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The Soviet-Yugoslav Treaty

The Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Post-War Collaboration that was concluded between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia on April 11, 1945, is a document of great international political importance. The conclusion of this treaty is one of the outstanding events of the final stage of the war of liberation which the freedom-loving nations are waging against Hitler Germany.

The Soviet-Yugoslav treaty reflects the relations of fraternal friendship and the partnership-in-arms that have grown up between the peoples of the two countries in the course of the war and which have withstood the test of fire. In the most trying days of their struggle for liberation against the German invaders, the Yugoslav peoples were inspired by the example of the Soviet Union. The knowledge that the resistance of the Soviet people was inexorably wearing down the Hitler war machine imbued them with fresh strength. On the other hand, history will never forget that during the most trying period of hostilities on the Soviet-German front, and particularly when the immortal epic of Stalingrad was being enacted, Yugoslavia was the only country in Europe where partisan troops, under the leadership of Marshal Tito, fought the Germans and contained scores of German divisions.

That the Soviet-Yugoslav treaty conforms both to the historical traditions as well as to the present-day vital interests of the two countries needs no proof. The peoples of Yugoslavia, as well as the other peoples of the Balkan Peninsula, were liberated from age-long alien domination at the price of no little sacrifice on the part of the Russian people. In the present war, the collapse of Hitler Germany's military might as a result of the blows inflicted by the Soviet troops was an essential condition for saving Yugoslavia from inevitable doom in the clutches of the German fascist invaders. Shoulder to shoulder with the men of the Yugoslav army led by Marshal Tito, the men of the Red Army freed Belgrade from the Germans, and are now completing the operation of clearing the soil of Yugoslavia from the Hitler scum.

Thus, the Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Post-War Collaboration is sealed not only by the signatures of statesmen, but also by the blood that the best sons of the peoples of both countries shed in their struggle for liberation against the common enemy. This treaty embodies the unshakeable determination of the peoples of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia to march together to consummate the defeat of Hitler Germany and also to avert all possibility of another attempt at German aggression and to ensure durable peace in the post-war period.

The object of the Soviet-Yugoslav treaty is still further to strengthen the unity of the freedom-loving peoples. It is an important link in the general chain of treaties the Soviet Union has concluded with the object of erecting a steel barrier against all future attempts on the part of German imperialism to launch another predatory war in Europe. This is precisely the object of the treaties the Soviet Union has concluded with Great Britain, France, Czechoslovakia, and now with Yugoslavia.

The Soviet-Yugoslav treaty is a valuable contribution to the cause of fraternal friendship among the Slavonic peoples. Notwithstanding the howls that are raised in certain Turkish and Polish émigré quarters about Slavonic solidarity and friendship, the joint efforts of the Slavonic peoples have been an outstanding factor in the struggle against the Hitler invaders. To avert the possibility of any fresh attempt at aggression in Europe on the part of Germany it is particularly important for the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe to maintain relations of close friendship and cooperation. The entire experience of history, and the experience of the present war in particular, has shown that these countries occupy a special place in German plans of aggression, and especially in the German drive to the East ("Drang nach Osten"), to the South and South-East, which is directed against the Slavonic peoples with the object of exterminating them.

The fact that the countries of Eastern and
South-Eastern Europe had not united to resist German aggression before the war was a great gain for Hitler imperialism. More than that, as a consequence of the narrow-minded and shortsighted policy pursued by the reactionary rulers of many of these countries, the latter either trailed in the wake of Hitler policy, or else, unwilling to find common ground with the Soviet Union, made no effort and were unable to organize effective resistance to German aggression. It is sufficient to recall that former Yugoslavia, for example, deigned to establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union only in 1940. The system of alliances that was established in Eastern Europe after the First World War was regarded by its inspirers and its West-European sponsors as a weapon not so much against aggressive Germany as against the peace-loving Soviet Union. Hence arose the tragedy of the small countries of Eastern Europe which might have become fortresses barring the road to German aggression, but actually became either accomplices, or else more or less helpless victims of Hitler Germany.

