these excesses and called upon the workers not to down tools so as not to hold up supplies for the troops who were barring the way for the aggressors. The unrest spread to some parts of the rural districts. It did not assume a nation-wide character, however, and remained sporadic and local. The movement subsided rather soon.

The cessation of unrest did not, however, imply that the political deadlock in India had come to an end. Almost the whole of public opinion in India, including even the parties and political groups which had strongly opposed the civil disobedience campaign, demanded the liberation of the Congress leaders as an essential condition precedent for the removal of the deadlock.

The failure of Cripps' mission, and the subsequent events in particular, caused great disappointment and anxiety not only in India, but also in Great Britain, the United States and other democratic countries. Many influential English newspapers expressed the hope that the Government would not confine itself to this one attempt to settle the Indian crisis, but would respond to the demands of the most important political organizations of India and draw up another program, which might serve as a basis for agreement. Both in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords numerous questions were put to the Government on the situation in India. Lord Emery, the Secretary of State for India, stated in reply to a question that responsibility for the failure of Cripps' mission rested primarily upon the Indian political parties, which could not reach agreement among themselves. He stated that a responsible Government for India was out of the question until the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League reached agreement and guarantees for the protection of the interests of the princes, the "untouchables," and other minorities, had been created.

As for the United States, its press and public circles repeatedly expressed grave apprehensions that the political situation in India would hinder the full and all-sided utilization of her resources in the war against the aggressor. Especially characteristic of this were the numerous utterances in the American press in connection with the recall from India of Philips, the President's representative.

Associating itself with the main theses expressed in the memorandum attributed to Philips, in which it was stated that the political situation in India did not conduce to the mobilization of her resources for the war, the Washington Post in September 1944 stated that the people of India at present had little reason to regard this war as their own.

Disapproval of the Anglo-Indian Government's policy was also expressed by several official persons and members of the United States House of Representatives and Senate. In particular, the opinion was widespread in the United States that the arrest and detention of a number of Congress leaders was a blunder.

Up to the beginning of 1944, the situation in India remained practically unchanged. In May 1944, Gandhi was released. True, Lord Emery repeatedly emphasized that Gandhi's release did not indicate any change in the British Government's policy, and that it had been prompted exclusively by consideration for Gandhi's health. Nevertheless, after Gandhi's release preparations were begun for various political negotiations. Gandhi offered to meet Jinnah, the leader of the Muslim League, to settle controversial questions.

Numerous Englishmen active in politics have long pointed to Hindu-Muslim strife as the main obstacle to the introduction of urgent measures for the democratization of the political system of India. Undoubtedly, religious strife has increased in India during the past decades. Nevertheless, even this negative phenomenon can scarcely be explained without taking into consideration the main evil, viz., India's political backwardness. In particular, many, not without good grounds, point to certain specific features of the Indian electoral system (religious community constituencies), the principles on which the Indian Civil Service and Army are recruited, and so forth, as the direct causes of this phenomenon.

The demand of the Muslim League for the partition of India into two states—Pakistan and Hindustan—was sharply opposed by the Indian National Congress, as well as by a number of other Indian organizations, which stated that the partition of India would lead to her enfeeblement. Pakistan was opposed not only by all-Indian organizations like the National Congress and the Liberal Federation, and not only by Hindu organizations such as the Hindu Mahasabha, but also by a number of Muslim organizations...
(Jamiat ul Ulema, Ahirat, and others) and by all the Muslim members of the Indian National Congress. Even a section of the Muslim League expressed opposition to the proposal to partition India.

Desiring to reach an agreement with the Muslim League at all costs, a number of Indian political organizations, and prominent Congress leaders, who were at large at that time, began to advocate the granting to Muslims of the right to self-determination in some form or other. This was strongly supported by Rajagopalachari, a prominent member of the Congress and ex-Premier of the Government of Madras. The All-Indian Congress of Trade Unions, which met at Nagpur in March 1944, expressed itself in favour of granting right to self-determination to all the nationalities of India, including the Muslim nationalities.

On his release Gandhi expressed a desire to cooperate in bringing about agreement between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League, as he regarded this as the most important condition for achieving national unity. Through Rajagopalachari, he sent to the Muslim League offers to open negotiations, and in the proposals he drafted he pointed out that in his opinion the relations between Pakistan and Hindustan should be established on a federal basis. Jinnah, not without some delay, expressed willingness to open negotiations, which took place in the autumn of last year. The results, however, were nil. Giving his reason for the breakdown of the negotiations Jinnah stated that the Muslim League would not agree to any connection between Pakistan and Hindustan, and demanded the complete secession of Pakistan. Moreover Gandhi's demand for a plebiscite in those provinces where Muslims constitute no more than seventy percent of the population was also unacceptable in Jinnah's opinion. The Muslim League demanded that Beluchistan, Sind, the Punjab, Bengal and Assam, within their present boundaries, be included in Pakistan without any plebiscite. Gandhi, however, expressed the hope that the negotiations would be resumed and stated that it were not for a third party agreement would have been reached.

The failure of the negotiations between Jinnah and Gandhi caused widespread disappointment in India, and dissatisfaction was even expressed by several prominent leaders of the Muslim League. At the same time, a number of English newspapers and journals in India as well as in England, such as the Civil and Military Gazette, Times of India, the Spectator, and others, wrote that the breakdown of the negotiations once again proved how profound and irreconcilable were the antagonisms between Hindus and Muslims. Much earlier, when the negotiations had only just started, the Times, pointing to the difficulty of the task that confronted Gandhi and Jinnah, had already emphasized that even the success of these negotiations would not solve the Indian problem because the "Sikh problem," and the problems of the "untouchables" and the Indian princes, would still remain unsolved.

It cannot be denied, of course, that India is faced with numerous complex problems, which are particularly aggravated by her colonial position. India is a multi-national country. The religious communities play an important role in her political life. Extremely influential forces are interested in perpetuating the political and ideological disunity. The solution of the numerous problems arising out of the political life of India is by no means an easy matter, but there can scarcely be any doubt that they are already knocking at the door, demanding immediate solution.

The key to success in this matter is the elimination of the main cause of India's weakness—her political backwardness. If democracy is consistently introduced in all spheres of the political life of the country, if the democratic principle of equality irrespective of race, nationality and religion is adhered to, India can throw off the burden of colonial backwardness that is crushing her peoples, overcome the obstacles in her path of economic and cultural development, and occupy her proper place among the freedom-loving countries of the world.
Apropos of a Certain Controversy

N. Ruzin

OF LATE ARTICLES have been appearing fairly frequently in the British and American press full of mutual criticism of a more or less violent character.

