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The World Trade Union Conference
Summed Up

The WORLD Trade Union Conference, which sat in London from February 6 to 17, will be an important landmark in the history of the working-class movement. The positive results it achieved should serve as substantial factors in the development of international co-operation between the trade unions of the democratic countries.

Convoked though it was amidst the difficult conditions of war the London Conference was distinguished for its widely representative character. It was attended by 204 delegates who represented about 60,000,000 organized wage and salaried workers in over 50 countries of Europe, America, Asia, Africa, and Australia. Of exceptional importance is the fact that the London Conference was the first world trade union conference in which representatives of the trade unions of the Land of Socialism—the Soviet Union—took part.

It is likewise important to note that representatives of trade unions in dependencies and colonies also took part in the conference. By its widely representative character the London Conference compares favourably with the congresses convened before the war by the International Trade Union Federation known as the Amsterdam International. It is common knowledge that during the whole period of its existence, this federation represented only a minority of the organized workers, inasmuch as the trade unions of the Soviet Union, the Congress of Industrial Organizations of the United States, the trade unions of Latin America and those of the whole of the colonial world were not affiliated to it. It may be said without exaggeration that never in the history of the international working-class movement had such complete and all-embracing representation of the organized workers been achieved at any assembly as was achieved at the London Conference.

The World Trade Union Conference met in the concluding stage of the struggle of the freedom-loving nations against German fascist tyranny. It conducted its deliberations during the days when the Red Army in its winter offensive was bringing palpably nearer our complete triumph over the enemy, and when the historic meeting of the leaders of the Three Allied Powers in the Crimea had again, and with exceptional vividness, demonstrated to the whole world the determination of the great freedom-loving nations to march together not only in encompassing the complete military, moral and political defeat of fascism, but also in ensuring a firm and just peace and international security after the war.

Having gathered at such an important historic juncture the London Conference was faced with a number of exceptionally important tasks. On the eve of its opening, we, in the columns of this journal, expressed the hope that the representatives of the different trade unions who had traversed different historical paths and possessed different traditions and experience would, given good will, be able to find a common tongue and achieve success on the road of comradely collaboration. This hope, which was shared by trade unionists not only in the U.S.S.R. but in all the other democratic countries, has undoubtedly been realized.

The World Trade Union Conference discussed a number of important questions that were on its agenda, including that of assisting the Allied war effort, the attitude of the trade unions towards the anticipated peace agreement, post-war reconstruction and the urgent demands of the trade unions, and, last and most important, the question of forming a new World Trade Union Federation. The decisions and documents unanimously adopted by the conference on all these questions reflect the determination of the working class of the democratic countries to unite their efforts not only to achieve the utter rout of fascism, but also to vindicate the vital interests of the working people after the war. In expressing this desire of the organized workers for lasting international co-operation and unity the delegates at the conference succeed-
In overcoming the difficulties which confronted them and in reaching agreement even on those subjects on which the most serious disagreement might have been expected.

There were, of course, ticklish moments at the conference. The English press, for example, widely commented on the incident that occurred at the opening of the conference, when Citrine, the General Secretary of the British Trade Union Congress, sharply opposed the proposals submitted on two questions by the Standing Orders Committee which the conference had set up, viz., on voting procedure and on the invitation to the conference of representatives of the trade unions of countries that were formerly satellites of Germany, and also of liberated Poland. It cannot be said that the arguments advanced by Citrine were convincing. In proposing that the function of the conference should be exclusively “consultative” he could think of nothing better to say in support of his contention than that the Soviet delegation was so large that it would be able to dominate the conference. But the bottom was knocked out of this argument by the proposal of the Standing Orders Committee, made in agreement with the representative of the Soviet delegation on the committee, that a basis of voting be established that would ensure voting equality for all delegations irrespective of their size. As regards Citrine’s arguments against inviting the trade unions of the former satellite countries and from liberated Poland, all they amounted to was that the composition of the conference had been decided upon by the General Council of the British Trade Union Congress as far back as 1943 and had been finally confirmed by it in the summer of 1944. But this was no justification for ignoring the extremely important changes that had since taken place in the international situation, and, in particular, the revival of the trade union movement in the countries which have been liberated from the German fascist yoke.

It looked as though Citrine’s utterances, made on behalf of the British delegation, were pregnant with grave consequences, the more so since he considered it appropriate to talk about the likelihood of an “unpleasant situation” arising. A number of not altogether unbiased observers gloated in anticipation of the breakdown of the conference. Thus the Manchester Guardian in an attempt to add fuel to the flames taunted the General Council of the British Trade Union Congress with having been careless in its preparations for the conference. The General Council, wrote that newspaper ironically, “must be wondering ruefully what sort of ungrateful child it has brought into the world.” Nevertheless, the hopes of the prophets of a split proved groundless. The conference found a way out of the difficulty. As a result of the convincing arguments advanced by the representatives of a number of delegations, and realizing how unanimous was the conference’s desire for unity, the English—who on this question were supported only by Stanczyk, an impostor from the camp of the Polish reactionaries whose presence at the conference was purely accidental—agreed to the compromise proposal made by the American delegate Thomas True, as a result of this compromise the trade unions of liberated Poland were unjustly left out of the conference, but agreement was reached on all other questions.

The decisions adopted by the conference constitute a program of action for the trade unions of the United Nations in rendering every possible assistance to the Allied war effort, in protecting the interests of the working class and of its industrial organizations in the period of transition from war to peace, and in laying the foundations of a lasting peace among the peoples after the war. These decisions will serve as powerful instruments for mobilizing not only the army of 60,000,000 trade unionists who were represented at the conference, but the entire working class of the democratic countries.

Of exceptional importance are the conference’s decisions concerning the lines on which the World Trade Union Federation should be built. Trade unionists rightly expected that the question of forming a new World Trade Union Federation, an effective and militant centre of the international trade union movement, would be in the forefront of the conference’s proceedings. Such, indeed, was the case. Naturally, the debate on this question was of an extremely animated character. It was found that all the progressive elements in the international trade union movement were emphatically opposed to the attempt to pour new wine into old bottles, to galvanize into life again the Amsterdam International, which had been relegated to the realm of shadows and which had suffered utter political bankruptcy. The utterances of Schevenels, the General Secretary of this organization, who outlined a plan for the reorganization of the Amsterdam International, met with a rebuff at the con-
ference. The proposal for co-existence of the new and old trade union federations met with no greater support, for it was quite obvious that the simultaneous functioning of two rival international organizations would not help to reinforce the unity of the trade union movement either internationally or in the respective countries; that such a situation would only play into the hands of the clique of trade union splitters headed by the leaders of the American Federation of Labour. The conference deemed necessary the formation of a single, workable World Federation of Trade Unions, and defined its aims and objects. By this decision, one of the most important it adopted, the London Conference justified the hopes of millions of workers in the democratic countries, who expected it to take real steps to secure organizational consolidation of the already established international collaboration between the trade unions of the democratic countries.

Of special importance is the fact that after recognizing the necessity of forming a new organization the London Conference immediately set up an Organizing Committee to put its decision into effect. This committee, which consists of forty-six members representing thirty-two countries, has already started work. To give one an idea of the importance of the functions which have devolved upon it it is sufficient to mention that it must draw up a draft constitution for the new World Federation of Trade Unions and send it to the different national trade union organizations for consideration, establish contact with the trade unions of those democratic countries which did not attend the London Conference for one reason or another, and prepare for the convocation of the inaugural conference of the World Trade Union Federation. The Organizing Committee has decided that this conference is to take place in Paris next September.

The results of the proceedings of the World Trade Union Conference have been highly appraised and favourably commented upon by the trade unionists of the democratic countries. Prominent organs of the trade union press of the United States, Great Britain, France, Latin America and other countries welcomed these decisions as a pledge of further success in international trade union collaboration.

There are undoubtedly numerous difficulties in the path of fulfilment of the decisions of the London Conference. The conference struck a heavy blow at the splitting designs of the reactionary elements in the trade union movement and increased their isolation. This applies primarily to the leaders of the American Federation of Labour, who not only declined to attend the World Conference but attempted to disrupt it. These reactionaries are continuing to weave intrigues with the object of preventing the unification of the organized working class, the foundations of which were laid at the London Conference. At a press conference held on February 16, Green, the President of the American Federation of Labour, unfolded an immediate program of splitting tactics, viz., to fight for the restoration of the bankrupt Amsterdam International, to split the working-class movement in Latin America, to "assist" the trade unions in the liberated countries of Europe in combating the "Communist peril," and so forth. These designs of the enemies of organized labour unity must be sternly resisted by all sincere advocates of militant working-class unity.

The World Trade Union Conference laid the foundations of international collaboration between the trade unions of the democratic countries. In his speech in closing the conference George Isaacs, the chairman of the conference and a member of the British delegation, said:

"The World Trade Union Conference is ending, but its work is just beginning. I hope that the spirit of comradeship which was demonstrated here and the great amount of unity which exists among us will be carried back to our organizations. They should be able to look back on the conference as a turning point in the working-class movement."

Soviet trade unionists associate themselves with this statement of the representative of the British working-class movement. The work of uniting and consolidating the ranks of the organized workers of the democratic countries is only beginning. Enormous tasks in this field still lie ahead. These are: still further to mobilize the working class for the purpose of rendering all possible assistance to the war effort of the Allies, to take an active part in the struggle for the utter rout of fascism and its extirpation, to protect the interests of the working class and the interests of democracy in the post-war arrangement of the world. These tasks will be carried out successfully if the spirit of mutual understanding and comradely cooperation that pervaded the World Trade Union Conference will continue to mould the activities of the trade union organizations in all the democratic countries.
The Situation in Rumania

N. Ruzin

These past weeks the political situation in Rumania has grown exceedingly acute. The course of events has revealed the true colours of the government headed by General Radescu. Unwilling and unable to base themselves on the democratic forces of the Rumanian people, the reactionary elements that dominate it banded together with yesterday's followers of Antonescu, the people who in league with Hitler Germany dragged Rumania into the war against the Soviet Union and the other United Nations. Carrying into execution the plan the reactionaries had prepared, General Radescu came out in the middle of February with malicious statements levelled against the National Democratic Front and against all the democratic demands of the popular masses of Rumania. He thereby obviously provoked the democratic organizations to actions which would furnish him with an excuse to smash the National Democratic Front and establish a reactionary dictatorship.

However, the leaders of the National Democratic Front did not succumb to the provocation and restrained the indignation of the masses within the legal bounds of political warfare. On February 24 the National Democratic Front called mass meetings in Bucharest and a number of other towns in order once more to voice the demand of the masses for the resignation of Radescu's reactionary government, the punctilious and speedy fulfilment of the armistice terms, curbing the pro-Hitler elements, and for democratic reforms.

Nearly half a million people attended the meeting on the Square of the Nations in Bucharest. It was addressed not only by representatives of organizations affiliated to the National Democratic Front, but also by a number of other leaders. When the meeting was over a procession was formed which marched to the Palace Square. At the head of the columns the demonstrators carried portraits of the King and of the leaders of the United Nations-Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill—and the flags of the United Nations. As the main columns debouched into the Palace Square, rifle and machine-gun fire was opened on the demonstrators from the roof of the Ministry of the Interior and from the windows of the demolished left wing of the palace. Two workers were killed and many of the demonstrators were wounded. It was only on the demand of the Allied Control Commission that orders to cease fire were given.

That this shooting up of a peaceful demonstration of the people in the streets of the Rumanian capital was not the arbitrary act of individual police brigands, but part of a deliberate plan, is attested by the fact that similar attacks by troops and gendarmes on peaceful demonstrations took place that same day in Craiova, Caracal and Brașov. In some cases besides police and troops groups of legionaries fired upon the people. In Brașov, for example, the demonstration was fired upon by a group of legionaries ensconced in the office of the National Tsaranist newspaper Avântul. During the demonstration in Sibiu a band of legionaries, who have found refuge in the National Tsaranist Party, distributed leaflets marked with the swastika. Incidentally, if anybody had any lingering doubt as to whether this bloody action of the Rumanian reactionaries was organized by Prime Minister Radescu and his immediate assistants, Radescu himself hastened to dispel it. In a radio speech on the evening of February 24 he adopted a tone which the Rumanians were accustomed to hear from Antonescu, Horia Sima and other avowed hirelings of Hitler. Radescu deliberately slandered the people by accusing the demonstrators of having attacked the police and the troops. He referred to the leaders of the National Democratic Front as "people without God or country," and as "savage hyenas," and concluded his speech with the words:

"We must all rise as one man and meet the danger face to face. The army and I will perform our duty to the end. You too must stand at your posts."

This frank appeal to the fascist elements in Rumania, this downright dictatorial tone indicated that Radescu had thrown off all restraint. His lying insinuations were refuted by hundreds of authoritative witnesses, including a group of prominent generals and other officers and also the well-known Rumanian journalist Nicolai Petrașcu, who is at the same time Reuter's correspondent and Chairman of the Association of Foreign Journalists.
in Rumania. In a statement he made to a TASS correspondent, Petraşcu said that the demonstration was quite orderly and that the police and troops opened fire on the demonstrators without any excuse or pretext.