This tragedy must never be enacted again. As the Second World War is drawing to a close, the aggressive forces of German imperialism are already making feverish preparations to resume their attempts to win world domination. The will of the freedom-loving nations is clear. The war must be ended in such a way as to render the German beast of prey absolutely harmless. At the same time, the greatest vigilance must be exercised in order to thwart every insidious German plan. Every possible attempt at new German aggression must meet with resistance of such power as will frustrate it with the least possible sacrifice on the part of the peace-loving peoples. In the light of the above, particularly noteworthy is Article 2 of the Soviet-Yugoslav treaty which provides for immediate and effective mutual assistance in the event of one of the parties finding itself involved in hostilities with Germany should she resume her aggressive policy, or with some state which may unite with Germany directly, or in any other form, in such a war. This article is a stern warning to those forces in Germany who are already drawing up plans for a “Fourth Reich” and to all those who intend, directly or indirectly, to unite with the German imperialists for the purpose of carrying out these plans.

Relations between the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe are now developing quite differently from the way they developed after the First World War. Parallel with close collaboration with the other great freedom-loving powers—Great Britain, the United States and France—friendship with the Soviet Union is to an increasing degree becoming the cornerstone of the foreign policy of the countries which have learnt the lessons of history. The democratic forces which came to the forefront in the political life of the small East-European countries are filled with hatred for the German invaders and wish to live in close friendship with the Soviet Union. Partnership-in-arms and close co-operation are the bonds which tie the Soviet Union with new, democratic Poland, with Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. It is in the spirit of successful co-operation that our relations are developing with these countries which only recently were participants in Hitler’s war against our country and our Allies, and now, thanks to the generosity of the Soviet Union, have obtained the opportunity of restoring their independence and of proceeding to organize their lives on democratic lines.

It is quite natural that the conclusion of the Soviet-Yugoslav treaty should be welcomed with tremendous satisfaction not only by the peoples of the two countries, but also by all friends of the common cause of the United Nations, and, primarily, by all Slavonic countries, who have drained the bitter cup of German occupation. In this connection, wide circles in Poland are raising the question of the advisability of a similar treaty of friendship, mutual assistance and post-war collaboration being concluded between the Soviet Union and Poland.

The Soviet-Yugoslav treaty reflects the undeviating desire of both countries to make their contribution to the cause of the post-war organization of peace and security and to take part in all international acts directed towards the achievement of this lofty aim. In connection with this, the treaty will operate in harmony with the international principles in the adoption of which the contracting parties have participated. Soviet public opinion welcomes this treaty with democratic Yugoslavia as one of the cornerstones of European peace and universal security.
To the Memory of a Great American

ON THE THIRTEENTH of April Franklin Delano Roosevelt intended to address
the American people by radio, but he was not
destined to carry out that intention. Death,
sudden and untimely, causing profound grief
among all the freedom-loving peoples, laid
the great President low a day before he was
to have spoken. But that undelivered speech,
which was published after President Roose­
velt’s death, sounds like a valedictory address
to his colleagues and to the entire people
of the United States.

In the last weeks and days of his life
Roosevelt could see the first, the military
part of the program of the Great Powers
laid down at the historic conference in the
Crimea drawing towards its accomplish­
ment. Today, the long-expected rout of
Hitler Germany is taking place. The com­
plete victory over the worst enemies of
mankind is a matter of the immediate future.
All the more important, therefore, becomes
the question of how the war should be end­
ed, how the danger of fresh German aggres­
sion is to be averted. All the more imperative
becomes the execution of the second part of
the program of the Great Powers—the or­
ganization of peace and security after the
war. It was this that Roosevelt wanted to
emphasize in his undelivered speech, the
logical deduction of which was: after victory
has been achieved the same energy and
consistency must be displayed in winning a
firm and durable peace. In the script of this
last speech the late President wrote:

“We do not intend to abandon our determina­
tion that, within the lives of our children and of
our children’s children, there shall occur no third
world war. We seek peace—enduring peace. More
than an end to war we want an end to the
beginning of all wars.”

These words formulate the main trend of
Roosevelt’s policy and activities as an adva­
cate and champion of the organization of peace
and security after the war. Today these
words have an even more timely ring about
them, for the war is ending, and many of
the problems which have arisen in the course
of it, problems of vital importance affecting
the fate of the peoples, are still awaiting
practical solution.

Roosevelt’s discernment as a great world
statesman was revealed in his clear under­

standing that the New and the Old Worlds
were united by a common destiny, in that
he fully realized that the wide expanse of
water that lies between the Western and
the Eastern Hemispheres does not in the
least separate their destinies. He struck crushing
blows at the reactionary isolationists’
view that America could, by sheltering her­
sel£ behind two oceans, stand aloof from the
struggle against the fascist enemies of man­
kind who were attacking the foundations of
civilization and progress.