In October 1944, for example, the London Sunday Despatch printed an editorial entitled "Struggle," in which certain American circles were credited with the desire of conducting the final offensive against Japan without Great Britain with the object of scooping the entire Far Eastern market exclusively for American interests after Japan's heavy industry has been destroyed or curtailed. Shortly before this, at the end of September, a number of articles and comments appeared in the Daily Mail describing how the Americans are taking advantage of their military administration in France to forestall the British and to seize favourable positions for American industrial and financial concerns. In November 1944 a debate was held in the House of Commons, the tenor of which was that the British were losing their positions in South America, which were being seized by the Americans. This debate evoked wide comment in the press of both countries. Similar controversies arose over a number of other questions, such as the Anglo-American oil negotiations, the international currency and finance conference and the plans for a world stabilization fund, the Chicago conference on post-war civil aviation, and so on.

Until the end of last year this controversy was kept within certain definite bounds; in December, however, it assumed an extremely acrimonious form. On December 5 a statement by the U.S. State Department was published in connection with the events in Italy and Greece. As we know, when the new Bonomi Government was formed in Italy, English circles raised objections to Count Sforza as candidate for the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs. Shortly after this they intervened even more energetically in the conflict between E.L.A.S. and the Greek Government. In connection with these events the State Department stated that:

"Since Italy is an area of combined responsibility, we have reaffirmed to both the British and Italian Governments that we expect the Italians to work out a form of government along democratic lines without influence from outside."

It went on to say that this policy would be applied to an even greater degree to Governments of the United Nations in their liberated territories.

The publication of this declaration by the American State Department was followed by lively and trenchant anti-British comments in a section of the American press. The British were accused of imperialism, of desiring to secure a "sphere of influence" in Europe by force, of violating the principles of the Atlantic Charter, and so on and so forth. It is significant that certain of the most reactionary organs of the American press, like the Hearst publications, jumped at the opportunity to launch a new series of anti-Soviet attacks. For instance, the New York Journal and American, which has gained notoriety in this respect, wrote that, strictly speaking, there was no cause to be indignant with the behaviour of the British and that, on the contrary, Churchill's policy in Greece deserved every support; it was "anarchy" and "malicious conspiracies," which, in the opinion of this newspaper, were to be combated. It concluded by stating that Churchill was resisting a powerful, subtle and ruthless conspiracy for the bolshevization of Europe.

While, therefore, certain American newspapers supported British policy in Europe, this support was rendered in such a form as to remind one of the clumsy and fatal services rendered by the bear in the fable.

The severe criticism of Britain in the American press evoked a sharp rejoinder in the British press. At the end of December and in the beginning of January several articles appeared, one after another, in various English newspapers and magazines, the general purport of which was that the British were tired of uncomplainingly tolerating the American attacks and that it was time to put a stop to them. The most noteworthy of these articles was the one published in the very last issue of the Economist for the year 1944. Briefly recapitulating the substance of American criticism of British policy the Economist declared that it was becoming very hard to bear these attacks calmly and smilingly. The author indignantly protested that in criticizing the British the Americans attributed to them their own shortcomings, and went on to say:
"Nothing is being or could be sought by the British half as dominating and exclusive as the sphere of influence created by the Monroe Doctrine."

The author complained that criticism of the British for playing "balance of power politics" came from the very lips that called for annexation by the United States of all convenient naval bases in both oceans.

The article further raised the question

"of the extent to which British policy can safely be shaped in reliance on American collaboration and just how much British safety can gamble on American good will."

The author answered this question by saying that there was no chance of receiving from the Americans adequate compensation for a policy of sincere collaboration in the form, say, of an Anglo-American alliance or an American guarantee of British territorial integrity, or at least a promise to put down aggression wherever it may appear.

"There is no more possibility of any of these things than of an American petition to rejoin the British Empire," the article declared.

It ended with the perfectly definite statement that in the matter of safeguarding her security and in her foreign policy generally Britain can no longer rely only on the Americans' vague promises.

"Henceforward," the article concluded, "if British policies and precautions are to be traded against American promises, the only safe terms are cash on delivery. And if the Americans find this attitude too cynical or suspicious they should draw the conclusion that they have twisted the lion's tail once too often."

Simultaneously with and immediately following this article in the Economist a number of other articles of a similar tenor appeared in important English newspapers. The News Chronicle and the Times, for example, accused the Americans of attacking British policy while they themselves avoided all responsibility for the settlement of urgent European political problems.

This assumption of the offensive by the British press evoked even more violent anti-British comments in America. Of the numerous utterances of this kind the most severe was the statement made to newspapermen by Congressman Celler who averred that the Economist article was undoubtedly inspired by the British Cabinet. Characterizing the article as "brash and ill-considered," Celler asked why Americans should not criticize the British Government for "imperialism run riot." He said that the Americans were bearing the brunt of the fight on the Western front while Britain was massing her troops against the Greek patriots. Mosley was released in England while Nehru was imprisoned in India.

If the Economist article was "typical of English public opinion," Celler declared, "it almost erases overnight the hard efforts of the United States liberals to win acceptance of the principles announced at Dumbarton Oaks. The article seemingly justifies balance of power politics, spheres of influence and the techniques of other Machiavellian mannerisms which breed war."

The prominent American journalist Lindley, writing in the Washington Post, significantly asserted that if the Economist article was to be understood as a threat of British withdrawal from the policy of cooperation with America, the United States was in a better position than any other nation to obtain greater bargaining power through threats of withdrawal or alliances instead of general world security.

Naturally enough, this controversy was exploited by various political circles to advocate principles which seemed to them politically advantageous at the present time. For example, the reactionary American press, which is notorious for its anti-British attacks, was prepared, as we mentioned above, to support Churchill as a cloak for a new anti-Soviet campaign. On the other hand, many progressive and liberal publications, which are generally favourably disposed towards Britain, in this controversy took up a distinctly anti-British stand. The isolationists took advantage of the controversy once more to raise the cry that Europe was a seething cauldron of political intrigue and that America would do well to keep aloof from it. In connection with this controversy Roosevelt's opponents of various shades hastened once again to accuse the United States Government of lacking a definite foreign policy, etc.

All this of course could not otherwise than gratifying to the enemies of the United Nations. The notorious Dr. Schmidt, who functions with such zeal at the press conferences of the German Foreign Ministry, made one of his customary clumsy attempts to inflate the significance of this controversy. Commenting on an article in the Times which declared that America wanted to avoid all
political responsibility in Europe, Schmidt insinuated that it was London’s purpose by this article to ascertain how far the United States was prepared to support Britain in the regulation of European problems without, and even in defiance of, the Soviet Ally. This example is enough to indicate who is the “third rejoicing party” in this controversy.