It can therefore be taken as a fact that the forces of reaction, headed by Radescu and his myrmidons, wanted to start a civil war against the Rumanian people relying upon elements that had involved Rumania in the war on the side of the Germans. That was their plan. The brazen sortie of the fascist elements provoked a storm of popular anger in Rumania. Immediately after the shooting the demonstrators gathered at an impromptu meeting at which ardent speeches were delivered demanding that the criminals who fired upon the people be brought to book. The Council of the National Democratic Front published a statement exposing Radescu’s criminal role in engineering the massacre and declaring that “the only answer to this criminal act can be Radescu’s immediate dismissal and arrest.” Six Ministers representing parties and organizations of the National Democratic Front sent a telegram to the King in which they called Radescu a butcher, protested against the massacre of peaceful citizens, and demanded the immediate dismissal of Radescu’s government and the arrest and punishment of the culprits.

The day following the shooting protest meetings and demonstrations were held all over the country. At huge meetings in Jassy, Constanţa, Timişoara, Braşov and scores of other towns and villages the Rumanian people expressed their indignation at the outrageous acts of provocation of the reactionaries. These meetings were addressed not only by representatives of the National Democratic Front. Colonel Constantinescu, Chief of Staff of the Rumanian Corps, spoke at the meeting in Jassy and conveyed to it the greetings of General Coman, Commander of the Corps. Another speaker at this meeting was Lazarescu, of the National Liberal Party, who expressed his indignation at the conduct of Radescu and Maniu. A telegram was sent to the King by the Central Committee of the Public Employees’ Union, signed by its Chairman, Professor Pofiria, by representatives of the employees of the Ministries of Economy, Finance, Health, Justice, Agriculture, the Interior, Education and Ways of Communication, as well as by Larianu, Chairman of the Bucharest Chamber of Commerce and Industry. They signed this telegram as eyewitnesses of the criminal acts of the troops and police and demanded Radescu’s resignation.

One would have thought that public opinion in all the democratic countries would have associated itself with this protest of the broad masses of the people of Rumania. After all, not even a month has passed since the leaders of the three foremost Powers of the anti-Hitler coalition publicly stated in the Declaration on Liberated Europe adopted at the Crimea Conference that “the establishment of order in Europe and the rebuilding of national economic life must be achieved by processes which will enable the liberated peoples to destroy the last vestiges of Nazism and Fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice.” Yet certain organs of the British and American press adopted a manifestly anti-democratic attitude on this question and came out in support of the Rumanian pro-fascist elements.

The British Ministry of Information, in its report on the Rumanian events, repeated the false statements of Radescu and the reactionary clique grouped around him. Ignoring the fact that nearly half a million people took part in the demonstration on which the Rumanian fascists fired, the British Ministry of Information declared in its statement that it was “Rumanian extremists calling themselves a “-democratic front,” but who in fact are Communists” who were trying to overthrow Radescu’s government. Evidently the authors of this statement have not yet rid themselves of the bad habit of dubbing any elements they don’t like “Communist bands.” In this same statement it is declared without the slightest foundation that the demonstrations in Rumania had “Soviet support.”

The Manchester Guardian asserts that Radescu’s government was attacked by a minority. The New York Times went even further: its Berne correspondent, citing mythical reports from the Balkans, wrote that in Bucharest a large group of armed Communists tried to overthrow the government and establish Soviets in Rumania. The correspondent cited the Bucharest radio in support of the assertion that Ana Paucker (member of the Central Committee of the Rumanian Communist Party) had led a Communist attack on the royal palace, the Ministry of the Interior, the Prefecture, and the Central Telegraph Office, and that the Communists shed blood. Unfortunately, one cannot help noting that this report by a reputable American newspaper fully coincides with the description of the Rumanian events
given by the German radio on February 28.

These and similar utterances by certain newspapers of the Allied countries involuntarily suggest a number of questions. What grounds are there for asserting, as the Manchester Guardian does, that Radescu is being opposed by a minority, when at the meeting on February 24 were gathered nearly half a million people, or roughly two-thirds of the entire adult population of Bucharest? If at the protest meetings against the firing on the demonstration 25,000 people gathered in Constanta, 30,000 in Timisoara, and 35,000 in Brasov, what grounds are there for the claim that the majority of the Rumanian people are for Radescu and not against him? Is it not high time to stop applying the epithets “bands,” “extremists” and the like to the millions of people who are striving for that very democracy which was proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter, the Crimea Declaration and in all the programmatic documents of the United Nations generally? Is it not high time for all who would be called democrats to stop supporting reactionary privileged upper strata, whose only concern is to preserve their privileges?

The National Democratic Front in Rumania unites not only the Communist and Socialist Parties; it also embraces the trade unions, the agriculturists’, union, the Union of Patriots—broad organizations of the working population. Radescu was actively opposed not only by the National Democratic Front, but by representatives of all parties and all sections of Rumanian society, including many representatives of the National Tsarist and National Liberal Parties, of the clergy, of business circles, the army, etc. In Rumania there is neither a Parliament nor anything resembling a Consultative Assembly. The military situation does not permit the immediate holding of general elections there. Does that mean that as long as there are no elections the government that happens to exist at the moment, irrespective of what its policy may be or in whose interests it functions, is to have a monopoly in voicing the will of the people?

The will of the people is expressed in diverse ways. Its expression does not, nor can it, always and under all circumstances be confined to the customary and traditional lines adapted to normal conditions of peace time. Did not the resistance movement in the Hitler-occupied countries express the will of the peoples of these countries to rid themselves of the invaders more clearly than any vote could have done? Was not the wave of meetings and demonstrations that swept through Rumania and embraced hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of representatives of the most diverse sections of society an unambiguous expression of the will of the Rumanian people? This can only be denied by those who love to talk about the will of the people, but who actually fear nothing more than the triumph of the genuine will of the people.

Public opinion in the Soviet Union is fully aware that the present events in Rumania cannot be considered only an internal affair of that country. The interests of the common struggle of the Allies against Hitler Germany will not permit a wretched handful of reactionaries, who are trying to preserve their privileges and save the fascist cadres, to provoke civil war in a country in the immediate rear of the Red Army, which is engaged in a bloody fight against the German fascist tyrants. Those who, while claiming to be champions of democracy, take the side of the reactionaries and enemies of the people every time a real, not only verbal, fight for democracy is on the order of the day are doing the common cause of the Allies a great disservice.

The Rumanian reactionaries sustained a defeat and Radescu’s government was forced to resign. It is to be hoped that it will be succeeded by a government which will call to stern account those guilty of the bloody massacre of February 24 and which will be able to ensure the scrupulous and speedy observance of all the terms of the armistice, the extermination of the Hitler agency in Rumania, the carrying out of urgent democratic reforms and the satisfaction of the legitimate demands of the masses.
Finland Before the Diet Elections

WHILE Finland was fighting on the side of Hitler Germany against the Soviet Union, the ruling circles in Helsinki loudly proclaimed that the Finnish people unanimously approved of their pro-German policy and fascist war. Subsequently it transpired that even then there were no few opponents of the German-Finnish coalition and the war, but their voices were forcibly suppressed. The opponents of the government’s policy were either intimidated or flung into prison or concentration camps. Not a single newspaper or public speaker was permitted to criticize the German-Finnish “comradeship in arms” that was so fatal for the country. In this way the Finnish government was able during the war to create the illusion of at least a tacit “unanimity” of the Finnish people in the fascist war.

This artificially created illusion, however, was swept away as soon as the armistice was concluded. It was enough to deprive the Finnish reactionaries of the opportunity of keeping the advocates of peace and of collaboration with the United Nations under lock and key for this mirage of the Finnish people united and solid around the banners of jingoism, reaction and fascism to vanish. It turned out that there was not only a camp of reaction and fascism in Finland, but also a camp of democracy and progress. From the depths of the masses sprang up at once a rapidly growing movement which rallied around the militant banner of the democratic front.

But the old camp of Finnish reaction did not yet lose its predominant position in the country. It was politically bankrupt as a result of its “comradeship in arms” with the Germans and was compelled to resign itself to the fact that the cabinet that was formed after the armistice included a number of representatives of the new orientation in Finnish politics headed by the Prime Minister Paasikivi. Nevertheless, thanks to the efforts of President Mannerheim, the old reactionary camp was very strongly represented in this cabinet and this probably explains why the Paasikivi Government finds it difficult to make progress. All departments of the state apparatus, starting from the higher cadres of the army, police, judiciary, etc., are dominated by the reactionary forces which, during the Ryti-Linkomies regime, displayed exceptional zeal in strangling the democratic forces of the Finnish people. In the present situation they are behaving more cautiously, but there is no evidence that they have abandoned their former fascist line and intend to leave the reactionary camp.

The leaders of the reactionary camp are now employing flexible defensive tactics and, when necessary, make a minimum of concessions in order to save a maximum of their positions and privileges. Virtually, they have no other program. Only the representatives of the democratic front have advanced a positive program which demands a change of course in Finland’s foreign and domestic politics in the interests of the Finnish people. Both camps are now appealing to the electors. In the political conflict between the forces of the old and the new course the forthcoming Diet elections, which are to be held in the middle of March, will undoubtedly mark a very important stage.

What questions are being pushed into the forefront in the present election campaign?

As regards foreign policy the main question is the radical revision of Finland’s ill-advised policy towards the Soviet Union that was pursued for so many years. Such a revision is dictated by the most vital interests of Finland. As far as the Soviet Government is concerned, it has clearly indicated its readiness to welcome all sincere steps on the part of the Finnish people towards friendship and collaboration with the Soviet people. It is quite obvious that the Soviet Government was fully in the position last year to dictate to Finland, had it so desired, more far-reaching armistice terms than those it actually presented and would have been morally justified in doing so. The leniency the Soviet Union displayed towards Finland was clearly prompted by the desire to help the Finnish people to take the path of firm peaceful relations and collaboration with their great Eastern neighbour.

After the armistice was concluded a fairly broad movement sprang up in favour of initiating and developing collaboration with the Soviet Union. This movement was headed by the well-known Finland-Soviet Union Society,
to which belong not only leaders of workers' organizations and representatives of the progressive intelligentsia, but also prominent representatives of some of the liberal and conservative circles of the Finnish bourgeoisie. Thanks to the activities of this important organization a breach has already been made in the wall of anti-Soviet prejudice, and steadily, if slowly, there is spreading among various sections of the Finnish public not only a realization of the historical necessity for Finland to live in peace and harmony with her Eastern neighbour, but also a deeper understanding of the importance to the country of the free development of Soviet-Finnish relations. People who six months ago saw no way out of the impasse that was created by the fatal German-Finnish "comradeship in arms" are now beginning to understand what incalculable advantages for Finland's future are held out by the development of economic, political and cultural collaboration with the Soviet Union; and they are beginning to realize that such collaboration opens up reliable prospects of a rapid and all-sided revival of the national economy and culture of an independent, democratic Finland.

There has never been a case in the history of independent Finland of the ruling reactionaries subordinating their policy to the national interests of the country. Had they been concerned about the interests of their country they would have found the road to collaboration with the Soviet Union long ago. But just as before the war, they sabotaged even the most modest steps towards development of commercial relations with the Soviet Union, so now they would like to block the road to the development of firm collaboration between the Finnish and Soviet peoples. They are obviously afraid that as Finnish-Soviet business and cultural relations expand the interest of broad circles of Finnish society in the further cultivation and expansion of such good-neighbourly relations will grow, and that then it will be extremely difficult for them to turn the country back to the former foreign policy, the spearhead of which was turned against the Soviet Union.

True, at the present time, the Finnish reactionaries do not publicly advocate a return to their former anti-Soviet policy, but neither do they dissociate themselves from the traditional policy of the reactionary ruling camp. They merely demand that their assurances of good will towards the Soviet Union be taken at their face value. These verbal assurances, however, fail to convince unbiased observers who look below the surface. For example, A. Werth, the English radio commentator, who recently visited Helsinki, drew attention in his statement of February 10 to the present political views of the leading elements of such a large pro-German organization as the Comrades-in-Arms League, which was at last dissolved in spite of the stubborn resistance of all the reactionary circles in Finland. Concerning these elements A. Werth said:

"These people had not yet accepted the idea that co-operation with Russia is the only course, and though Germany is being effectively knocked out by the Red Army, they still go on playing with the idea that there may some time be a conflict between Russia and Britain and America, and that Finland can then cash in."

Nevertheless, after his trip to Finland A. Werth became convinced that "the idea will also sink in that they [the Finns] will have to co-operate with the United Nations, notably with their neighbour, Russia." "Now a new era has opened in Finnish-Russian relations," he emphasized. At the same time, knowing how stubborn the Finnish reactionaries were and the "educational" activity they had conducted for many years in inculcating the spirit of jingoism and Nazism, he quite rightly warned that time would be needed for the entire Finnish people to accustom themselves to the new idea of Soviet-Finnish collaboration.