In the person of Franklin Delano Roosevelt
the Soviet people have lost a friend. Anxious
to organize resistance to the fascist aggres­
sors, the late President appreciated the
role of the Soviet Union as a bulwark of
peace among the nations. With his name
is associated the ushering in of a new
stage in the relations between the Soviet
Union and the United States. Roosevelt was
justly proud of the establishment of normal
diplomatic relations between the Soviet
Union and the United States as one of
his great achievements. When the years of
severest trial ensued, the Soviet Union and
the United States, jointly with Great Britain,
stood forth against the common enemy. In
the course of the most sanguinary war the
world has known a fighting alliance of the
Three Great Powers was forged: and it is
now triumphantly accomplishing its mission
of liberating mankind from the danger of
enslavement by fascism which threatened it.

Roosevelt had demanded that the fomenters
of war be put in quarantine eight years ago,
when, after the Italian fascists attacked
Abyssinia, the flames of Italian-German
fascist aggression lit up the sky over Spain.
Looking forward with anxiety to the future,
which was fraught with mortal danger for
all the peoples, including the American
people, he, already in 1937, uttered a warning
in the speech he delivered in Chicago. In
this speech he said in part:

“The peace-loving nations must make a concert­
ed effort in opposition to those violations of
treaties and those ignorings of humane
instincts which today are creating a state of international
anarchy and instability from which there is no
escape through mere isolation or neutrality.”

Naturally, Roosevelt was a determined
opponent of the disastrous policy of “appeas­
"The heads of the great Governments in this hour are literally responsible for the fate of humanity in the coming years... History will hold them accountable for the lives and the happiness of all."

With his characteristic energy and organizing talent Roosevelt set to work to develop the defensive might of the great Trans-Atlantic Republic. The farsightedness of this, one of the greatest statesmen of modern times, was confirmed by the subsequent progress of events. These events proved the correctness of the policy the President successfully pursued in face of the opposition of the isolationists, whose short-sightedness might have led to consequences fatal for America and for all the freedom-loving peoples. Roosevelt's intense labours and efforts were crowned with success. In a short space of time the United States developed its mighty war industry potential, put millions of its citizens under arms and built a most powerful Navy and Air Force. The passing of the historic Lend-Lease Law on March 11, 1941, ensured the democratic countries assistance in their struggle against the warmongers. The American people rallied around Roosevelt and his progressive policy, which was based on a profound understanding of the responsibility he bore to the country of which he was the head, and to all mankind.

During those anxious years the cornerstone of Roosevelt's political activities was the development and strengthening of co-operation between the great Trans-Atlantic Republic, Great Britain and the Soviet Union. In broad perspective the President regarded this friendly co-operation, based, not on temporary and transient factors, but on the fundamental and lasting interests of the great trinity of powers and of all the democratic countries, as the only conceivable way not only of routing the fascist aggressors but also of building a durable peace on the foundation of universal security.

In his numerous utterances and addresses to the American people and to international audiences, Roosevelt invariably pointed to the grandeur of the tasks that confront the Great Powers and all the United Nations in connection with the post-war arrangement of the world. He emphasized that, unlike the period following the conclusion of the First World War, the United States must now take a most active part, in conjunction with the other democratic powers, in creating guarantees for a durable peace and security.

This was an article of faith with the late President Roosevelt, and this explains the enormous strength of his position within and without the country. To what extent President Roosevelt utilized his prestige and the popular support he enjoyed for a determined struggle against the reactionary forces who tried to introduce elements of uncertainty and instability in the foreign policy of the United States is now a matter for history to decide. The President's great accomplishments will be inscribed forever in the annals of the struggle of the freedom-loving nations against fascist tyranny and obscurantism.

This is precisely why the fascist bandits hated Roosevelt so cordially. The bankrupt gangsters now standing on the brink of doom are trying to gain some comfort from the death of the great President in the hope that "the breach caused in the Allies' ring will never be closed," as one of Hitler's henchmen wrote the other day. What else can the fascists hope for? But their calculations are built on sand and are doomed to failure.

At the San Francisco conference, which is to open in a few days' time, the delegates will be faced with the task of drafting the statutes of the International Organization for the Maintenance of Peace and Security, in defining the fundamental principles of which the late President took a most active part. The finest monument that can be erected to this splendid man would be the realization of the main idea which inspired his political activities, viz., to ensure mankind peace and security.