But in the Allied countries too the Anglo-American controversy gave rise to the most diverse conjectures and inferences which were scarcely calculated to strengthen the anti-Hitler coalition or to promote unity and concord among the Allies. The French newspaper Populaire, for example, seeking for the “real reasons” underlying the Anglo-American differences, concluded that they lie in the fact that in the struggle for world economic supremacy Britain is striving to secure her position by force, whereas America relies on the power of gold, believing that she can buy everything.

It is gratifying to note that lately the tone of both the British and American press has been distinctly milder in discussing problems of Anglo-American relations. The sound idea that priority must be given to the fundamental task, in the accomplishment of which all the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition are vitally interested, namely, the final defeat of Hitler Germany, is gaining the upper hand in the minds of all except downright agents of fascism.

And, indeed, it requires no great mental effort to realize that until Germany is definitely beaten, the task of defeating the common enemy as early as possible cannot but claim priority over all the other tasks of the different Allied countries.

From this viewpoint, and from this viewpoint alone, must we judge the entire policy of each of the United Nations and all the utterances of statesmen and public men: everything that hastens the final collapse of Hitler’s war machine, everything that adds to the strength of the anti-Hitler coalition, is to be welcomed from the standpoint of the interests of progressive mankind. And, vice versa, everything that diminishes this strength and, consequently, delays the final victory over Germany only plays into the hands of the fascist bandits and their agents.

---

**On Freedom of the Press Again**

In connection with Comrade N. Baltiisky’s article “Freedom of the Press—A Frank Talk With Mr. Kent Cooper,” published in No. 1 of our journal for the current year, Mr. Kent Cooper, the Associate Director of the Associated Press, has published the following reply:

“Mr. Baltiisky has made a welcome contribution to the international discussion on the proposal of freedom of information by making clear the Soviet conception of freedom of the press, which, as I have always said and repeatedly referred to, differs from the American conception, which, in turn, he does not describe as an American would. There is some indication of error somewhere in his understanding of what I said. I have, of course, long been aware of the Soviet Constitution guarantee of a free press, and it was exactly that which I had in mind in the statement I made of the difference in the Soviet and American conceptions of the term. In the same address I spoke of the tremendous strides Soviet Russia has already made in following out its plan of press freedom.

“The most promising note in Mr. Baltiisky’s article is that he is in complete agreement with what has become the American view, namely, that with victory, freedom of the press shall be established in the aggressor countries. That is the matter of immediate, transcendent concern, leaving to the future, as I have repeatedly said, a better understanding between the peoples of the great countries that are side by side in this defensive war. Meanwhile, I am sure Mr. Baltiisky would agree with me that if there had been freedom of information in the Axis countries, especially in Germany, Russia would not now be suffering the most cruel and unjust war in its history.”

Such is Mr. Cooper’s statement. We are extremely gratified to note that having familiarized himself with N. Baltiisky’s article he no longer repeats his original statement that there is no freedom of the press in the Soviet
Union. In his reply, however, Mr. Cooper tries to reduce the whole question to one of a “difference in the Soviet and American conceptions of the term.”

This half-hearted withdrawal is also unsound, for on the basis of the facts quoted in Comrade Baltiisky’s article we can take it as established:

Firstly, that the broad masses of the people in the Soviet Union enjoy freedom of the press not only formally, but in actual fact; and in so far as the entire Soviet press is controlled by the organizations of the working people, it is not dependent on the private interests of the rich, and of capitalist concerns, but wholly and solely serves the interests of the people, and is an inestimable instrument for the cultural, moral and political education of the masses. This means that the Soviet Union has the most progressive form of freedom of the press. This form cannot, however, suit the tastes of those who serve the private interests of their masters.

Secondly, that in the United States, the enjoyment of freedom of the press by the citizens largely depends upon whether they own sufficiently large amounts of capital, and this, in the long run, moulds the predominant features of this press; and in so far as the owners of the big American newspapers are interested in obtaining the largest possible amount of revenue from their enterprises, the national and ethical functions of the press are in practice, as a rule, subordinated to this narrow object of profit-making. This means that capitalist interest determines the content of this press and restricts its freedom.

Thus, there is here a fundamental difference, objective in character, between the actual status of the Soviet and American press, and not a subjective difference in the “Soviet and American conceptions of the term.”

Thirdly, that it can be easily proved that the destruction of freedom of the press in Germany, to which Mr. Cooper now refers, for a long time met with no condemnation in the columns of the influential American newspapers or in the reports of the Associated Press. On the other hand, it was not by mere chance that the regime of obscurantism and the suppression of all democratic liberties in Germany was exposed with most vigour and consistency by the Soviet press at a time when many influential organs of the American press tried to convince their readers that Hitler’s regime, which is based on the cult of brute force and lawlessness in both home and foreign politics—but which in no way violates the principles of a society based on capitalist and not the people’s interest—has certain “merits” and “advantages.”
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READING WITH OMISSIONS

The conclusion of the Soviet-French Treaty of Alliance and Mutual Assistance was welcomed with great satisfaction by wide circles of the democratic public. This event has been quite rightly appraised by all sincere friends of the common cause of the United Nations as an important link in the general system of international security.

Amidst the well-nigh unanimous chorus of welcome, however, "comments" were heard which struck a sharply discordant note. The strange statement made by the journalist Alister Forbes in the London Daily Mail may serve as an example. The statement was as follows:

"It has not escaped notice that the text of the Franco-Russian treaty contains no references to proposals for future world security."

What has not escaped our notice, to use Forbes' expression, is another fact, namely, that in his fit of excessive suspicion, this journalist has put his foot in it. As a matter of fact, the preamble to the treaty, published in all the newspapers, reads literally as follows:

"Having resolved to collaborate in the cause of the creation of an international system of security for the effective maintenance of general peace and for ensuring the harmonious development of relations among nations...."

This then is the position as regards Forbes' very free interpretation of the Soviet-French treaty.

The fact that Forbes holds no monopoly on the unceremonious handling of the truth is proved by the message sent to the New York Times by that newspaper's Paris correspondent. He asserts that informed French circles fear that the Franco-Soviet alliance may cause France to become estranged from the Atlantic countries.

Which circles entertain these fears, the correspondent omits to say. But we can make good the omission. It is well known that the conclusion of the Soviet-French Treaty of Alliance was welcomed with immense enthusiasm by the French public, and was heartily and unanimously approved of by the entire press as a great achievement by renascent France. The absurd idea that the treaty can in any way harmfully affect France's relations with the other Allied Powers never entered anybody's head.

The only "circles," forsooth, which met the conclusion of the alliance between the U.S.S.R. and France with hostility were the German fascists and their henchmen Laval, Doriot and others of their ilk, who are still hiding in their lairs, hoping to escape the wrath of the people. These "circles" are, of course, very displeased with the Soviet-French treaty, and accompany their "comments" with all sorts of calumnious fabrications.