In the election campaign the Finnish reactionaries have come out under the false watchword of "protecting the independence of Finland." This is the very slogan under cover of which, as is known, they waged the war in conjunction with the Germans for aggressive aims. Now they are using this slogan to conceal their aim of abusing the independence of Finland in the way they had done in past years, when Finnish diplomacy intrigued against the security of the neighbouring Soviet State. Nevertheless, the Finnish people are beginning to realize as a result of their own experience that the only danger that might threaten the independence of Finland are the shady tricks of the Finnish reactionary jingoes working hand in glove with German fascists, or other enemies of the Soviet Union. In their election campaign, the representatives of Finnish democracy are exposing the pernicious foreign policy pursued by the reactionary camp and are advocating in opposition to it a policy of peace, friendship and collaboration with the Soviet Union.
As regards questions of domestic policy, prominent among election issues are the political and economic demands of the Democratic League of the Finnish People, which consists of the so-called “Group of the Six”, (led by the six members of the Diet, who, during the war, were arrested for anti-war activities), the Communist Party, a number of local organizations of the Social-Democratic Party, most of the leaders of the Social-Democratic opposition, and numerous democratically-minded intellectuals. The Democratic League of the Finnish People primarily puts forward a program for the democratization of the state, administration and legislature, the extirpation of fascism from the government offices and from all public and political life, and also the prosecution of those responsible for the war and other war criminals.

The representatives of the reactionary camp deny the existence of fascism and fascists in the country and on these grounds deny the necessity for any measures to eradicate fascism and its influence from public life. True, during the past two months hundreds of fascist organizations have been dissolved, but in most cases the fascists have remained in their posts, including very high posts. Not a single department has been purged, neither the leadership of the army and the police, nor the government and municipal offices. Even the old criminal Secret Police, which closely collaborated with the German Gestapo, is still alive and flourishing. Nor have the Finnish adherents of Hitlerism yet been deprived of the opportunity of disseminating fascist poison. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that Finnish democrats regard such a situation as intolerable from the point of view of the normal development of Finland.

At the same time the Democratic League of the Finnish People comes out in the elections in defence of the economic interests of the working classes, upon whose shoulders the Finnish reactionaries are trying to impose the brunt of the material consequences of the war. In their election program the organizations affiliated to the Democratic League propose a number of measures for alleviating the hard conditions of the workers, peasants and salaried employees. A special place among these measures is occupied by a practical plan for allotting land to settlers, demobilized soldiers and poor peasants. To carry out this important plan a land reform is proposed, to be carried out at the expense of the arable land of the large private estates, and adequate state aid to settlers.

These important problems of foreign and domestic policy constitute the dividing line between the two fronts that are deploying in the election campaign. Whoever wishes to make a pre-election appraisal of the relation of forces of these two fronts must bear in mind that the Democratic League of the Finnish People was organized only several months ago and that it is opposed by all the old parties, including the Social-Democratic Party, which have long been in power. True, as a consequence of their political bankruptcy in connection with the war, these parties have lost many of their former supporters, but, on the other hand, they have gained new supporters from the dissolved I.K.L. (the Nazi party), the Schutzkorps and other fascist organizations. While there are a number of wavering or opposition democrats among the candidates put forward by parties like the Social-Democratic Party, the Swedish Party, the Progressive Party and the Agrarian Party, the fact remains that the leaders of these parties are hand in glove with the arch-reactionary Coalition Party with which they had formed the governmental bloc during the war.

In addition, the following must be taken into consideration. There are many localities in Finland, particularly in the rural districts, which have by no means been completely freed from the atmosphere of hidden intimidation on the part of the Schutzkorps elements. In most of the towns and villages throughout the country the democratic forces have no premises in which to hold meetings, whereas their opponents, of course, have premises everywhere. The old parties have other advantages too. They have hundreds of newspapers, whereas the supporters of the Democratic League of the Finnish People have only a few. The reactionaries have large election funds at their disposal, whereas the democrats have only small funds, collected mainly from the workers. Moreover, the old parties in the Diet have considerable experience in electioneering with all the demagogic dodges (some of them even have experience in faking election results). On the other hand, the old parties are handicapped by their former collaboration with the Hitlerites. Over thirty of the principal and most well-known candidates of these parties—linkomies, Tanner, Ramsay, Reunikka, and others—are so discredited as close accomplices of the Hitler bandits that
either they were compelled to abstain from standing for election, or else their own parties had to throw them on the scrap-heap without waiting for the verdict of the electors. It will readily be understood that if the reactionary elements had succeeded in using the course of the election campaign to consolidate their positions this would have been fraught with serious danger to the Finnish people, for the reaction, thus encouraged, would have attempted to manoeuvre the country into a repetition of the fatal mistakes that so recently brought it to the brink of disaster.

The Democratic League of the Finnish People is fighting under clean colours and for a just cause. Herein lies its advantage. And this is quite sufficient to enable the young forces of Finnish democracy, by their earnest struggle in the interests of the people, to win at the forthcoming elections considerable mass influence and a considerable number of seats in the Diet. If this result is achieved in the very first elections contested by the League, it will undoubtedly mark an important step forward on the part of the Finnish people towards a better future.

**Reactionary Intrigues in Italy**

S. SLOBODSKOY

**ITALY** is a country where fascism not only sustained military defeat but also suffered complete moral and political bankruptcy. In the course of the war the Italian fascists utterly exposed themselves as Hitler's lackeys and as unscrupulous adventurers who shrank from no crime. The programs of all the Italian parties and organizations which have rallied to the banner of progress demand that fascism be extirpated. However, little has yet been done in this direction.

So far the purge in liberated Italy has consisted mainly of the dismissal of minor officials from certain administrative bodies and of the stripping of a certain section of prominent fascists, most of whom are at present beyond the reach of the Italian authorities, of their titles of honour. Only in recent months have the courts taken up the cases of war criminals and high-placed traitors, but the list of persons brought to trial is ridiculously small compared with the number of fascist criminals and their accomplices who are residing on the liberated territory of Italy and who hold responsible posts in the army, the police, in municipal and in government bodies.

It was over a year after the signing of the armistice before General Roatta, fascist spy and butcher of the Slovenian people, was put in the prisoner's dock. As chief of the intelligence service of the fascist army, Roatta, together with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and other fascist organs, organized espionage, sabotage, political assassinations and fascist actions in a number of countries, principally in Republican Spain and France. Even before the conclusion of the Italo-German military alliance, Roatta established close contact with the German intelligence service and furnished it with valuable information. The list of crimes in which Roatta and former Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Suvić and other prominent fascists who have been brought to trial with him are implicated is a very long one. In it figure, in particular, the assassination in Marseilles in 1934 of King Alexander of Yugoslavia and the French Foreign Minister Barthou, the assassination by the French Cagoulards on orders from Rome of the Rosselli brothers, leaders of the Italian anti-fascist "Justice and Liberty" organization in 1937, etc. During the war Roatta commanded the Second Italian Army of Occupation in Yugoslavia. There he distinguished himself by his extreme brutality and ferocity towards the partisans and the civilian population. He was included in the Yugoslav Government's list of war criminals long ago. Roatta's atrocities in Yugoslavia have long been universally known. But this did not prevent him from acting as Chief of Staff of the army of liberated Italy right down to April 1944.

Taddeo Orlando, another prominent Italian general, formerly commander of the Sardian Granatieri Division which gained notoriety by the frightful atrocities it committed in Slovenia, is also accused of war crimes by the Yugoslav patriots; but this did not
prevent him from serving as Italian War Minister right down to June 1944. At present he is a commander of gendarmerie (of the Carabinieri Corps) and has made himself notorious in this post by addressing a circular to his subordinates drawing their attention to the “alarming lack of discipline and dangerous spirit of sedition” among the masses and ordering them to act against them “resolutely and without hesitation.”

Only very recently have proceedings been commenced against the traitor generals who surrendered their positions to the Germans without a fight, and who hindered the efforts of the Italian patriots to organize resistance to the forces of occupation. One of these generals, Basso, surrendered Naples to the Germans without a fight. After this he was appointed commander of the armed forces on the island of Sardinia, and was then given another post.

Only in November 1944 did the authorities make up their mind to confiscate the property of Dino Grandi and other high fascist leaders.

Big landowners, industrialists and financiers known to have been actively implicated in the fascist terror and in Mussolini’s military adventures have, in the main, been left unmolested. The tolerance displayed towards fascist accomplices in liberated Italy was strikingly evidenced by the sending of the financier Luigi Podesta, who for a long time was a prominent agent of Mussolini’s in America, to the United States on a “technical” mission (the printing of Italian banknotes). The appearance of Podesta in the United States on an official mission provoked a storm of indignation among broad Italo-American circles, who were certain that he had been arrested long ago.

The failure to fight with due energy for the extirpation of fascism has aroused the deep dissatisfaction of the masses and the protest of sincere patriots. But hitherto they have failed to secure any radical change in the situation. The existing purge law, the procedure it lays down, the method of constituting the bodies authorized to carry out the purge, above all, the fact that the directors of the purge have no real powers afford the widest opportunity for sabotage and for the shielding of the criminals, who have no lack of high-placed protectors inside and outside the country. Suffice it to say that the president of the Special Supreme Court for the trial of fascist criminals is the president of the Court of Cassation, who held that post also under the fascist regime.

It cannot be denied that the course and character of the purge are influenced by the fact that a number of provinces situated in proximity to the war zone are still under the direct control of the Allied military administration, and that generally the freedom of action of the Italian government is severely circumscribed by the armistice terms. It would be wrong, however, to attribute the extreme laxity with which the fight against fascism is being waged in Italy entirely to external causes. The demand for the eradication of fascism, the punishment of the fascist criminals, and the speeding up of the democratization of the country is encountering fierce resistance, first and foremost, from the reactionary, pro-fascist forces in Italy who are prepared to go to all lengths to save the remnants of fascism, upon the preservation of which their privileges and their immunity from punishment for their own crimes depend.

In their fight against the complete elimination of fascism and the creation of a free, democratic Italy, the reactionary forces lean for support on the Vatican and on the clerics who take their orders from it. The Vatican has done not a little to save from condign punishment a number of prominent fascist leaders who were found on the territory of liberated Italy. According to the press, some of them (Federzoni, Rossoni, Bottai, and others) are hiding in the Vatican. It is largely on the insistence of the Vatican that many leaders of provincial fascist organizations have still gone unpunished, and that numerous fascist appointees still hold leading posts on the local government bodies of Southern Italy. This is in full harmony with the line of the Vatican as defined by Pope Pius XII even before Mussolini’s overthrow in his message to Archbishop Spellman of New York, the sum and substance of which was that in the event of the downfall of the fascist regime the fascist party was to be disbanded, but the fascist prefects were to be retained in their posts as a bulwark of order.

It is the cherished ambition of the Vatican to preserve the principles of the fascist system as far as possible, only without the fascist signboard and without the most compromised of the fascist leaders. It is not surprising that the clerical elements in the country most closely connected with the Vatican are
appearing in the role of “peacemakers” in respect to Italian fascism. This is the position taken up, for example, by the Quotidiano, organ of the Catholic Action, a federation of church charitable, economic and propaganda organizations, which continued to exist under the fascist regime and which counted not a few fascist agents among its leaders. This newspaper pleads for mercy towards the fascist criminals and demands that they be tried in accordance with the ordinary rules of judicial procedure.

“It should not be forgotten,” it preaches, “that even the worst criminal is a human being, all the more so since neglect of the human being lies at the bottom of the totalitarian dementia.”

The leaders of the Italian Liberal Party profess to favour an “objective” and “unbiased” purge, but actually they are doing their utmost to hinder it. The Liberals combine a defence of the fascist criminals with an attempt to belittle the danger represented by these cutthroats, who are still active in the country. Risorgimento Liberale, organ of the Liberal Party, publishes articles under the heading “Fascism Is Dead,” in which it avers that all fears of a “revival of the fascists’ underground activities” are groundless, and that the possibility of the remnants of the old regime rallying and reappearing as a political force “must be definitely rejected.”

Besides their benevolent and “charitable” attitude towards the fascist criminals, the Liberal and clerical circles are betraying great consideration for the police and the gendarmes, who act in the spirit of General Taddeo Orlando’s instructions mentioned above. Last October the police and the gendarmes brutally attacked a demonstration of civil servants of Palermo, who came out into the streets demanding increased salaries. About a score of the demonstrators were killed and one hundred were injured. The Osservatore Romano, official organ of the Vatican, deemed it necessary to lend moral support to the police, whose behaviour roused a storm of protest in the country and rendered valuable service to the Sicilian separatists. Controverting a newspaper which wrote that “under a democratic regime the people are not fired upon, and arms are used against the enemies of the people and to defend the people from their enemies,” the Vatican organ adduced the superb argument in justification of the conduct of the police that “the gendarmes and the police are also part of the people.”

The resistance of the reactionary forces is not confined to opposing the extirpation of fascism. As a rule, all measures designed to democratize the political system, to ameliorate the condition of the workers and peasants in any way, to organize the fight against profiteering and the black market, to enlist the efforts of the people in raising the country from its economic prostration, and to reorganize and purge the army, encounter the stubborn resistance and sabotage of the reactionary forces. Characteristic of the pace at which the process of democratization is going on in Italy is the fact that the decision, adopted already by the Badoglio Cabinet, to create a more or less authoritative “Consultative Assembly” to function with the government has not been put into effect to this day. On the other hand, the Senate, whose members were appointed by the king and selected from among the most conservative and reactionary elements, has been resuscitated with the object of using it as a counterpoise to the Central Committee of National Liberation.