This is the noble legacy Franklin Delano Roosevelt has left to the American people, and to all fighters for freedom and democracy.
Trade Unions and the State

K. OMELCHENKO
Editor of the Newspaper "Trud"

CERTAIN foreign circles fairly often bring up the question of the relations between the trade unions and the state. The interest displayed in this subject is quite intelligible as it concerns an extremely important sphere of contemporary political life in all democratic countries where trade unions exist.

One cannot help noting, however, that the discussion invariably centres around only one country on our planet, namely, the Soviet Union. Moreover, the subject is discussed only from one definite angle, the angle of the so-called "neutrality" of the trade unions. The advocates of "neutrality" maintain that trade unions are organizations which stand "above the state," if one may so express it, and claim that this applies to the trade unions in all countries except the Soviet Union, where they are "connected with the state," and, consequently, are "not independent," and are not even democratic working-class organizations. From this, certain elements draw the conclusion that it is impossible to co-operate with the Soviet trade unions. The most vociferous advocates of this schismatic view are the reactionary leaders of the American Federation of Labour. Similar arguments may, however, be met with also in the European press. The Swedish Domens Nyheter, for example, recently made the following statement regarding the "character of the Russian trade union movement":

"Lack of independence has always distinguished the Russian trade union movement from the trade union movement of the democratic countries."

Hazy statements to the effect that the Soviet trade unions "lack independence" may also be found in the columns of the Swedish Social-Democratic newspaper Morgen Tidningen, the organ of the Swedish government. Honestly speaking, this newspaper would do far better to ponder over the lack of independence of the Swedish federation of trade unions, which, as all the world knows, has been trailing in the wake of the ruling circles of Sweden during the whole period of the war. If that newspaper had honestly raised the question of the degree of "independence" the leaders of the Swedish trade unions have displayed in vindicating the interests of the Swedish working class, the answer would have been perfectly clear; for during the war the activities of the Swedish trade unions have been completely subordinated to the government's policy, which, as is well known, has been of extreme service to fascist Germany and her satellites. The natural result has been that the interests of the Swedish working class have suffered considerably.

If it were only a matter of the personal likes and dislikes of certain leaders and organs of the press one could ignore the assessment of the Soviet trade union movement made, say, by Green, the President of the American Federation of Labour, or by certain Swedish newspapers. But both the Swedish Right-Wing Social-Democrats and the American trade union isolationists make their arguments about the "neutrality" and "independence" of the trade unions a pretext for vilifying the Soviet trade unions. On these grounds they oppose co-operation between the trade unions of their countries and those of the U.S.S.R. They are doing all in their power to isolate the Soviet trade union movement. Thus, the discussion of the problem of "trade unions and the state" and the touching concern that is displayed about the "character of Russian trade unionism" are far from academic.

Before dealing with the character of the Soviet trade unions and their activities we must be clear on certain general principles which govern the activities of trade unions and their relations with the state. There is nothing wrong in the trade unions co-operating with the state, and such co-operation cannot be condemned as such. Situations and periods occur in the lives of nations when co-operation between the trade unions and the state is not only permissible but even essential, on one indispensable condition, however, viz., that such co-operation is in the interests of the working class. Not only the Soviet, but also the British and the American trade unions, for example, are actively supporting the governments of their respective countries in the struggle against Hitler Germany. Who would ever doubt that this support and co-
operation are positive factors in promoting the interests of the working class? Could the trade unions today remain neutral towards the policy of the state in the struggle against Hitler aggression without actually betraying the cause of the working class? The decisions passed by the World Trade Union Conference in London to render the utmost assistance to the war efforts of the Allies provide a clear and unambiguous answer to this question. Consequently, the question of the relations between the trade unions and the state cannot be examined apart from the concrete historical situation.

The relations between the trade unions and the state in our country have also been determined by history. The attitude of our workers and trade unions towards the state under tsarism was quite different from their attitude towards the state today, under the Soviet system, when social relations have undergone a radical change and the working class has become the ruling class. In our country it is the working class which exercises political leadership of society. Soviet society contains no classes whose interests run counter to the interests of the working class. The close co-operation between the trade unions and the Soviet state is determined by the fact that the Soviet Union is a socialist, a workers' and peasants' state, in which all power belongs to the working people. Co-operation between the Soviet trade unions and the Soviet state does not and cannot in the slightest degree imply either encroachment on the independence of the trade union movement or the renunciation by the trade unions of their main functions, viz., protection of the interests of the working class. This is the opposite of what exists in capitalist countries, where, quite often, the trade unions sacrifice the interests of the working class to the interests of the ruling class, which in those countries is not the working class but the bourgeoisie.