Is it from this source that the Paris correspondent of the New York Times obtained his information?

STILL ANOTHER "PLAN"

Evidently, the Belgian ex-Prime Minister, van Zeeland, is not immune against the new and very widespread epidemic of "planomania" which is so characteristic of the present, final stage of the war.

M. van Zeeland drew up a plan of his own for the post-war arrangement of Europe and hastened to tell the world about it in an interview with a correspondent of the United Press. He proposes the formation of a "European economic federation composed of France, Great Britain, Belgium and Holland." What functions this federation is to perform the author of the plan does not say, but he gives the reason that prompted him to propose it. The establishment of this federation, he says, will be an interim measure pending the organization of international security, which is not feasible in the near future.

Thus, the whole plan is based on a negative; on doubt concerning success of the United Nations' efforts to set up an international security organization that will ensure a lasting peace for all nations, big and small.

For how long is this "interim measure" propounded by M. van Zeeland to operate? Evidently, for a long time, because, according to the author of the plan, this economic association must not bear an exclusive character, and will strive to consolidate and expand relations with other groups and countries.
In other words, we have before us a project which has features in common with and strangely resembling those ill-conceived projects to divide Europe into separate blocs and groups that have already appeared in the press. In this respect, M. van Zeeland’s plan can have no claim to originality.

**MISPLACED ZEAL**

According to the general concensus of opinion, the affairs of the Spanish fascist dictator Franco are in such a deplorable state that hardly a single reputable insurance company in the world would take the risk of underwriting his regime for any length of time. Nevertheless, some people are willing to act as props for the shaky edifice of Spanish fascism, in the expectation that it will be able to withstand the purifying whirlwind of events.

The other day a certain Guido Gonella made such an attempt to render “first aid” to Franco in the columns of *Il Popolo* of Rome. First of all, he categorically declares that Francoism is not fascism, but something which “merely has certain features in common with the totalitarianism of other countries,” yet he makes no attempt to point out the difference between Francoism and German or Italian fascism. He wants us to take his word for it that there is such a difference.

On the other hand, Signor Gonella asserts that the Franco regime has “great historic services” to its credit. Do those services consist in the fact that Franco’s Spain served as the first “experimental field” for the Hitler war machine? or in the fact that during the five years and more of war it has supplied war contraband for Hitler Germany and has served as the centre of German espionage in the two hemispheres? Or, lastly, do those “historic services” of Franco consist in his having sent his “Blue Division” to the Soviet-German front, or in supplying other outlaw fascist cutthroats for Darnand’s militia and the Gestapo during the Hitler occupation of France?

Signor Gonella concludes his blather about the dissimilarity between Francoism and fascism and about the former’s “historic services” with a statement which virtually sums up the whole substance of the article published in *Il Popolo*:

“Let us not,” the author exhorts us, “with a light heart throw away the advantages which the preservation of the Franco regime in Spain represents for conservative Europe.”

But what about democratic Europe, may we be permitted to ask? The triumph of the cause of democracy, for the sake of which the soldiers of the United Nations are shedding their blood, precludes the possibility of existence, after the war, not only of one hundred per cent fascist regimes, such as Francoism undoubtedly is, but also of every possible mongrel species of fascism—half-blood, or even quadroon fascism.

Fascism must be completely wiped out in Europe; our continent must be purged of fascist profanity. Only then will the peace, tranquillity and security of the peoples be assured.

**A FARSIGHTED MINISTER**

As we know, a large part of Netherlands territory is still awaiting liberation from Hitler occupation, and it is undoubtedly the first duty of the Dutch people to help the Allied troops to clear their country of the German invaders. M. Gerbrandy, the Netherlands Prime Minister, who recently arrived in the liberated districts of his country from London, holds a rather different point of view, however.

According to the British press, on arriving in his country M. Gerbrandy noted the high state of organization and discipline and the amazing unity that prevailed in the ranks of the internal resistance movement. But strange to say, the Minister was disturbed rather than pleased by this state of affairs. Evidently, he had learnt very definite lessons from recent events in neighbouring Belgium and decided to follow in the footsteps of his colleague, the Belgian Minister M. Pierlot. At the same time, M. Gerbrandy wanted to avoid the unpleasantnesses that M. Pierlot experienced in his conflict with the resistance movement.

M. Gerbrandy had worked out beforehand a project for establishing an administrative system which would preclude the possibility of “insubordination” on the part of members of the resistance movement. The English weekly, the *Tribune*, reports that, from the very beginning, the Dutch Government made arrangements for their own military and civil dictatorship. A special state of siege has already been proclaimed by the Dutch Government in London for the liberated Southern provinces. Under this siege... the military administration will rule in Holland not only for the period of military operations, but also after the complete liberation of Holland.”
But even these measures fail to inspire M. Gerbrandi with complete confidence in the morrow. He is troubled by the gnawing doubt that the Dutch people might refuse to resign themselves to such a regime and might take it into their heads to fight for their democratic rights. And so M. Gerbrandi’s mind continues stubbornly and persistently to work in one, and only in one direction. The farsighted Minister is now working on a new and even more far-reaching plan. According to the diplomatic correspondent of the Times, this plan is to send the resistance forces to England to be trained in preparation for their despatch to... the Pacific.

A farsighted Minister, indeed!

---

**Interview with Louis Saillant**

*Secretary of the Confédération Générale du Travail and Chairman of the French Council of National Resistance*

Louis Saillant is a member of the French Trade Union Delegation that has just arrived in Moscow. The other members of the delegation are Benoît Frachon, Secretary of the C.G.T. and head of the delegation; Albert Gazer, Secretary of the C.G.T.; Lucien Labrousse, General Secretary of the Building Workers' Union, and Mark Dupuis, Secretary of the Railwaymen's Union.

Louis Saillant has taken an active part in the trade union movement for the past sixteen years. In 1937 he was elected Secretary of the Woodworkers' Union of the Paris District. In the very first months of the German occupation he became one of the most active organizers of the resistance movement. In the course of our interview he told us about the part the trade unions played in the struggle against the German invaders and their agents.