Even more significant are the frenzied efforts of the pro-fascist forces to preserve the bankrupt and discredited General Staff of the army, which in September 1943 did everything in its power to undermine Italy’s defences against a Hitler invasion. This Staff had become utterly corrupt and, as General Berardo, its former chief, declared, was a nest of “careerism and peculation.” (About the political complexion of the Staff the general thought it wise to say nothing.) The existence of such a Staff has long been a serious hindrance to the rehabilitation of the Italian army. Only in November 1944, when the question of creating a morally and politically sound and militarily efficient army had become exceptionally acute, did the government venture to adopt a decision to disband and reorganize the General Staff. But it is still uncertain whether the authorities will be strong-minded enough to carry out this reform in all its implications, for the reactionary forces are deeply interested in preserving a situation in Italy where, in the words of the New York P. M., the “democratic civil authority is dependent on the monarchical and reactionary led army.”
in which, according to the same newspaper, there are still 400 Mussolini generals.

It is not surprising that the activities of the reactionaries assumed an unusually virulent and organized character after the arrest of Roatta and the decision to reorganize the General Staff. The immediate purpose of these activities, which led to a government crisis at the end of November and the beginning of December last year, was to split the Central Committee of National Liberation, to destroy its political influence, to oust the Communists and other Left parties from the government, and to set up a new, Right cabinet consisting of such "authoritative" representatives of traditional Italian Liberalism as ex-Premier Orlando, who continued to co-operate with Mussolini even after the assassination of Matteotti, right down to November 1924. One of the first acts of this new government was to be the complete abolition of the detested Commissariat for the Punishment of Fascist Criminals.

The reactionary cliques which directed these activities were no doubt aware that they might provoke a storm of protest on the part of the democratic and anti-fascist forces of the country. But it is to be presumed that the reactionaries, having thrown off all restraint, were not averse to provoking the masses to violent action in the hope of thus bringing about foreign intervention in their own favour. The initiators of these activities were not worried by the fact that the aggravation of the internal struggle would be detrimental to the fight against the Germans and play into the hands of Hitler and Mussolini. The enlistment of the broad masses of the Italian people in the fight against Hitler has no part in the plans of the Italian reactionaries and their protectors among the pro-fascist circles in the democratic countries. Both are only inspired with fear and hatred of the partisan movement against the German occupation, which is a mass school of genuine patriotism and democracy.

The provocative plans of the reactionaries were defeated, thanks to the fact that the democratic forces, and the Communists in the first place, saw through the intrigue, foiled the machinations of the enemy, and prevented the disintegration of the Committee of National Liberation, which continues to be a big factor in rallying the sound forces of the Italian people in the fight against fascism on the external and internal fronts. The action of the Italian Communists, prompted by a consciousness of political responsibility and a sense of duty, prevented the rise of a situation in Italy which would have been fraught with serious consequences to Italy's participation in the war and to her future welfare.

The reactionary, pro-fascist forces have found a particularly favourable soil in Sicily, where practically nothing has been done to purge and infuse new blood into the government and municipal bodies, and where the privileges and virtual rule of the big landowners remain intact to this day. Agents of Hitler and Mussolini are regularly smuggled into Sicily, where there is an exceptionally large "Fifth Column," represented by the fascist and pro-fascist officials who are snugly ensconced in the local government and various economic bodies and are enjoying the full support of the landowners, financiers and reactionary clergy. In many parts of Sicily (as in other parts of Southern Italy) there have been cases of attacks on the premises and the leaders of the Left parties and trade unions, and the man-handling, arrest and torture of active anti-fascists. The poverty of the mass of the Sicilian population, their political backwardness and the anger which has been accumulating for decades against the brutal oppression of the parasitic classes are being exploited by Mussolini's agents and by the tools of the feudal landowners to foment and foster separatist tendencies on the island and to instigate anti-government and anti-national actions. In recent months these actions have assumed a rather serious character. The notorious criminal Maffia organization is being revived under the badge of separatism. One would think that it should be the task of the authorities to render the reactionaries harmless and to win over the population by introducing essential social and political reforms, and to rely upon the local democratic and anti-fascist forces in the fight against the fascists and pro-fascists. Actually, however, the authorities are inclined to lean more on unreliable and unauthoritative representatives of the old official class and on the police and gendarmerie, which are badly contaminated with fascist elements and therefore easily succumb to the diverse intrigues of sinister forces, and which sometimes themselves deliberately provoke the population to open action.

The reactionary forces are doing their
utmost to hamper Italy's economic and political rehabilitation. This creates a situation favourable to profiteering, marauding, banditry, unscrupulous intrigues and other anti-social manifestations. In particular, one observes a growth of all sorts of shady and criminal organizations, which engage in banditry, blackmail and intrigue under the guise of "political activity." Some of these organizations possess their armed detachments which, as was the case with the fascist "squadre" (the bands which made the "march on Rome" in 1922), enjoy the support of the military, financiers and high-placed reactionaries.

In January 1945, in the course of a round-up, the chieftain of one of these bands, a certain Albano, nicknamed the "Hunchback," was killed. He was betrayed to the police by his accomplices. Investigation of the "Hunchback" case revealed that he was connected with a gang of adventurers and provocateurs calling itself the "Party of Proletarian Unity," around which a number of other suspicious organizations were grouped. A "congress" held by these organizations was attended, among others, by a former fascist Minister, by several big profiteers who used to finance Mussolini, and, it is rumoured, by the present director of the Bank of Italy. It transpired that the leader of the "Proletarian Unity," Salvarezza, an adventurer and blackmailer, who was arrested in connection with the "Hunchback" case, had extensive and highly ramified connections. Specifically, he was connected with a prominent Hitlerite general, with fascist big businessmen and with Sicilian separatists, was received after the liberation of Rome by Prince Umberto, the ruler of the kingdom, worked for the release of Roatta and hatched plans to deliver him from jail. This provocateur tried to make a career by combating the Socialists and Communists, conspired to compromise and kidnap their leaders, and offered his services as an instigator of actions against the Left parties. These activities secured for him profitable connections and patrons in the reactionary camp.

The Italian patriots are trying to put an end to the state of paralysis in which the political, social and economic rehabilitation of the country finds itself. They quite rightly hold that the decisive task, on the successful accomplishment of which the internal and international position of Italy will largely depend, is to secure the fullest possible participation of both the liberated and the occupied parts of the country in the fight against Hitlerism. The Italian authorities have lately proceeded to create a big national army by calling up for military service large contingents of the youth and by incorporating former partisans in the army. A Ministry for the Affairs of Occupied Italy has been set up to strengthen contacts with the partisan movement.

But the policy of yielding to the fascist and pro-fascist forces in the rear scarcely tally with the move to mobilize the masses of the liberated and occupied parts of Italy for the defeat of the Nazi occupants and Mussolini's bands. It will be difficult to develop an effective war effort which will demand fresh sacrifices from the broad masses of the people, and, at the same time, allow the fascist military and other criminals and traitors, who are responsible for the sufferings of the people and are plotting new acts of treachery and crimes against them, to go completely unpunished.

How pernicious and dangerous the policy of concessions to reaction is may be gathered from the recent actions against the calling up of the youth to the army engineered by the sinister forces: the series of violent armed demonstrations in Sicily (in the course of which 19 policemen and 19 demonstrators were killed), the armed attack on a meeting called by the patriots in connection with recruiting in Cagliari (chief town in Sardinia), the attempt to organize a demonstration against recruiting in Naples, etc.

Italy's official decision to take a serious part in the war against Hitlerism presupposes a firm policy of eradicating the survivals of fascism, of calling the fascist criminals to book, and of curbing the pro-fascist reactionaries. Sincere friends of Italy will judge the true political complexion of the various political groups and leaders who have rallied to the banner of democracy by their attitude towards the task of purging the country of all remnants of fascism.
THE HISTORIC decisions of the Crimea Conference of the leaders of the Three Allied Powers are of enormous significance for Yugoslavia's future. As is known, these decisions contain the recommendation to Marshal Tito and Dr. Subasić “that the Agreement between them should be put into effect immediately, and that a Joint Provisional Government should be formed on the basis of that Agreement.” The new Joint Yugoslav Government is further advised to extend the Anti-Fascist Assembly of National Liberation to include “members of the last Yugoslav Parliament who have not compromised themselves by collaboration with the enemy.” Thus, a new body, to be known as a Temporary Parliament, is to be formed. Lastly, the decisions provide for the subsequent ratification by a Constituent Assembly of all the legislative acts passed by the Anti-Fascist Assembly.

There can be no doubt that these decisions of the Crimea Conference will help considerably to rally still further the national forces of Yugoslavia, and this in its turn, will hasten the complete liberation of the entire country from the Hitler invaders and their hangers-on. The conditions will thus be created for the complete regeneration of the country on truly democratic lines.

The specific feature of the situation in Yugoslavia during the present war has been that while the country was under the yoke of the German fascist invaders, the émigré government and the elements that grouped themselves around it for a long time opposed both the striving for national liberation of the masses of the people who were fighting in Yugoslavia and the vital objects of the struggle of the United Nations. For a number of years the men at the head of the Yugoslav émigré government—Purić and his predecessors—pursued a policy inimical to the people. Suffice it to recall that Draža Mihajlović's Chetniks were considered this government's “army” and their ataman was the War Minister. The government-in-exile tried to keep the masses from fighting the Germans. Its adherents claimed that the positions of the forces of occupation were “impregnable,” in connection with which advice was given “to wait a while” ostensibly in order to avoid heavy and useless sacrifice.

The operations of the Yugoslav People's Army of Liberation, however, long ago refuted the fairy tales about the alleged impregnable positions of the Hitler invaders in the Balkans. Already in 1943 one-third of the territory of Yugoslavia was liberated from the invaders and five million persons freed from Hitler captivity. The self-sacrificing struggle waged by the Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian patriots saved the lives of millions of people who, undoubtedly, would have perished had not this heroic mass resistance been put up. The casualties sustained by Marshal Tito's troops were far less heavy than those sustained by the civilian population as a consequence of fascist violence and murder. In the course of nearly four years of continuous fighting the Yugoslav People's Army of Liberation wiped out about half a million enemy men and officers, while its own losses amounted to about 230,000. During the same period 1,500,000 civilians, nearly one-tenth of the population of the country, perished in the occupied regions as a result of fascist terrorism.

The national liberation movement acted like a magnet upon the broad masses of the people from the moment it arose. The partisan units, which subsequently grew into the People's Army of Liberation, drew their strength from their inseverable ties with the people. During the period of occupation, which was also a period of self-sacrificing struggle waged by the best men and women among all the peoples of Yugoslavia, fundamental changes took place in the social life of the country. New democratic forces arose and new social relations were established. In the struggle against the foreign invaders a new, free, democratic, federal Yugoslavia came into being. The broad masses of the people regard the pre-war, pro-fascist regime as dead and buried. The civilized world highly appraises Yugoslavia's contribution to the common cause of the United Nations in their fight against Hitler imperialism.

All this, combined with the Red Army's victories which have brought Hitler Germany face to face with inevitable disaster, could not but affect the mood of Yugoslavs abroad.
Considerable sections of the émigrés refused to stand aloof and cut their ties with their motherland. This found its reflection in the utterances of prominent Yugoslav political leaders in England and America who paid tribute to the heroic struggle waged by the People's Army of Liberation and called upon the people to render it every assistance. The reactionary émigré government of Purić found itself isolated, and this isolation grew as the position of Hitler Germany became worse and the successes of the Yugoslav people in their struggle for national liberation increased. Great-Serbian chauvinism, the sole prop of the reactionary governments, lost all influence even in Serbia. The resignation of the Purić government in May 1944 testified to the bankruptcy of its political line. A new government was formed, headed by Dr. Subašić, and at once the question of the relations between the royal government abroad and the national liberation movement at home arose.

Subašić's statement of his intention to collaborate with the national liberation movement was favourably received in fighting Yugoslavia and her doors were flung open for all genuine anti-fascists wherever they were to be found, at home or abroad. The national liberation movement was never averse to enlisting the aid of the army and women who were prepared to take a real and active part in the common struggle to liberate the country from the yoke of the hated fascist invaders.

At the time the Subašić government was formed Yugoslavia was in very sore straits. The invaders were conducting their seventh general offensive with the aid of air, parachute, and tank forces. At that time the Hitler Command had in Yugoslavia thirty German divisions and about an equal number of vassal and Quisling forces, making a total of about 600,000 men. This was twice as large as the number at the command of the People's Army of Liberation. The territory recaptured by Marshal Tito was mainly mountainous country without any large towns and almost destitute of large industrial plants. The armaments, ammunition and supplies needed by the army were manufactured in small handicraft workshops. The civilian population suffered extreme privation and hunger, there was a shortage of medical supplies and of consumers' goods.

Subašić's visit to the liberated area and his negotiations with Marshal Tito in June 1944 produced good results. Agreement was reached on many questions. The Subašić government recognized the national democratic achievements of the Yugoslav peoples during their three years' struggle. It fully recognized the fighting forces of the people organized in the People's Army of Liberation under the command of Marshal Tito, and denounced the traitors who were collaborating with the enemy. It called upon the whole of the Yugoslav people to make common cause with the People's Army of Liberation. Marshal Tito, on his part, gave a pledge that the Committee of National Liberation would not raise the question of the country's final form of state while the war was in progress. It was agreed that this question would be settled by the people after the entire country was liberated. Both Marshal Tito and Dr. Subašić agreed that it was necessary to form a joint democratic government at the earliest possible date.