Every unbiased person who is familiar with the actual state of affairs in the Soviet Union must admit that the activities of the Soviet trade unions are of an extremely extensive and fruitful character. The fruits of these activities are inseparable from the general achievements of the working class of the U.S.S.R., viz., abolition of exploitation, abolition of unemployment and all-round improvement in the economic, social and material conditions of the working class. Those who are familiar with the Soviet system of social insurance and maintenance cannot fail to see how far ahead of their foreign comrades the Soviet trade unions and the Soviet workers have advanced in the sphere of protection of the health of the working people, mother and child welfare, and maintenance in old age, in spite of the fact that there are trade unions in many foreign countries which are far older than the Soviet trade unions. The enormous cultural progress of the workers of the Soviet Union is also an indisputable fact; and the colossal opportunities, compared with Western Europe and America, enjoyed by the Soviet workers, the Soviet youth and Soviet women for satisfying their cultural requirements, their opportunities for education and improving their skill in their various trades and professions, and their opportunities for promotion, are undeniable achievements of the Soviet system.

The Soviet state provides the trade unions with facilities for protecting the economic and legal rights of their members on a scale unprecedented in any other country. At the same time our trade unions are materially independent of the state. They exist and carry on their functions with their own funds, obtained from membership dues. The working people of our country have every ground for regarding their trade unions as the most democratic in the world.

The very principle on which the Soviet trade unions are built up testifies to their widely democratic character. In the first place they are voluntary organizations. The question of joining or of leaving a trade union is a matter for the free choice of every wage and salaried worker. No artificial barriers are placed in the way of a worker who wants to join a trade union. Neither occupation, degree of skill, sex, nationality or race, nor political or religious convictions, are obstacles to trade union membership. All the leading trade union bodies, from the bottom up, are elected and are responsible to their electors. The secret ballot fully ensures to the members of the trade unions the democratic expression of their will.

Thus, one of the most important distinguishing features of the Soviet Union is that here the protection of the interests of the working class by the trade unions is inseparably bound up with constant support of the state by the trade unions. The entire policy and all the activities of the Soviet state are conducted in the interests of the working
class and have for their main object the all-round and far-reaching protection of these interests. The reactionary leaders of many trade unions in the capitalist countries compel their unions to support the state to the detriment of the interests of the working class, for the policies pursued by the governments of these countries, by serving the ruling groups and the propertied classes, often run counter to the interests of the masses.

In the light of these general propositions the following, at first sight paradoxical, fact will become clear. Those very trade union leaders in foreign countries who attack the Soviet trade union movement on the plea of protecting trade union "neutrality" and their "independence" of the state, deliberately push up the policy pursued by their own trade unions towards the state. If, however, we examine this policy, the following will become clear. Firstly, that it departs from trade union "neutrality" and "independence" even in theory. Secondly, that, in practice, the trade unions usually follow in the wake of the policy of their governments. Very often they do this to the detriment of the vital interests of the working class which they are supposed to protect.

We shall deal first of all with the country where the history of trade unions goes back further than that of any other country, viz., Great Britain.

We have before us a work by Professor Cole entitled *British Trade Unionism Today* which was published in London just before the outbreak of the present war. As the author tells us, the book was composed with the collaboration of thirty trade union leaders and other experts. Considerable space in it is devoted to the question of the relations between the trade unions and the state. The author says that there are two views concerning the objects pursued by the trade union movement.

"On the one side are those who regard the industrial organization of the workers as the instinctive expression of the class struggle which is inherent in the wage relationship between capitalist and labourer, and can be transcended only by the suppression of capitalism itself. The workers who take this view are class-conscious proletarians... seeking to weld the whole working class together into a solid force for the overthrow of capitalism. For them, Trade Unionism is essentially a fighting movement, resting on a class basis; and any agreements which the workers may make with their employers are but truces, temporary intervals in a war which can end only with the final victory of the working class."