"It is well known that the Vichy government dissolved the C.G.T.," said Louis Saillant. "At the head of the trade unions, thus deprived of central leadership, were placed treacherous elements, members of the 'Fifth Column,' who tried to convert the trade unions into adjuncts of the Vichy machine, into instruments of the occupational authorities. The workers began to leave the unions en masse and the unions practically fell to pieces. At the same time, already in July 1940, the activistés, who remained loyal to the militant trade union movement, began to form the first underground People's Committees in the factories. These committees took upon themselves the task of organizing sabotage. They also conducted the economic struggle in the effort to improve conditions of labour, and organized strikes, which bore a pronouncedly anti-Hitler character. For example, already in 1941, a big strike was conducted by the miners of the Départements du Nord and Pas-de-Calais. Under the leadership of the People's Committees, a Workers' Militia began to be formed in the factories, which served to supplement the ranks of the franc-tireurs and partisans. In addition to the Humanité and Vie Ouvrière, which were already coming out underground, Libération, the organ of the resistance movement, began to be published at the end of November 1940. Now, after the liberation of France, this newspaper is being published legally in Paris under the title of Libération-Soir and has a large circulation. On the front page of our underground Libération we had the following request to the readers: 'Please don't destroy after reading, but write out in ten copies.' This request was carried out very conscientiously. The newspaper, which we printed in a thousand copies, actually had a circulation of tens and hundreds of thousands. In spite of the fury of the Gestapo and the Vichy police, Libération appeared regularly once a week and had a mass circulation.

"The years 1941 and 1942 were replete with the struggle for the restoration of the trade unions and the elimination of the German-Vichy agents from their ranks. By the autumn of 1943 the principal unions, such as
the Metal Workers', Miners', Builders', Civil Servants', and others, were restored, but continued to function underground. We also set up a Bureau of the C.G.T. on the basis of unity."

The following is an interesting detail. In the course of his two years' work in restoring the trade union movement, Louis Saillant kept close contact with Benoît Frachon, but, for reasons of secrecy dictated by the underground conditions, he did not meet him once during this period.

"On May 27, 1943," continued Saillant, "the resistance organizations united under the leadership of the Council of National Resistance in which I represented the C.G.T. This was a period of intense and growing struggle against the German invaders and the Vichy 'authorities.' On the one hand France became the arena of mass manhunts. Carrying out the orders of the Hitler slave-owners, Laval organized the forcible deportation of masses of French workers to Germany. On the other hand, the partisan movement spread, and sabotage increased in the factories and in the transport system. All over the country 'Maquis' sprang up. These were camps where, maintained by the people of the neighbourhood, thousands of young workers evaded recruitment for forced labour in Germany. Actually, these Maquis became partisan bases. To lead the struggle against deportations to Germany, to maintain connection with the Maquis, and to assist the families of the partisans and francs-tireurs—all comprised the duties of the trade union representatives in the Council of National Resistance.

"On June 2, 1944, several days before the Allied troops landed in Normandy, the C.G.T. issued instructions to the trade unions to prepare for strikes, which, if the military situation permitted, were to develop into insurrections. How events unfolded in Paris is well known. On August 10, the railwaymen went on strike, and at 15 hours, on August 18, by arrangement between the C.G.T. and the leadership of the Christian unions, a general strike was declared in the capital. Participation in the strike was one hundred per cent. Literally the entire life of the city came to a standstill. Next day, August 19, the insurrection began. First the offices of the Prefect were captured and by noon the government offices were occupied.

"The three last underground meetings of the Council of National Resistance were held on August 22, 23 and 24, in the premises...
tured international federation will have to be universal in the fullest sense of the term. It will have to be a genuinely world organization; and, first and foremost, of course we shall need the most active participation of the Soviet trade unions in this federation. It will be the task of the international trade union organization to mobilize all the efforts of the working class for the speedy achievement of victory, and for active participation in the work of ensuring a lasting peace. Such an organization is as inconceivable without the participation of the Soviet trade unions as is victory over Hitler Germany without the great, self-sacrificing efforts of the Soviet people.

"The French workers regard the participation of the Soviet trade unions in the future international organization not only as desirable, but as an essential condition for the existence and activity of this organization, the main object of which will be to defend the interests of the masses of the workers in every respect. I emphasize that this is not only my opinion, but also the opinion of all French workers."

Meetings and Conferences in London

AN INTERVIEW WITH E. SIDORENKO, SECRETARY OF THE ALL-UNION CENTRAL COUNCIL OF TRADE UNIONS

The Editors of this journal requested Comrade Sidorenko to share with our readers his impressions of England, where he spent several weeks in the autumn and winter of 1944. As a member of the Soviet trade union delegation, Comrade Sidorenko took part in the deliberations of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee, attended the 76th Trade Union Congress at Blackpool, and then, in December, as head of the delegation, took part in the deliberations of the committee for preparing for the forthcoming world trade union conference. Comrade Sidorenko also attended the preceding Trade Union Congress at Southport. Below we give Comrade Sidorenko's story of his impressions of his meetings and conferences in London.

At the first glance London seemed to have undergone no change during the eighteen months that had elapsed since we attended the Southport Congress. There was the same animation at the railway stations and in the streets, the same bustle in the City, and the same smooth rhythm of work in the factories. Later we were to convince ourselves that this was not quite the case. Certain changes have undoubtedly taken place in the lives and conditions of Londoners.

A new feature was introduced, primarily, by the barbarous bombing of the city with what the English people call "flying bombs." There was no such bombing the last time we were in London. Now these "flying bombs" come over day and night. In December the "alert" was sounded two or three times every night. This bombing amazes one by its senseless ferocity. It must be said to the credit of the English people that they display wonderful fortitude. During an "alert" life in the city goes on as usual. Everybody remains at his work. A certain amount of tension is felt, of course, but this is quite understandable when one bears in mind the casualties and destruction this bombing entails. But there are no signs of fear or panic. On the whole, the Germans have utterly failed in their object of causing confusion and disorganization in London.

The "flying bombs" have stimulated the efforts of the Londoners to secure a speedy victory, the speedy defeat of the enemy, and the end of the war. This is felt particularly in the factories, of course.

Desiring to see how our English comrades-in-arms in the struggle against German fascism are living and working, we made a long tour through England, visiting large industrial centres, the Liverpool docks, the textile mills in Manchester, the plants in Coventry, Bir-
mingham and Sheffield and, of course, London. True, our inspection of these factories and plants was often rather cursory, mainly owing to the shortage of time at our disposal.

Of our meetings with the English workers I have carried away the finest impressions. Everywhere we were given a cordial, comradely, friendly welcome. Particularly vivid are the impressions we carried away of our visit, only too short, unfortunately, to an aircraft engine and parts factory in the suburbs of London.

This is how it came about. We were inspecting a large plant at which the cars of the Underground Railway are repaired, and the technical equipment of which is extremely interesting. Here we spent about three hours. Right next door there is another plant where aircraft engines are manufactured. The two plants actually use the same broadcasting service. When the workers at the engine plant heard that the Soviet trade union delegation was next door, they immediately sent a delegation to invite us to visit them. We accepted the invitation and were simply overwhelmed by the welcome accorded us. On our appearance in the enormous assembly shop, the workers greeted us with an uproarious ovation—they banged and rattled and shouted greetings, sang Soviet songs and cried out: “Three cheers for the Soviet people!” “Three cheers for the Soviet Union!” “Three cheers for the Red Army!” “Three cheers for Marshal Stalin!” The workers pressed round us, each trying to get as near as possible to express his sentiments. They shook hands with us, asked us to convey greetings to the Soviet workers, told us how eager they were to know more about the Soviet Union, and so forth, and then they lined up for the purpose of obtaining from us—our autographs.