Undoubtedly, the Tito-Subašić agreement greatly contributed to the reinforcement of national unity in Yugoslavia. This explains why it met with the complete approval of the Yugoslav peoples and was very favourably received in the Allied countries.

On July 7 Dr. Subašić formed a new Cabinet, which included two Serbs, two Croats and two Slovenes. It contained two representatives of the national liberation movement. By way of removing obstacles to the achievement of national unity, Subašić abolished the Staff of Draža Mihajlović. This marked a grave defeat for the Yugoslav pro-fascist émigré circles who vainly clung to this now utterly exposed Hitler agent, the chief of the Chetnik bands.

An important factor that hastened the liberation of the Yugoslav people from the German fascist yoke and the achievement of the cherished desires of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was the absolutely new military and political situation that arose in the Balkans as a result of the unprecedented victories of the Soviet troops. In the summer of 1944 the Red Army, fulfilling its historic liberating mission, expelled the German invaders from the eastern part of the Balkan Peninsula. Naturally, this seriously weakened the German positions in the western part of the peninsula. The Red Army rendered the Yugoslav People's Army of Liberation enormous assistance. The Soviet fighting men shattered the powerful German defences in Eastern Serbia and together with Marshal...
Tito's troops liberated the ancient city of Belgrade, the main centre of the German defences in the Balkans. The restitution of their capital to the Yugoslav peoples was of first-class importance.

One of the consequences of the triumph of Soviet arms in the Balkans was the collapse of the fascist regime in Bulgaria and the accession of the "Fatherland Front" Government to power. The fratricidal war among the South Slav peoples was thus brought to an end. The artificially fomented enmity was eliminated by the efforts of both sides. The united military efforts of Yugoslavs and Bulgarians facilitated successful operations in clearing the German scum out of the Slavonic lands of the Balkan Peninsula. Now that the Red Army's winter offensive has inflicted irreparable losses upon the German troops, Hitler is vainly trying to avert the utter rout of the German forces which are still in the Balkans by gradually withdrawing the remnants of the shattered army of occupation.

There are still about 200,000 German and approximately 150,000 Pavelić bandits in Yugoslavia. This tattered army is being methodically mopped up and destroyed by units of the People's Army of Liberation. The latter have already liberated two-thirds of the territory of their country. The invaders have been expelled from Serbia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Sandžak, Herzegovina and Dalmatia; nearly all the islands, a large part of Bosnia, and considerable parts of Croatia and Slovenia have been liberated from the Germans.

Such are the notable results achieved by the four years' nation-wide struggle in Yugoslavia. Could the People's Army of Liberation have achieved such successes on the battlefield without the complete support of the people?

Nevertheless, reactionary circles in neutral and even in Allied countries, are trying to impugn the democratic character of the state system of new Yugoslavia. Not a few Goebbels legends on this score are circulating in the foreign press. The reactionary section of the foreign press tries to depict the national liberation front in Yugoslavia as a "Communist organization," which, it is alleged, was thrust upon the people and is not supported by them. It is common knowledge, however, that the national liberation movement unites in its ranks people of different democratic groups and parties.

The elections to the Anti-Fascist Assembly, now to be transformed into a Temporary Par-

liament, were conducted on the widest democratic basis. Over half the inhabitants of the country took part in them, the entire population of the liberated area eighteen years of age and over enjoying the right to vote irrespective of sex, nationality, or religion.

The nation-wide character of the Anti-Fascist Assembly cannot rouse the slightest doubt. The Yugoslav peoples exercised their political rights for the first time for over twenty years. The last elections to the Skupšchina were conducted by Stojadinović in December 1938 amidst a reign of unbridled fascist police terrorism. In spite of that, the government's ticket polled only 1,339,000 votes, while that of the opposition polled 1,639,000. By various manipulations, however, Stojadinović got together a pro-fascist "parliament" with 304 "deputies," in which the opposition had only 68 seats. It is interesting to note that some of the candidates on the official ticket who were "elected" had polled only 14 to 20 votes, whereas opposition candidates who had polled several thousand votes were declared not elected. In the old Skupšchina there were scarcely any representatives of the opposition parties of that time, the only exception being a small group of members of Maček's Croatian Peasant Party, most of whom subsequently went over to the Ustashi.

It is not surprising that the overwhelming majority of the members of this "parliament" obsequiously served the German, Italian and Hungarian fascists. Some of them belonged to the puppet government formed by the traitor Nedić. Others were members of Pavelić's "Zbor," while many fought in the ranks of the Ustashi and Chetniks. The conduct of the government and opposition "deputies" during the occupation differed in no way; nearly all Maček's deputies went over to Pavelić. Recently a number of these "deputies" fled to Hitler Germany to escape retribution. Under these circumstances, as the Yugoslav press observes, the task of finding members of the old Skupšchina who have not compromised themselves by contacts with the enemies of the people is no easy one. Nevertheless, all the deputies who fulfill this stipulation will have a seat in the Temporary Parliament.

Now that the complete destruction of the Hitler war machine is near, the formation in federal Yugoslavia of a joint democratic government enjoying prestige and confidence at home and abroad and recognized
by all the Allied countries becomes an urgent task. Only such a government can most effectively ensure Yugoslavia's security and economic development, and economic and political collaboration with the object of guaranteeing peace and progress in the Balkans.

Already in November 1944 a new agreement was concluded between Marshal Tito and Dr. Subašić to form a joint people's government at the earliest possible date. While proclaiming the principle of the continuity of state authority in Yugoslavia, the agreement reaffirmed that the ultimate form of government would be fixed by a free decision of the people. It was provided that King Peter II should not return to the country until such a decision was made and that in his absence the royal power should be exercised by a Regency Council. Everywhere—in Yugoslavia and abroad—the new agreement met with hearty approval. Everything seemed to show that the agreement would be put into effect without delay. It guaranteed the Yugoslav people free elections and left it to them to decide the question of the form of state, including the question of the Constitution and the monarchy. At the last moment, however, King Peter refused to approve the agreement, expressed lack of confidence in Subašić and tried to compel him to resign.

The same forces that had supported Mihajlović for four years now tried to disrupt this agreement. Virtually, this was the last big stake played by the paltry remnants of the Yugoslav émigré reaction who were dreaming of the times of Great-Serbian hegemony and of a pro-fascist dictatorial regime. This new attack on the national unity of Yugoslavia roused a storm of protest all over the country. Serbs, Croatians and Slovenes unanimously characterized it as a treacherous stab in the back. The political line pursued by King Peter II was sharply condemned by the overwhelming majority of the English newspapers. Thus, the Daily Express of January 25 wrote, with obvious irritation: "It should be brought home to this young man that the people of Britain are not greatly interested in him."

A by no means insignificant role in the reaction's attacks on Yugoslav national unity is played by the notorious Maček who deserted to the camp of the enemies of the people long ago. This "peasant leader" entered Cvetković's pro-fascist cabinet, which adopted the decision that Yugoslavia should join the Hitler "Axis." Maček made no secret of his hatred of the Serbs and of progressive circles among the Croatian people, and openly backed Nazi Germany and her bloody "new order." The American journalist Parker quotes in his book Headquarters Budapest the following statement by Maček:

"The Serbs must distinctly understand that either they will give us what we are asking for or we will find someone else who will. Yes, I mean Adolf Hitler.... Somebody must make order in Yugoslavia. If the Serbs cannot, Germany can."

Events have shown that Maček had taken the path of treason and treachery. It is no accident that one of the present advisers of the émigré King Peter is Juraj Krmjević, one of Maček's close companions who, in conjunction with the Ustashi, took part in organizing the autumn putsch in Zagreb. Already at that time the Maček clique wanted to start civil and fratricidal war in Yugoslavia.

Exposing the intrigues of the Yugoslav reaction abroad, whose object is to prevent the Tito-Subašić agreement from being put into effect, the Belgrade Borba wrote:

"All the roads of the Yugoslav reaction lead to Berlin, and there can be no doubt that its recent pronouncement against the Tito-Subašić agreement was concocted in Goebbels' kitchen."

The decision of the Crimea Conference on the Yugoslav question and the guarantee that it will be implemented without deviation or delay strike another blow at the Hitlerites and their accomplices. The hopes of the fascist chiefs that Yugoslavia would become a stumbling block in the relations between the Allied Powers have now been utterly shattered. The close unity of Serbs, Croatians, Slovenes and Macedonians within a democratic federal Yugoslavia is fully in accord with the general interests of Europe, as it is the best guarantee of peace and tranquility in the Balkans.
ON JANUARY 10 Senator Vandenberg, a Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, delivered a lengthy speech in the Senate on United States foreign policy and the problems arising from the international situation. In the beginning of February he delivered another speech on the same subject in Detroit—Vandenberg represents Michigan in the Senate. These speeches attracted wide attention and evoked lively comment in America.

There is no need to dwell on Senator Vandenberg's orientation in foreign policy; it is well known. The policy he advocated before the present war, that the United States should keep out of European affairs, actually meant leaving the German aggressor in Europe a free hand. His position before the Pearl Harbour events was that of strong opposition to the assistance the United States was rendering the Allies, for, in his opinion, this assistance was involving America in the war. After the United States entered the war on the side of the anti-Hitler coalition Senator Vandenberg and his like-minded friends continued to exhibit an extremely unfriendly attitude toward the Allies, and primarily toward the Soviet Union. Very frequently Vandenberg, like the McCormick—Hearst—Scripps-Howard press which supported him, attacked the Soviet Union in terms which virtually differed little from those employed by the German press. Every event of an international character, and even many events connected with the internal life of the Soviet Union, they turned into a "problem" that was widely utilized for sowing dissension among the Allies. The utterances of these politicians on the "Finnish problem," the "Polish problem," the "Baltic problem," the danger of the "Bolshevization of Europe," etc., were of such a character that many American newspapers asked whom they were really fighting—whether they were taking part in the war against Hitler Germany which the American people were waging in alliance with the U.S.S.R., or whether they were waging a private war of their own so as to speak, against the United States' Allies? This, however, did not prevent Vandenberg, who is one of the leaders of the Republican Party, and one of its chief authorities on foreign policy, from uttering, during the last election, grandiloquent but very vague phrases about uniting the Allied effort, international post-war co-operation, a just and enduring peace, etc.

Vandenberg's January oration teemed with well-wishing. He began by urging the necessity of "straightest, plainest and most courageous thinking"; then he vowed that he "profoundly believed in honest candour devoid of prejudice or fear," expressed his devotion to "enlightened civilization," pleaded for "candour upon the high plane of great ideals" and demanded "a new dignity and a new authority for international law." He spoke in a "spirit of anxious humility," agreed that it was "easier to become critical than to correct" and again vowed that he did not "wish to meddle, but only to help." He called for "a maximum of Allied co-operation and a minimum of Allied friction" and averred that he had not the remotest desire to be hostile. Vandenberg, who had exerted so much effort to sow dissension among the Powers in the anti-Hitler coalition, now proclaimed himself an opponent of sharp debate, censured "stupid, sinister interior ambitions within this grand alliance," condemned "snarling," "bitter arguments about infirmities," "rivalry" and "bickering," and admitted that all this could only "pour water on the Axis wheel."

Does this mean that Vandenberg has been transformed from Saul into Paul, as some American newspapers would have it? A reply to this question necessitates an investigation into the real content of his philosophy, and this philosophy is a very simple one. It can be summed up as follows: the United States' Allies, i.e., the Soviet Union and Great Britain, are committing all sorts of "unilateral actions," which are incompatible with "justice" and other "great ideals" cherished by the Senator. Vandenberg accuses the United States Government of acting as a "silent partner" within this grand alliance. True, Vandenberg himself cannot be accused of excessive silence, but his repeated warnings have not had the desired effect. Disappointed by this failure, he decided to peer deeper into things and to find the root of the evil. He found this root, and it proved to be the fact that the United
States’ Allies were acting under the influence of fear, which, of course, adversely affects their ability to think soundly. It appears that they fear a rebirth of German aggression. “Fear of reborn German aggression is our apple of discord,” he said.

When an ailment has been diagnosed it is possible to proceed with the cure. Having undertaken the function of family physician to the United Nations, so to speak, Senator Vandenberg wrote out the following prescription: the Great Allied Powers should immediately, without waiting for the formation of an international security organization, conclude an agreement for the demilitarization of Germany. The United States should immediately conclude an enduring treaty with the Allies, to be ratified by the United States Senate, which, in order to prevent fresh German aggression, should authorize the President of the United States, independently and consistently, without further reference to Congress, to provide the Allies with armed assistance at any time. If this were done the United States’ European Allies would, at last, be cured of their frightful ailment, namely, fear of German aggression, which prompts them in their unreasonable and unjust actions.

But what are these reprehensible actions? What does Senator Vandenberg mean when he talks about “unilateral actions” and “individual actions”? What, in particular, does he mean when he permits himself to talk about “unilateral plans of Russian post-war expansion” and to say that “Moscow desires to assert unilateral war and peace aims which collide with ours”? Vandenberg willingly explains:

“Fear of reborn German aggression is the cause of the proposed partition of Poland. This fear gave birth to the Anglo-Soviet agreement of 1942, to the Soviet-Czechoslovak agreement of 1945... and to the Franco-Soviet pact of 1944.”