We went over the assembly shop and passed into the next one. There the same scene was repeated. And this happened all over the plant. We felt somewhat conscience-stricken at the thought that we had caused the work to be interrupted.

What struck us in the factories, in contrast to last year, was the concern the workers expressed about post-war prospects. The workers undoubtedly want the speediest defeat of the enemy and are willing to work as hard as they possibly can to achieve it; but their natural eagerness for a speedy victory does not remove their anxiety about the future. In all our conversations with workers, shop stewards and trade union officials of all categories, from leaders of local organizations to officials of the General Council, we were conscious of this disquietude about the post-war conditions of the working class. During our talks with the workers we invariably heard the questions: What is going to happen to us on the morrow of the war, when war production is reduced and the men return from the army? Will there really be unemployment again?

Many women are now employed in the English factories. They are working splendidly, but, as a rule, with very rare exceptions, they receive from thirty-five to forty per cent less pay than men for the same kind of work. The working women vaguely feel that they are only temporary stop gaps in industry; that as soon as the men return from the war they will be asked to leave. Naturally, this prospect frightens the English working women, the more so as evidently even the trade unions do not always defend their interests with sufficient vigour.

From the conversations we had with English workers and shop stewards we gained the definite impression that discontent often existed in the factories on account of unfair working conditions. Here and there this gives rise to strikes. We heard English workers say that if it were not for the war, if they were not afraid of hampering the British army and the heroic Red Army, if it were not for the alliance with the U.S.S.R., they would have gone on strike for better conditions now, and for certain guarantees for the future. Nevertheless, we can definitely state that the British working class is performing its duty and is working for victory with tremendous enthusiasm and intensity. The vast mass of the British workers and British trade unionists appreciate the fact that the task of rendering the front every assistance, of augmenting the military might of the Allied armies, is the paramount task.

Under these circumstances, exceptionally responsible and important tasks naturally devolve upon the trade unions. Many of these problems can be solved most successfully in collaboration with the trade unions of the other democratic countries. The British organized workers undoubtedly understand that the position of the trade unions will be greatly strengthened and their voice carry more weight in the solution of any problem if they act in close cooperation with the trade unions of the other democratic countries. This explains the hearty appro
workers of the resolution, moved by the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee and unanimously adopted at the Blackpool Trade Union Congress, to convene an international trade union conference.

This also explains the close attention the British public devoted to the deliberations of the committee for preparing for this conference in which we took part, and on which I would like to say a few words.

The committee first met on December 4, and sat for several days. Its meetings took place in Transport House, the headquarters of the Trade Union Congress. This is a vast building in the centre of the city, not far from the Houses of Parliament, held by the General Council on a 99-year lease. At the meetings of the committee we met the representatives of the British Trade Union Congress headed by Citrine, and of the American Congress of Industrial Organizations headed by Hillman.

In a friendly, business-like atmosphere, the committee drew up the agenda for the world trade union conference and discussed a number of questions concerning procedure and representation. As is well known, the agenda, in the main, consists of the following items: the expansion of Allied war effort; the attitude of the trade unions towards the future peace agreement; the basic principles of the world trade union federation; the immediate demands of the trade unions in the post-war period, and problems of post-war reconstruction.

Although a discussion by the preparations committee of the questions that will come before the conference had not been contemplated, some questions of principle were nevertheless taken up. Thus, the original draft of the conference agenda drawn up by the General Council contained the following item: "The reconstruction of the existing International Federation of Trade Unions." By the latter was meant the so-called Amsterdam Trade Union International. At the very first meeting Hillman stated that the representatives of the C.I.O. had arrived in London with the very definite object of discussing the formation of a new world trade union federation, and that the idea of reconstructing the Amsterdam International referred to in the agenda was totally out of the question. The issue was put very bluntly. Hillman said that what was needed was a new international organization which the Soviet trade unions, the C.I.O. of America, the British trade unions and all other trade union organ-
izations in the democratic countries would join. The restrictions that had existed up to now must be removed. An organization must be created that will really unite the trade unions.

Our delegation also emphatically rejected the proposal that the international conference should discuss the question of reconstructing the Amsterdam International. As a result, after a long debate, the British delegation proposed that the item of the agenda be redrafted to read as follows: "The basic principles of the world trade union organization."

In answer to the question as to whether attempts will not be made to interpret this formula in the sense that the Amsterdam International is to serve as the basis for the new world trade union organization Citrine said that he had in mind the principles on which the new international trade union organization should be built. He went on to say that the British unions could not ignore the experience acquired by the Amsterdam International because, after all, it had existed for decades and could not be left out of account. The British trade unions were the oldest organizations affiliated to the Amsterdam International and they could not but reckon with the latter.

The preparations committee carefully scrutinized the list of unions invited to the conference. The General Council had sent out invitations to the trade union federations in all the democratic countries. At the meetings of the committee it was made clear that Yugoslavia would be represented by the trade union centres which had their headquarters on Yugoslavian territory. The problem of the attendance at the conference of the trade unions of Italy, Bulgaria, Rumania, Finland and Poland proved more complex. The British delegation stated that the representatives of the trade unions of the first four countries mentioned would not receive visas for entering England, in so far as their countries had fought against the United Nations. It was decided that in so far as the trade unions of Italy, Bulgaria, Rumania and Finland represented the democratic forces in those countries, they ought to be allowed to attend the conference. Subsequently, however, the General Council informed us in writing that it had discussed this question again and had decided not to send invitations to those countries. As far as Poland was concerned, Citrine was opposed to her
being invited on the grounds that Poland was not yet liberated, and there were no trade unions there. Evidently, the General Council was then not yet aware that trade unions with a membership already exceeding 100,000 had been restored in the liberated area of Poland.

We also discussed the question of the voting procedure at the conference. On behalf of the British delegation Citrine proposed that all decisions at the conference be adopted only "by common consent," i.e., if only one delegation or even one delegate voted against any resolution it was to be deemed not carried. This procedure was objected to by us and the Americans, on the ground that it created easy opportunities for defeating any proposal that would be submitted. This question was left unsettled. The voting procedure will be decided either at the conference, or at the next meeting of the preparations committee, which it is intended to call on the eve of the conference.

On the whole, both the General Council and the preparations committee completed all the necessary work of preparation for the world trade union conference in London. According to the preliminary returns about 150 delegates, representing 40 national trade union organizations in over 30 countries, will attend the conference.

We left England on December 31, on New Year's eve. Our aeroplane rose over London at 11 o'clock at night. We celebrated the New Year at a height of approximately 3,000 metres.

BOOK REVIEWS

Tainted Goods in the International Market

D. ZASLAVSKY

The enormous interest now being universally displayed towards the Soviet Union has stimulated the demand for literature on this country in the United States, Great Britain and other countries; a demand for new literature, it should be added, for the old literature on the subject has proved to be worthless. An increased demand calls forth an increased supply. The book market is now flooded with books and pamphlets about the Soviet Union, about the Russian people and the other peoples who inhabit the Land of Soviets. This literature includes history, geography, economics and also fiction.

This is to be welcomed. But as the market in question is subject to the laws of competition, we feel it our duty to warn the trustful reader. In every market there are unscrupulous traders who do not hesitate to offer for sale goods of dubious and even of positively bad quality. They offer for sale books in alluring covers and with screaming titles, but with a literary stuffing that is calculated to clog the readers' minds.

Above the raucous chorus of hucksters crying their wares are heard the shrill voices of two ladies who are trying to entice customers. They shout: "Buy me!" "Take me!" In the United States and Canada it is Madame Nina Verhovskoy-Hyde who in partnership with Mr. Fillmore Hyde is praising her literary talents. In England, Madame Moore-Pataleev's wife tries to outvoice her.

Nina Verhovskoy-Hyde's book is entitled Russia Then and Always. Madame Moore-Pataleev's is entitled I Am a Woman From Soviet Russia. The titles are alluring. They show that the authoresses of these books are skilled in the use of cosmetics. These ladies know that there are still no few simpletons who are unable to distinguish between cheap rouge and a natural bloom. The titles are calculated to make the readers believe that the books were written by Soviet authors, or by authors who are familiar with Russia, the Soviet Union, because of their Russian origin.

The authors trade in their "Russian" names. Under their paint they try to conceal their anti-Soviet complexes. To dispose of their tainted goods, they assure their customers that they are "friends" of the Soviet Union, that they are defending it, and so forth.
But the more vehemently they utter these assurances, the more the reader should be on his guard. He is being cheated.

Madame Nina Verhovskoy-Hyde lays some claim to scholarship. She philosophizes! Madame Moore-Pataleeva adopts a plainer style. She dabbles neither in science nor in philosophy. She merely poses in front of the reader, turning this way and that, displaying her charms from all aspects, and asserts: "Understand me, and you will understand the Land of Soviets." But from whatever angle one looks at this revolving lady, in profile or en face, at her face or her back, the only impression one obtains is that she is one of the "hard-boiled" type of whom the Soviet Union has rid itself as a totally foreign body in the polity of the Soviet people. The political climate of the Soviet Union is unsuitable for such adventuresses; in the international market, however, they are in their element.

Both ladies, Verhovskoy and Moore-Pataleeva, have not the faintest conception of what the Soviet Union and the Russian people are like. They have long forfeited all right to call themselves Russians. Their books cannot even be called literature; they are simply pieces of ladies' fancywork.

There is no need to examine or refute these ladies' fancywork in detail. Two samples will suffice.

Nina Verhovskoy-Hyde's book begins with the legendary hero Sviatogor and ends with him. He is presented not merely as an image and a symbol, but as a historico-philosophical concept. Sviatogor is presented as the incarnation of the Russian people. Then and always he was "slow, patient and inclined to philosophize." He was not fond of work. Ilya Murometz was of the same type.

"Ilya preferred a simple village feast and good companions, a day of idleness, to work; but if work be necessary, then let it be work indeed, catalytic and thoroughgoing."

Such is the beginning. The end is picturesque:

"The defence of Stalingrad and the campaigns of the Dnieper bend leave no doubt whatever that Mother Russia has survived the storm—that to Russians the Russian earth is no longer a stage for an experiment in sociology, but is again the Patch of Sviatogor, in defence of which Russian men and women from the days of Kiev have shown themselves ready to sacrifice their homes, their loved ones, and their lives."

Thus, she starts out from Sviatogor and arrives at Sviatogor. That would not be so bad.

But what is in between? In between is Alyosha Popovich. He was the cause of all the trouble! And our authoress speaks of him both with rapture and exasperation. Obviously, she has lost her heart to him. She says:

"Of all, he is the most handsome and ingratiating. He loves the ladies, with whom his success is enormous. His swagger is ruthless and effective, and his devil-may-care life is one of willful disregard of laws and rules, which, since they have been made by man, he feels are freely to be broken by man.

"By sly and frankly underhanded means he gets his way and gains his ends, which, of course, are for the good of Russia—although always contrived so as to contribute to his own amusement. He is of prime importance because throughout all Russian history the maddening yet appealing qualities of this lawless hero are forever cropping up in the Russian people, stubbornly thwarting all efforts toward reform and regulation, provocatively undisciplined, reckless and intransigent; ... the traits of Alyosha Popovich symbolize the ever-lasting muttleness of spirit, the lust for wandering and the vague, unpointed rebellion that was the despair of those who fought to make Russia an orderly and effective state."

This lengthy passage relieves us of the necessity of quoting any more. This symbolism covers the entire history of Russia down to our times. Not real history, we hasten to add, but a jumble of garbled historical facts and anecdotal balderdash. This is not simply balderdash, however, but a definite political trend. Nina Verhovskoy-Hyde tries to induce her readers to believe that throughout their entire history the Russian people remained, on principle, alien to European civilization, that they are not "European." Hence, all the European peoples were always hostile to Russia and regarded her as a menace to culture. Such is the "historical law" this authoress has discovered. Consequently, she writes:

"Since France fell, carried down by the wars of Napoleon, England has been her [Russia's] enemy, with a modern Germany lately added for good measure."

This lady tries to palm off this balderdash as historical facts, and her own cherished dreams as a "historical law."

She goes on to claim that at all times during their history, "then and always," the Russian people were hostile to foreigners. This, according to our authoress, explains their "lawless spirit." Nina Verhovskoy conceives the entire history of Russia as a struggle between the "Western-minded" Russians who favoured foreigners, and those who opposed
Western, foreign culture. The "Western-minded" were utterly defeated, so that:

"If there still exist in Russia remnants of the Western-minded Russian groups ... they form an exceedingly silent minority."