Vandenberg also includes in the list the “Soviet Union’s unilateral plan,” which, he alleges, “contemplates the engulfment, directly or indirectly, of the surrounding circle of buffer states.” And, repeating this long-exposed falsehood, Vandenberg vows that he has not the remotest desire to be hostile. If it is true that hypocrisy is the tribute which vice pays to virtue, it must be admitted that Vandenberg paid this tribute with a lavish hand.

Vandenberg is of course, at liberty to describe the adoption of the Curzon line as a “partition of Poland”—the line which the United States’ Allies themselves, then far from friendly to the young Soviet Republic, laid down as the Soviet-Polish frontier after the First World War, and which was fully approved of by the official United States bodies which were then controlled by Vandenberg’s friends, the Republicans. And now Vandenberg attributes the “partition of Poland” to the Soviet Union, to which the Polish people owe their salvation from certain destruction in the clutches of the German vampire. The American Senator, of course, at liberty to describe the extinguishment of the last vestiges of Nazism and Fascism in the countries which formerly were Hitler’s satellites as the formation of “a cordon of unwillingly controlled and partitioned states.” As is known, the Declaration on Liberated Europe, adopted by the Crimea Conference, envisages a policy that will enable the liberated peoples to destroy the last vestiges of Nazism and Fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice.” Vandenberg, of course, at liberty to prefer pro-fascist and pro-Hitler regimes in the small countries of Europe to democratic government by the people. And, of course, he is at liberty to express regret at the collapse of the idea of forming a “sanitary cordon,” the chain of anti-Soviet states, with which our enemies at one time wished to fence off the Soviet Union from the rest of Europe. But in the light of the views he expressed, of what value are his appeals for unity among the Allies, for a “just peace,” and for “enlightened civilization”?

Other items in the list of “unilateral actions” which rouse Vandenberg’s ire are all the treaties of alliance the Soviet Union has concluded during the war. This may sound incredible to our readers, but it is a fact. This American Senator gravely asserts that the treaties of alliance and mutual assistance concluded between the Soviet Union and other European countries with the object of achieving victory over Hitler Germany and of ensuring a firm and lasting peace in Europe and all over the world—treaties which, as is well known, far from contradicting the principles of an international security organization, are permeated with its spirit and aspirations and will serve as an exceptionally effective element in the general system of international security—that these treaties collide with the “war and peace aims” of the United States.

Senator Vandenberg asserts that the United States’ European Allies “must choose”: they must either depend upon American assist-
In preventing German aggression, virtually refrain from displaying any independence in foreign policy which Vandenberg describes as “unilateral privilege within multilateral peace,” or pursue an independent foreign policy—but in that case they must not count on American assistance in the event of a rebirth of German aggression. Such is the first sight incredible and improbable dilemma with which Vandenberg confronts the Allies. Such are the promises and threats of this United States Senator. These promises and threats reveal the insincerity of Vandenberg’s propositions. Indeed, if he were really concerned about preventing German aggression he would only welcome such effective measures for the achievement of this purpose as the treaties of alliance and mutual assistance in the struggle against German aggression concluded between the U.S.S.R. and England, Czechoslovakia and France; such as the institution of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and democratic Poland; such as the extermination of fascism in the countries that were Hitler’s satellites. For no unbiased person can fail to agree that all these measures indisputably help to combat the danger of German aggression and thereby lighten the tasks of the United States in this struggle. But the trouble is that with Vandenberg such vague phrases as “the demilitarization of Germany” are nothing more than a lure to distract attention from the main objective. His promises cannot be taken seriously. He himself let the cat out of the bag when he demanded an honest and impartial attitude even toward enemies. He swears off “appeasement,” but the peoples have a good memory which will not let them forget what the motto “impartiality” toward the enemy means in the mouth of an erstwhile appeaser.

The whole content of Vandenberg’s speech is but further proof of the fact that his fine phrases about the freedom and the rights of small nations are merely a screen to cover up encroachment upon the rights of not only the small but even the Great Powers, and that his criticism of the “dictatorship of the Great Powers” is a mask to conceal his pretentious claims for the establishment of the dictatorship of one Great Power over all the other powers, great, medium and small.

One must indeed lack a sense of humour to advocate such mutual relations between the Allies and at the same time dilate on the importance of “unity” among the Allies and recall the “unity” which Jonah enjoyed when he was swallowed by the whale. Coming from the lips of this United States Senator, this figure of speech sounds like unconscious irony, for his scheme provides for a whale with an extremely capacious belly to hold all the United Nations who are to act the part of modern Jonahs. Vandenberg cannot possibly conceive of collaboration between the Allied Powers on the basis of equality and mutual understanding of their vital interests. It would scarcely enter his head to demand that the United States should refrain from pursuing an independent foreign policy; that it should not, say, conduct negotiations such as are now proceeding at the Inter-American Conference in Mexico; that it should display no concern about the safety of its frontiers or about bases in the Atlantic and the Pacific, and so on and so forth. But such is the logic of the imperialist that he regards as natural the ethic: What is mine is mine, what is thine is thine. Vandenberg’s philosophy is the philosophy of the avowed imperialist, who in his unbridled covetousness lays claim to the entire world. The lessons of history mean nothing to him. He never pauses to think that German imperialism, for instance, twice already made a bid for European domination, and then for world domination, but the fates decreed otherwise. An avowed imperialist assumes that if not his belly at least his pocket will have the requisite capaciousness.

In the light of Vandenberg’s entire scheme the value of his strictures on “power politics,” and his call to substitute justice for force also becomes clear. This gratuitous charge of pursuing “power politics” was very effectively rebutted by the British Premier, Winston Churchill, when he said in the speech he delivered in the House of Commons on January 18:

“I know some of our Trans-Atlantic friends so well that I am sure that I can always speak frankly without causing offence. Is having a navy twice as big as anybody else’s in the world power politics? Is having the largest air force in the world with bases in every part of the world power politics? Is having all the gold in the world power politics? If so, we are certainly not guilty of this offence.”

Vandenberg’s utterances were favourably received also in circles other than those of his friends, the Republican; they were favourably commented on by certain political circles which do not share the views of the Republican Party. The Office of War Information arranged a foreign broad-
cast of the main points of Vandenberg's speech in twenty languages and, as was reported in the press, a representative of this Office stated that this broadcast would help to convince other countries that the United States was ready, like the other countries, to bear responsibility for post-war international policy. What a delusion!

No one disputes the fact that all the freedom-loving nations are vitally interested in having the great Trans-Atlantic Republic also after the war firmly take the path of international collaboration and an active part in laying the foundation and erection of the edifice of the world security organization, whose mission it will be to prevent a rebirth of German aggression. But where has it been decreed that the other countries, big and small, including the Powers who have borne the full brunt of the struggle against Hitler Germany, must now pay the United States for its participation in world affairs by renouncing their independence in policy making? Is not this participation primarily in the interests of the United States itself?

Certain United States newspapers regard Vandenberg's speech as indicating his final abandonment of isolationism. True, his present speech differs in form from his previous utterances, in which he openly denied that it was necessary for the United States to take any part in the struggle against the forces of aggression; but isolationism is not only the naive conception of provincials who, having shut themselves up in their houses and bolted their doors, imagine that they can keep aloof from all international conflicts. Even if the rank and file of Vandenberg's supporters entertained such naive views, the leading isolationists were certainly not so simple. In the pre-war period their position was based on definite political calculations. Their idea was to allow Hitler to achieve hegemony in Europe; to support German imperialism and to strike a bargain with it. Subsequent events, of course, proved how fatal and unreal these calculations were, but these calculations are superseded by others which, as we have seen, are likewise unacceptable for the peoples striving to ensure a really just and stable peace.

In spite of the attempts of a certain section of the United States press to depict Vandenberg as an advocate of an international security organization, he himself, as is evident from his Detroit speech, regards it as one of the principal merits of his proposal of an agreement for the demilitarization of Germany that it will enable the scheme drawn up at Dumbarton Oaks to be "modified." But Vandenberg not only wants to mutilate the Dumbarton Oaks scheme and reduce it exclusively to the demilitarization of the aggressor countries; he wants to extrapolate the quintessence of the idea of an international security organization, which can be realized only by means of firm collaboration between the powers on the basis of equality of states and joint responsibility of the countries upon the united efforts of which the prevention or suppression of fresh aggression practically depends.

Vandenberg's scheme cannot be considered as expressive of the United States' present foreign policy. For if American policy were built up upon this scheme it could not find common ground with the other United Nations. The peoples have not forgotten the lessons of the recent past. These lessons teach us that it was the sordid greed of the imperialists that hampered an association of the peoples' efforts to block German aggression. This greed cannot be productive of lasting peace; it can only give rise to new wars. If, as Vandenberg believes, fear is a bad counsellor, his insatiable appetite will hardly make a better. Such appetites are binding and Vandenberg already seems to envision the whole world with knees bent at the entrance to the shrine of the dollar. Naturally, an ex-isolationist will find it difficult to pick his way through all the intricacies of contemporary international problems, but more farsighted people must clearly discern that by itself the United States' incontrovertible economic potency is no guarantee of peace and security. No single power can shoulder such a task. Has not the experience of the present war shown that the united efforts of all the freedom-loving peoples are necessary to curb an aggressor? At the same time it must not be forgotten that the economy of the United States, like that of the other capitalist countries, is subject to crises, at which times internal economic and social problems inevitably consume the lion's share of the country's attention and energies.

Thus Vandenberg's scheme is wholly unacceptable to the freedom-loving peoples. On this account it is absolutely unreal and while certain American circles have hastened to endorse it this is merely evidence of the misconception that successful collaboration be-
tween peace-loving Powers is actually possible under the principles he has set forth. The sooner all sincere advocates of a stable and just peace and of enduring collaboration be-
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ONCE MORE ON THE TECHNIQUE OF MODERN MYTH-MAKING

In our last issue we printed a note, "The World of Fantasy," on the subject of the absurd rumours that were current in certain foreign newspapers to the effect that the Soviet Government had decided to form a German provisional government consisting of prisoner-of-war generals headed by Paulus.

The purpose of the note was not to refute the malicious fabrication, which, of course, stood in no need of refutation. The purpose was, by citing a concrete instance, to disclose the mechanism whereby such newspaper canards are manufactured through the joint efforts of journalists of a certain sort. The note quoted a series of statements each of which added something fantastic to the original malicious fabrication. The final chord in this curious competition in the realm of imaginative fertility was sounded in an editorial in the pro-fascist New York World-Telegram, which alleged that the Soviet Union was saving German militarism with the aid of the Free German National Committee.

Apparently, the purpose of our note was in a certain measure achieved. At any rate, the partners in this collective myth-making effort began to scurry as if they were scalded. The most emphatic of all was Wood, the executive editor of the afore-mentioned New York World-Telegram, who declared that "it was futile to make statements" on the subject. Naturally. What can a cardsharper "state" who has been seized by the elbow just as he was pulling a false card out of his sleeve?

Other persons who figured in our note chose to react in a different way. The well-

known journalist Dorothy Thompson, who also had a hand in the creation of the malicious legend, now beats a retreat and at the same time tries to place the blame on others. First of all, she cites the Moscow radio broadcasts, although, of course, you will not find in them even a scintilla of evidence supporting the assertion about the "German government" to which Thompson treated her readers.

Secondly, recommending herself as one "who desires the best possible international relations, particularly with the Soviet Union," she writes:

"I can well understand that the Soviet government, having made one policy, decides that under changed circumstances a different policy may be advisable."

In other words, the point is not that Thompson, without any justification, seized upon and gave further currency to a patent and undeniable falsehood, which she has now willy-nilly to disclaim, but that the Soviet Government, don't you see, has adopted "a different policy."

Thirdly, Thompson says that if she were in the Soviet Union herself, she would engage in "honest and truthful reporting." As if anything in America prevents her from "honestly and truthfully" writing about the Soviet Union, and as if, on the other hand, Thompson does not know that not all foreign correspondents who have been to the Soviet Union write "honestly and truthfully" about it.

Fourthly and lastly, after all these sleights-of-hand, Thompson deems it appropriate to advise us to "abandon the idea that American journalists and American readers are idiots."

Of course, nobody in the Soviet Union entertains any such absurd and foolish idea.
But one cannot help remarking that Thompson herself by her conduct in this affair furnished very edifying material on the subject of how some American journalists treat their readers.

James, editor of the New York Times, a propos of this same note, appeals to us not to pay attention to petty criticism. He waxes rhetorical, wanting to know why the Russians cannot understand that freedom of the press has its advantages, especially in other countries.

The Soviet people, of course, are fully alive to the advantages of freedom of the press—even that circumscribed freedom of the press which exists in other countries. But they are not accustomed to identify freedom of the press with freedom of malicious and pernicious fabrication. And it must be said that certain foreign pressmen, as may be seen from the facts we have cited, do not always distinguish between the two.

* * *

**FICTITIOUS SERVICES**

On the eve of the complete victory of the United Nations over Hitler Germany, when the defeat of the Germans is as near as it is inevitable, the Turkish Mejlis met in extraordinary session and passed a decision: to declare war on Germany. This act was preceded at the session by the speeches of several deputies, who explained why it was necessary for Turkey to make this gesture precisely at this juncture. Deputy Günaltay, for instance, declared with business-like candour that Turkey was now declaring war on Germany in order to secure the right to attend the peace conference. Of a similar tenor were the speeches of several other deputies, who, also more or less frankly, regarded the declaration of war on Germany as something equivalent to a ticket of admission to the victory celebrations of the freedom-loving nations.