Fancy that, now!
But enlightened foreigners would have been able to cope with the Russian people had it not been for the pernicious influence of education. "Learning—that's the plague; learning—that's the cause!"—exclaims Nina Verhovskoy-Hyde, echoing Griboedov's Faminosov. She paints a frightful picture of the intellectual anarchy that prevailed in Russia:

"The intellectual disunity was aggravated by the spread of education, for the opening of universities in the period after the liberation of the serfs produced in Russia a riot of sociological theorizing exceeding in extravagance anything the world had ever seen. ... On this people the discovery and study of social theory seemed to act like a powerful exciter, producing a sort of orgy of undirected intellectualism."

The usual blather about "Red terror," "the destruction of the family, the Church and marriage" in the Soviet Union, and so forth, puts the final touches to the portrait of this authoress. Her "conceptions" are a gross libel on the Soviet people who, she alleges, have been hostile to European culture, incapable of building up a state and stand in need of foreign teachers, organizers and rulers. The source of all this slander is obvious. It comes from Berlin. Nina Verhovskoy repeats the most stupid German fascist inventions in defiance of the fact that the Red Army, which was created by the Soviet people, by the Soviet State, has struck mortal blows at the fascist strategists, at the fascist politicians and at the fascist ideologists, save the mark!

Such are the goods that are offered American readers who wish to learn the source of strength of the Soviet State and of the might of the Soviet people.

Anybody who offers tainted sausage for sale is liable to prosecution. The Public Health authorities exercise control. But there is no control over the hucksters who hawk poisonous, tainted books. Such control ought to be exercised in the United States by the press, by the critics and satirists. Unfortunately, the United States press is still silent about this, and shrewd hucksters need not fear exposure.

We have said that the other lady, Madame Moore-Pataleeva, adopts a plainer style. She deals only with her own biography and travels. She has been everywhere. She has turned everybody's head. And oh! how fascinating she was. Once she nearly charmed a baboon, but for some reason nothing came of her love affair with this specimen of the quadruman. We shall deal with only this episode in the life of our biped. There will be no need to add anything.

In the course of her wanderings Madame Moore-Pataleeva found herself in Sukhumi. Like many other tourists, she visited the well-known Monkey House in that city. She looked at the monkeys and the monkeys looked at her. Her meeting with the baboon created an indelible impression upon the latter, and a certain "professor" is alleged to have suggested that Madame Moore-Pataleeva should produce offspring with it. Why this "professor" should have found traces of kinship between the baboon and our adventure seeker is unknown. At all events, the authoress tells us that he "implored me [the authoress] to consider this request." She refused. The experiment was not made. Madame Moore-Pataleeva fled to England, and the disconsolate baboon was left in Sukhumi.

We are absolutely certain that nothing of the kind happened; that in her insatiable desire to slander the Soviet Union, Madame Moore-Pataleeva did not hesitate to slander herself. Obviously, in her zeal, she overdid it.

Such are two books of the multitude that now flood the book market of America and England. We do not say that they are typical. Perhaps they are the worst of their kind. But they have not called forth abroad the unanimous and hearty roar of laughter that one might have expected. They have not roused the indignation that would have served as a warning to profit-seekers and fascist agents. This is not all. This idiotic and positively obscene book of Moore-Pataleeva's with the story about her adventures in the Monkey House is published by Gollancz, who hitherto has not been tempted by the adventures of Tarzan, and has had no hand in publishing trash. That firm can forfeit its reputation as publishers for the sake of an extra penny or two if it likes!

It is our business to warn trustful readers. Let the buyer beware!
January 1

Formation of the Provisional Government of the Polish Republic headed by Prime Minister Edward Osóbka-Morawski. The Provisional Government's declaration was published in the Soviet press on Jan. 3.

Archbishop Damaskinos took up the Regency of Greece. The Papandreou Government resigned.

Mass meetings were held in Debrecen and other towns of liberated Hungary, at which members of the Provisional National Assembly reported to their constituents.

France officially adhered to the Declaration of the United Nations.

January 2

A delegation representing the Provisional National Government of Hungary, headed by János Dyónydyösi, Minister for Foreign Affairs, arrived in Moscow to conduct negotiations for the conclusion of an armistice.

January 3

American troops captured the island of Marindique, situated south of Luzon, Philippines. Indian troops landed on the island of Akyab off the west coast of Burma.

The 79th Congress of the U.S.A., elected on November 7, 1944, was opened.

January 4

V. M. Molotov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., received János Dyónydyösi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Provisional National Government of Hungary.

Formation of a new Government in Greece, headed by General Plastiras.

Chronicle of International Events

January 1945

January 5

The forces of the E.L.A.S. (the military organization of the Greek National Liberation Front) retired from Athens.

Field Marshal Montgomery was appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Northern group of the Allied Armies on the Western front.

January 6

J. V. Stálin, President of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R., received Señor L. Quintanilla, Mexican Ambassador to the U.S.S.R. V. M. Molotov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., was present.

TASS announced the recognition by the Soviet Union of the Provisional Government of Poland and the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries. V. Z. Lebedev was appointed Extraordinary Plenipotentiary Ambassador of the Soviet Union to Poland, and Zygmunt Modzelewski was appointed Ambassador of the Polish Republic to the U.S.S.R.

President Roosevelt sent a message to the United States Congress dealing with the war situation and also with questions concerning the home and foreign politics of the United States.

January 7

A monument to the Soviet soldiers who have fallen in the struggle for the liberation of Bulgaria was unveiled in Vidin, Bulgaria.

January 8

The Soviet press published a statement by A. Gorkin, Secretary of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., denying the rumours circulated by the foreign press to the effect that M. Bierut, President of the Krajowa Rada Narodowa, while under arrest during Pilsudski's fascist regime, was exchanged for a Pole under arrest in the U.S.S.R.

A delegation representing the Confédération Générale du Travail left France by aeroplane for the U.S.S.R. Among the delegation were the Secretaries of the C.G.T. Saillant, Frachon and Gazier.

January 9

American troops landed on Luzon, the main island of the Philippines.

January 10

A Society for Belgian-Soviet Friendship was formed in Belgium.

January 11

An armistice between the Commander of the British land forces in Greece and the Central Committee of E.L.A.S. was signed in Athens.

January 12

The troops of the First Ukrainian Front passed to the offensive in the region west of Sandomir and breached the enemy's strongly fortified defences on a front of forty kilometres. In the course of two days of offensive fighting the troops of this front advanced up to forty kilometres and enlarged the breach to sixty kilometres, occupying over 350 inhabited points.

King Peter of Yugoslavia issued a communiqué published in London announcing his refusal to recognize the agreement concluded between Marshal Tito and Prime Minister Šubašić in the autumn of 1944 concerning the provisional state authority in Yugoslavia.

January 13

The Soviet press published a TASS announcement of the opening of trade negotiations between Finland and the U.S.S.R.

January 15

The troops of the First Ukrainian Front captured the town of Kielce.
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