But in the opinion of deputy Mumtaz Okmen this true explanation was too prosaic, and he proceeded to idealize Turkey's "great services" to the Allies in the war. Okmen held that the first of these services was that Turkey did not join the German armies, in other words, did not become a partner in German rapine. If, he boasted, Turkey had been tempted by the promises of the German aggressor and "had not opposed him like a grim rock, it may be asserted that the results of the two great victories of El Alameyn and Stalingrad, which changed the fate of this war, would have been doubtful." As a reward for having resisted so great a temptation, Okmen claims for Turkey—a share of Stalin's immortal glory. Yes, that is exactly what this virtuous deputy said:

"Although our great neighbour alone resisted the enemy at Stalingrad, the Turkish people have a share in the glory of this heroism."

It is hard to say what predominates in these words: cynicism or naiveté. Martial glory is not distributed at a round table; it has to be won in battle. Okmen appeals to the forum of the whole world to decide his claim to a glory that does not belong to him: "I ask the world..." But the whole world remembers that during the months of the Stalingrad epic (ay, and subsequently too), when the Soviet people were shedding their blood for the sake of victory over Germany, von Papen was living in Ankara and felt quite at home there...

Of course, M. Mumtaz Okmen may have in all earnest forgotten such irksome facts of the recent past. But he could not have failed to understand what the world press is now unanimously saying, namely, that Turkey has been exceedingly tardy in declaring war on Germany. Nor could Okmen have helped knowing that Turkey can claim no special services in the fight against Germany. In appealing to the memory of the nations Okmen was much too precipitate: the memory of the past years of war cannot add to that coveted but extremely scant glory of his.

* * *

**"INDISPENSABLE" HITLERITES**

The British and American press has already repeatedly criticized the situation in the Ally-occupied German town of Aachen, where the Allied military administration has invited Hitlerites to help govern the town.

The editor of the American newspaper P.M. reports from the spot that, on the recommendation of the local Catholic bishop, a certain Oppenhof, former representative of the German munitions firm Veltrup, was appointed mayor of Aachen. Oppenhof, who figures as a "non-party man," collected suit-
able assistants around him. His chief assistant served under Hitler’s rule in the Veltrup plants as a secret informer to their owners and betrayed to the Gestapo workers suspected of anti-fascist sympathies.

Among the 325 officials of Aachen appointed by the Allied military administration, 57 were until very recently members of Hitler’s party, of whom 22 in the past occupied prominent posts in the fascist hierarchy. Under the influence of protests published in England and America, 39 of the Nazis have been dismissed. It was expected that another 10 would be discharged before the end of February.

“There are no plans,” writes the editor of P.M., “for dismissing the remaining ... whose technical knowledge is allegedly indispensable.”

As to “non-party” fascists like Oppenhof, the question of their dismissal is not even raised. Nothing, apparently, menaces these “indispensables” except—the declaration of

the Crimea Conference on the treatment of Germany.

“DEAD MEN” IN HIDING

It is reported from various sources that the Hitler gang are occupied with the problem of how, after their inevitable defeat, to preserve their cadres for subversive action and preparations for a new war. With this object in view the fascists are resorting to diverse and at times unexpected tricks.

The Swedish Expressen reports:

“Since the Russians began their record advance on Berlin the number of ‘suddenly deceased’ leading fascists has been mounting. When the Allies begin to establish control over Germany, they will apparently have good reason carefully to verify the lists of those who died in the recent past.”

This report is one more confirmation of the need for profound vigilance with respect to the Hitlerite war criminals and their underlings.
The Daily Scene in China

TRAVELLERS' NOTES

M. MOSKVIN and V. PETRENKO

On the Kunming Highroad

The rain was falling in a fine autumn drizzle as we rode out on to the Kunming Highroad. Our Chevrolet moved along at the rate of twenty-five to thirty miles an hour. About two hours later we began to overtake pedestrians. Judging by the badges they wore they were Chinese soldiers. They were a sorry sight. Gaunt, worn out, barefooted or in straw sandals, they barely dragged their feet along. They wore shorts and khaki tunics. In addition to a rifle and bullet pouch, each carried a knapsack on his back and had a rolled blanket strapped across his shoulder. Later we met stretcher-bearers carrying wounded soldiers. Evidently we had reached the tail end of a large military unit.

Our car was held up for several minutes near a group of soldiers who were resting. In conversation we learned that they belonged to a Chinese army that was marching into the province of Hunan. Thousands of coolies constituted the baggage train. They carried everything, from Staff papers to kitchen cauldrons and boxes of ammunition. Riding down the column we counted no more than twenty motor trucks and three passenger cars, six pieces of artillery of different calibres, and several mortars. As regards technical equipment, the Chinese Army has nothing to boast about.

The soldiers were of the most diverse ages. We met eighteen-year-old lads and fifty-year-old veterans. Some of them were so exhausted that they could barely keep on their feet. We saw men lying by the roadside obviously incapable of going on further. The junior and medium rank officers did not appear to be in much better shape. They all marched along in silence, with downcast eyes, bent by the burden of life on the march. This was a real front-line army, the like of which may be met with on any sector of any war area in China.

Not all Chinese troops are like this, however. The Republic possesses armies that are far better constituted, armed and equipped; but these are in the rear. Take, for example, the army of Hu Tsunan, which we saw in Sian. It consists of several units entirely of physically fit young men, who are well clothed and equipped with modern types of weapons. These soldiers are fed much better than the men in the armies at the front. The same can be said of the troops quartered in the province of Szechwan, and of the units directly under the command of the Army Committee. These troops have not set eyes on the enemy almost throughout the entire period of the war. Their function is to "guard the tranquility" of the rear, to blockade the Special Border Region, i. e., to carry out "special tasks" as the Chinese leaders call it.

We arrived in Kunming late at night. In the morning we went to look round the town. In the streets, in the shops and in offices we saw plenty of young, sturdy, well-fed men, and we could not help recalling the exhausted soldiers we had seen the day before. We saw the same picture in other towns besides Kunming. Hundreds of salesmen were in the shops, bored to death because they had nothing to do. And how many shops there were! It was often difficult to tell who were the buyers and who the sellers. On visiting government offices we met an enormous number of men of military age. If the staffs of these offices were reduced by only twenty or thirty per cent, and if those released were called up for the army, scores of divisions could be formed.

Why were they not in the army?

We were told that it was all the fault of the law. The law, it appears, prohibits the conscription not only of persons employed in government offices, but also of those employed in private commercial offices and banks. To evade military service it is not even necessary to be employed in any of these offices; all one needs is an exemption paper. To put it more plainly, as an official in Chengtu explained to us, only those go into the army who have no money and cannot buy themselves off. The question as to who is to go into the army and who is to be exempted is decided by the recruiting officer and the paozdya (foreman). If a conscript, or his kinsman, pays a definite price in money or in kind, he is allowed to remain at home. If he has not the wherewithal to pay, he is called...
The conscripts undergo a period of three or four months' training, after which they are round up, tied by the wrist in groups of three or four and sent to the mustering and training centres under convoy.

The conscripts are young. It appears that conscripts are rounded up, tied together by the wrist. You ask in astonishment: who are they? and you are told: conscripts. It appears that conscripts are rounded up, tied by the wrist in groups of three or four and sent to the mustering and training centres under convoy.

The conscripts undergo a period of three or four months' training, after which they are sent off on foot in the same manner, but in larger contingents, to replenish the units at the front.

Every modern army is a complete organism and has a uniform system of recruitment and administration. In China, however, it is different.

The armed forces of the country are not unified to this day. Very often one meets with large units which are counted on the strength of the Chinese Army, but actually are troops belonging to individual Chinese generals, or provincial governors. For example, the troops at the personal disposal of Lung Yun, the governor of Hunan, number, together with garrison units, as many as 200,000 men. Ma, the Mohammedan general, has a force of 150,000 men under his command. General Yen Hsi-shan, the commander of the Second Military Area, behaves as if he were the ruler of an independent state.

During the heavy fighting that took place in the province of Honan, a situation arose in which the troops of General Chang Ching-wang were being bled white. One would have thought that General Yen Hsi-shan, seeing the straits the neighbouring army was in, would have commenced operations against the Japanese. He not only failed to do that, however, but even refused to carry out the order from General Headquarters to assign several units to participate in this operation.

"What are Yen Hsi-shan's troops employed for?" we asked a Chinese, whose acquaintance we made in Lo-yang.

"For the maintenance of order in the rear," answered our acquaintance significantly. "General Yen Hsi-shan is afraid that fighting the Japanese would weaken his troops, and once his troops were weakened his strength and influence would wane. Without troops one cannot acquire money, and without money and troops one cannot exercise power."
Our acquaintance described to us the conditions in General Tang En-po's army. The men and officers of this army were converted into workers and coolies for factories that belonged to different generals. Tang En-po himself owned two factories, the raw material for which the soldiers brought from Japanese-occupied territory. His example was followed by other generals.

When the Japanese commenced their offensive in Honan the generals hastened to save their property. The men of their divisions were transformed into coolies and carried away on their backs the factory equipment, goods, raw materials and the personal property of the generals. The columns of coolies stretched for scores of kilometres along the road to the rear. The rest of the soldiers, left without commanders, scattered, denuding the front.

This conversation helped us to understand why the Chinese forces have suffered defeat, and why many Chinese generals are opposed to the unification of the armed forces of the Republic.

In an Army Hospital In the town of X we applied to the mayor for permission to visit one of the local army hospitals.

The scene that met our eyes was very depressing. Sick and wounded soldiers were lying on the floor; their bedding consisted of straw, and they were covered with their own army blankets. The stench was frightful. Evidently the wounded had not had their wounds dressed for several days and their bandages were indescribably filthy.

We talked with the surgeon. He shrugged helplessly and opened a small cupboard containing a dozen or so of bottles and a small quantity of bandages.

"This is all I have," he said. "Our hospital is off the main road, and transport difficulties prevent us from receiving what we need. Moreover, there is an extreme shortage of medical supplies and of bandages in the country. At the front the situation is even worse."

Idle Factories Travelling through the province of Szechwan we stopped, one hot summer day, at a steel plant situated a hundred kilometres from the temporary capital. We wanted to go over the plant, but we learned to our disappointment that it had recently been shut down. The owner of the plant, who came out to meet us, invited us to his house. During the conversation at the sumptuous dinner he treated us to we spoke quite frankly. We expressed surprise that his plant should have stopped work at a time like this. There was a war on, we said, the army needed iron and steel, and, after all, there were not so many steel mills in China.

"The only reason I closed the plant," answered the owner with a sigh, "is that nobody bought anything from me. My equipment is not bad; I have enough raw materials, but I ran the plant at a loss. The authorities are not interested in the goods we produce; they find it more profitable to receive steel from the Americans under the lend-lease law than to support home industry."

We learned that during the four summer months not less than seventy plants of a similar type had closed down. At the present time only plants which belong to the government or to big corporations whose shareholders occupy posts in the administration are working.

Foreign and particularly American newspapers are writing a great deal about the situation in China; but much is written without any special desire to delve down to the roots of things. To know what is really going on in the country one must peer into all the crevices of its life, examine the causes which retard the country's progress and the people's struggle for national liberation. It is sufficient to visit Chinese units at the front to realize why the Chinese troops are suffering defeat at the hands of the Japanese.

Against this gloomy background, however, a number of bright features may be seen. At the front we saw Chinese soldiers who in the overwhelming majority of cases fought staunchly for their country and died in the effort to check the Japanese offensive. We saw Chinese peasants toiling on their land from early morning till late at night, uncomplainingly bearing all the burdens of wartime. We met intellectuals whose hearts were torn by the distress of their country and people. The progressive sections of the Chinese people are calling upon the government and the leadership of the Kuomintang to put a stop to internecine warfare and to curb the reactionaries. The desire of Chinese progressives for national unity, for the democratization of the state, for the revival of political liberty and the development of culture meets with an ever growing response among the broad masses of the Chinese people.
BOOK REVIEWS

A Suspicious "Strategy"*

A. POLEVOI

UNDER present circumstances problems of military theory engage the minds of others besides a narrow circle of experts. The enormous dimensions military operations assume today provide military science with an inexhaustible source of material. The interest displayed in works devoted to the task of revealing the significance of present-day events by the lessons of the past, against the background of the entire preceding history of war, is natural.

Liddell Hart's book The Strategy of Indirect Approach, a new edition of which has appeared during the war, claims to be a work of this nature. The author observes that a number of prominent English military writers had taken part in compiling the first edition of this book, which appeared in 1929. The publication of a new edition at the height of the war shows that the author, and the military and political circles he represents, do not regard the book as obsolete but, on the contrary, are still inclined to adhere to the main principles enunciated in it.

Liddell Hart is known to our readers by his essays on the history of the First World War, his descriptions of the armies of post-war Europe and, incidentally, by his book on the notorious Col. Lawrence, who directed the activities of the British Intelligence Service in the Near East. One could not help noting that this author's works bore the undoubted impress of prejudice and narrow-mindedness. After all Europe has gone through, however, one might have expected to find in his recent works something in harmony with the present epoch of the gigantic struggle the freedom-loving nations are waging against the common enemy, the dark forces of Hitlerism. We must say quite bluntly that the reader will find no trace of this in the book under review.

What are the principles enunciated in this book? The strategy of indirect approach, Liddell Hart tells us didactically, is a theory of how to solve the problems of politics by war, without, if possible, engaging the enemy forces. According to the author, waging war means making wide use of the active operations of allied armies, while exercising indirect influence upon the enemy oneself. By the latter he means blockade, political-diplomatic combinations, propaganda pressure from within, and so forth.

The strategy of indirect approach does not pursue the object of routing the enemy; it does not set out to achieve victory. It strives to establish the status quo ante bellum at the end of the war. The task is to restore a situation in which each power is faced by an opponent sufficiently powerful to check it, and in which every combination of powers is neutralized by a corresponding counter-combination. Thus, the strategy of indirect approach aims at securing influence in all combinations, and thereby at being over them by taking advantage of the full play of politics.

Liddell Hart avers that the political experience of Great Britain, the experience of her wars, shows that after a war—and after a successful war in particular—Great Britain's allies become her enemies. Consequently, in the author's opinion, the enemy must be spared, because he is a potential ally, and the allies should, if possible, be weakened, for they are the most likely enemies of the future.

Liddell Hart recommends that in waging war in a certain coalition the starting position should be prepared for a future war in another coalition. In keeping with this, passive waiting tactics should be adopted in the course of the war, and operations should be conducted only in the remote, second-rate theatres. Engagements which might inflict heavy losses upon the enemy and assist the allies should be avoided. The brunt of the war in the principal theatre should be borne by the allies. When the enemy is so worn out that he is in danger of utter defeat by the conscientious allies the strategy of indirect approach prescribes the hurried conclusion of peace by agreement at the expense of the allies.

The author tries to prove and substantiate these "noble" arguments by references to history. For this purpose he gallops through

the military history of mankind. Before the astonished reader’s gaze rushes a turbulent stream of events, dates, personages and pseudo-strategical theories without any consideration for historical perspective, development of the technical implements of war and the character and organization of armed forces. The Graeco-Persian, the Peloponnesian and the Punic Wars flash by in a metaphysical whirlwind. Classical antiquity gives way to Byzantium and the Middle Ages. Then follow the campaigns of the Swedish king Gustavus Adolphus, of Cromwell, Turrenne, the wars of the eighteenth century, the wars of the French revolution and Napoleon, Prussia’s wars against Austria and France, and the First World War.

The author presents historical facts in such a way that if dates and place names were struck out, the name of Caius Julius Caesar could be replaced by that of Hitler, say, that of Pericles by Frederick II, Xerxes by Hindenburg and Philip of Macedon by Eugene of Savoy and nobody would notice the difference. This unceremonious handling of the facts of the past is, of course, not accidental on the part of the author of the “strategy of indirect approach.” One thing stands out in all these exercises, however. Engagements which decided the fate of nations are either not mentioned at all, or else are mentioned merely in passing, or described in such a fashion as to create the impression that they were not the decisive factors. All battles, from the Battle of Marathon in 490 before the present era to the breach of the German front by the Allied troops on August 8, 1918, are presented by Liddell Hart as uncalled-for and thoughtless departures from “bloodless” manœuvres; military ruses and economic, political and diplomatic “pressure,” which, in his opinion, are alone capable of guaranteeing success at low cost and without any risk.

The unscientific examination of phenomena of the past from the viewpoint of preconceived political ideas of today causes Liddell Hart to hush up the most vital facts of English history. There is no mention in his essay of the naval wars and engagements of the end of the sixteenth century, of the Anglo-Dutch wars of 1652-54 and 1665-67, of the naval engagements during the War of the Spanish Succession, and so forth. In dealing with the Napoleonic Wars he fails to mention Abonkir or even Trafalgar! One would think that glorious Nelson had never existed. In his essay on the First World War he makes no mention of the Battle of Jutland. In short, all the facts which illustrate the decision of vital issues in history by fighting are carefully eliminated. They don’t fit into the author’s theory.

Liddell Hart’s conceptions also cause him to garble the military history of Russia. There is nothing in his book about the campaigns of Peter I, about Poltava; nor is there any mention of the operations and engagements conducted by the great Russian military leader Suvorov, who was held in such profound respect by Nelson. There is no mention of Kutuzov. The author describes the Russian army’s operations in 1812 as the “Russian strategy of evasion,” (p. 155) and ignores Smolenisk and even Borodino, where Napoleon’s armies were bled white in fierce fighting, which prepared the ground for the rout of the invaders.

In the “constructive” conclusions he draws from his historical review, Liddell Hart defines the importance of strategy as follows: strategy has not to overcome resistance except from nature (rivers, mountains, and so forth); the aim of strategy is to reduce the enemy’s opportunities for resistance by utilizing the elements of movement and surprise. Perfection in strategy is the achievement of decisions without serious fighting; its ideal, pure strategy, is achieved “when the enemy surrendered his purpose without any physical action at all being required.” (Pp. 189, 190, 191.)

Behold the great discovery in the field of strategy! But this “discovery” is an attempt to distort the facts and to revive the Jong-obsolete strategy of armchair warfare, the very same strategy which Suvorov upset by his practice of delivering crushing blows. In the beginning of the last century that crazy German von Bii1ow tried to convince everybody that battles were due only to the ignorance and backwardness of generals. In 1805, the year of Austerlitz, this luckless prophet declared: “There will be no more battles.” But today, nearly a century and a half later, Liddell Hart says the same thing after the Battle of Moscow, the turning point in the present war, and after Stalingrad.

Liddell Hart advises commanders to “postpone the battle, postpone the attack.” But for how long should an offensive be postponed? To this the author replies: “until the moral dislocation of the enemy.” (P. 183.) But what if the enemy’s ranks refuse to become dislocated? It is common knowledge
That the best way to secure the moral dislocation of the enemy is to strike a series of powerful blows at him. It is well known that this is the shortest way to victory. But the concept of "victory" is alien to this author. He holds the term in contempt. He writes it in quotation marks and talks about the "mirage of victory." (P. 211.)

That Liddell Hart's conceptions, which he calls the "strategy of indirect approach," have nothing in common with strategy needs no proof. Strategy is the science of conducting war, and not of how not to conduct war in the course of a war. It is evident also that his views reflect a very definite political line.

In this author's opinion, a state which is satisfied with its territorial boundaries does not need victory. The only correct rule for such a state to follow in war, he claims, is to pursue "limited objectives." What does this mean? The author tells us that it means: "Peace through stalemate, based on a coincident recognition by each side of the opponent's strength..." (P. 208.)

What are the means of achieving this stalemate peace? In the strategy of indirect approach these means are subordinated to its main object. Discussing the "balance of forces," in which the enemy enjoys either general superiority or superiority in a particular theatre of operations, Liddell Hart recommends waiting for a change in the relation of forces as a result of the "intervention of allies." (P. 186.) The function of the ally in "indirect strategy" is very definite in both war and peace, and the author very frankly expounds it, in the historical aspect, so to speak.

"If, after the Marne, in 1914, or even later, she [Germany] had adopted a war policy of defence in the west, offense in the east, the issue of the war might well have been different. For, on the one hand, she could unquestionably have consummated the dream of Mitte-Europa, while... the United States remained outside the conflict. With the whole belt of central Europe under her control, with Russia out of the war, even in economic vassalage, there is flimsy ground for any belief that the efforts of Britain, France, and Italy could have done more than, if as much as, to induce Germany to relinquish the bargaining counters of Belgium and northern France in return for a undisputed retention of her gains in the east. A greater Germany, greater too in potential strength and resources, could well have afforded to forgo the desire for a military victory over the western allies." (Pp. 267-68.)

This passage reveals sufficiently clearly the concise meaning contained in Liddell Hart's lengthy utterances. In the face of the eloquent testimony of history he and those who think like him believe that a "greater Germany," which had become such by the subjugation of Central Europe and Russia, would not be a menace to Great Britain. In their opinion the fatal blunder of history was that the Germans in 1914 did not think of "turning irrevocably to the East." But since they did not think of it themselves it can be suggested to them! Liddell Hart's friends have exerted no little effort to divert German aggression to the East. In pursuing the notorious policy of appeasing the aggressor they flung Austria and Czechoslovakia into the clutches of the Germans, and when the World War had already flared up they tried to achieve a "stalemate" at the price of the defeat of other countries.

It would not be out of place to recall that, in the long run, this adventurist policy brought Great Britain to the verge of disaster in 1940. Disaster was averted only at the price of heavy sacrifices on the part of the English people; and the mortal danger that threatened Britain and other freedom-loving countries was removed by the self-sacrificing struggle of the Red Army which broke the back of the fascist beast. But the advocates of the bankrupt "political balance" learned nothing. In the ensuing years they exerted all their efforts to postpone the opening of military operations in the West; and after the Red Army's victorious offensive operations and the development of the operations of the Allied troops in Western Europe these people who like to play with fire did all in their power to prevent the rout of the enemy and to secure the conclusion of a compromise peace.

This object is pursued, in particular, by a new book by Liddell Hart which appeared in 1944, i.e., the year when the Allies, at last, opened the Second Front in Europe. As if in mockery the author gave this book the title Why Don't We Learn the Lessons of History? In it he advocates the betrayal of allies and a deal with the enemy for the sake of—nothing more nor less than a firm and lasting peace! He writes that history shows that complete victory has never led to the results which the victors always expect, viz., a firm and lasting peace. The victors always sow the seeds of new war, because victory gives rise among the vanquished to a desire for retaliation and revenge, and the victors create new rivals. When victory
is achieved by an alliance, as is most commonly the case, this is the most common result. A victory that is too complete inevitably gives rise to complications and makes the task of concluding a just and wise peace treaty all the harder. Where there are no controls on the appetites of the victors, there is no longer any restraint on the conflicts of views and interests among the members of the alliance. The differences between them become so sharp that what was a comradeship in face of a common danger is transformed into enmity and mutual dissatisfaction, so that allies in one war become enemies in the next.

This plea that a third war is inevitable deserves the closest attention. It must not be forgotten that appeals for a "balance of forces policy" are heard again and again in the English press, in Parliament, and so forth. This policy is advocated in opposition to that of firm and lasting collaboration between the freedom-loving countries. True, the advocates of this policy do not always go to the length of drawing Liddell Hart's conclusions, but evidently Liddell Hart says what the others are thinking. The point is that he raises higher than others the curtain that conceals the political thoughts of definite reactionary circles which do not betray the slightest inclination to abandon their Munichite course. These circles are an undoubted menace to the cause of achieving the utter rout of Hitlerism and of ensuring a stable peace based on a firm policy of international security. However, the freedom-loving nations will not permit suspicious "strategists" to frustrate the noble aim of destroying Hitlerism and of laying the foundations of a firm and lasting peace in the interests of all the freedom-loving nations. The historic decisions of the Crimean Conference of the leaders of the Three Allied Powers are a pledge of this.

February 17
Troops of the Red Army captured Wornitzl and Mehlsack in East Prussia.

The World Trade Union Conference closed.

February 18
The decision of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R. to assist in the restoration of Warsaw was published.

February 19
United States marines landed on Iwo Island (Volcano group).

February 20
The White House published a communiqué on negotiations in Alexandria between Churchill and Roosevelt concerning military operations in the Pacific.

February 21
Red Army troops captured Czerek in northwest Poland.

The Inter-American Conference attended by representatives of the United States and of eighteen Latin American countries opened in Mexico.

February 22
A public meeting to celebrate the 27th Anniversary of the Red Army was held in Warsaw.

February 23
The Order of the Day of Marshal of the Soviet Union

J. V. Stalin, Supreme Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R., on the 27th Anniversary of the Red Army was published.

After a month's siege and stubborn fighting Red Army troops captured the city and fortress of Poznań in Poland, a strategically important centre of German defence in the Berlin direction.

A demonstration of 100,000 people and a military parade were held in Belgrade to celebrate the 27th Anniversary of the Red Army.

The Turkish Mejlis approved the Government's decision to declare war on Germany and Japan.

Government troops in Bucharest fired on a demonstration organized by the National Democratic Front of Rumania.

The Egyptian Parliament approved the Government's decision to declare a defensive war against the Axis powers.

Ahmed Maher Pasha, Prime Minister of Egypt, was assassinated in Cairo.

February 25
The Soviet press published congratulations addressed to J. V. Stalin by foreign statesmen on the occasion of the 27th Anniversary of the Red Army.

A new Government headed by Nokrashi Pasha was formed in Egypt.

February 27
The troops of the Second Byelorussian Front broke the enemy's resistance west of Chojnice (Konzit), advanced 70 kilometres in the course of four days of offensive fighting and captured Schlochau, Stegers, Hammerslehn, Baldenberg and Bugitz in Pomerania.

Churchill delivered a speech in the House of Commons on the results of the Crimean Conference.

Syria declared war on the Axis powers.

The Anglo-French negotiations conducted in London between Bidault, French Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Churchill and Eden were concluded.

February 28
The Radescu government (Romania) resigned.

Red Army troops captured Neu­stettin and Prechlav in Pomera­nia.
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