The second idea of Trade Unionism is that it exists in order to protect and advance the interests of a defined group of workers who possess some special skill or other mark of distinction from the general mass of labour, so that they can hope by a close combination of those who possess this special qualification to secure better terms of employment and a higher status than would be possible if each man acted alone. The aim of those who hold this view is to create for themselves a limited monopoly of labour, in order to improve its price, just as capitalists' endeavours by combination to exact a monopoly profit. There is in this type of Trade Unionism no set intention to change the economic system, but only a will to make it work better from the standpoint of the particular group. Nor is there any desire to build up a solid combination of the whole working class; for it is clearly impossible for all of them to exact special privileges. If there is to be exploitation, there must be persons left to exploit."

The author goes on to say that "in practice no trade union accepts completely either of these points of view," and in Britain there predominate rather "combinations approaching very near to the second idea." The author observes that this influences "trade unionism as a whole..."

One may or may not agree with the ideas enunciated above, but one thing is clear, and that is that not one of them has anything in common with the vaunted principle of trade union "neutrality." Neither the first point of view, which is based on the recognition of the class struggle, nor the second, which advocates the principle of class collaboration and of supporting the capitalist system of society, can by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as neutral.

Outstanding investigators of the British trade union movement like Sidney and Beatrice Webb emphasized more than once in their *History of Trade Unionism* that the official policy of the trade unions always expressed the striving of their leaders towards a sort of coalescence with the machinery of the state.

"And most remarkable of all," we read in the chapter entitled "The Place of Trade Unionism in the State," "the Trade Union itself has been tacitly accepted as a part of the administrative machinery of the State... The recognition of the Trade Union Movement as part of the governmental structure of the nation began in an almost imperceptible way... It is now taken for granted that Trade Unionism must be distinctively and effectually represented... on all Royal Commissions and Departmental Committees, whether or not these inquiries are concerned specifically with "Labour questions"..." It is needless to say that this recognition was not accorded to the Trade Union world without a *quid pro quo* from the Trade Union Movement to the Government."
The character of this coalescence of the trade union machinery with the machinery of state in Great Britain, which very often runs counter to the vital interests of the British workers, was most vividly revealed in the most dramatic periods of the British working-class movement, such as, for instance, during the General Strike in 1926. As an example of how the British trade unions subordinated the interests of the working class to the interests of the ruling classes, we may quote the deplorable Munich period, when Chamberlain's policy of "appeasing" the German aggressor hastened the approach of the Second World War. In spite of the wishes of the trade union membership, the leaders of the Trade Union Congress followed in the wake of the official government policy and when the government tackled, they invariably tackled too.

The coalescence of the trade union federations with the bourgeois machinery of state—through compulsory arbitration and conferences of employers and various class colaboration organizations—was observed also in other capitalist countries before the war. The representatives of the Amsterdam International officially announced a "new attitude towards the state." Theories such as "constructive socialism" and "industrial democracy" made their appearance. The substance of the latter was most vividly expressed by Karl Zwing, one of the "theoreticians" of the Amsterdam International, in the following words:

"We must not lose sight of the fact that the working class is part of the capitalist system: the collapse of that system would be tantamount to its (the working class's) collapse, and, consequently, it is the great historical duty of the working class to secure—by defining its place in this system—an improvement of the entire social system, which, in turn, would be identical with an improvement in its own condition."

In this argument the function of the trade unions as a protector of the interests of the proletariat is not even mentioned; their main object is stated to be "the national concentration of the trade union movement and the identification of its objects with the prosperity of the whole."

These tendencies have found striking expression in the activities and policies of the American Federation of Labour. They became known in the trade union movement as Gompersism, after Samuel Gompers, the former head of the A.F. of L. Professor S. Perlman, one of the apologists of Gompersism, stated in his book *A History of Trade Unionism in the United States* that in certain periods, especially during the First World War, "the Federation took its cue completely from the national government." He goes on to say:

"An important aspect of the co-operation of the government with the Federation was the latter's eager self-identification with the government's foreign policy, which went to the length of choosing to play a lone hand in the Allied labour world.... During the greater part of the period of American neutrality its attitude was that of a shocked layer of peace who is desirous to maintain the strictest neutrality."

"When war seemed inevitable, the national officers of all important unions in the Federation met in Washington and issued a statement on American Labour's Position in Peace or in War. They pledged the labour movement and the influence of the labour organizations unreservedly in support of the government in case of war."

We shall not enter into a general analysis of the question raised here by the author; we merely state the facts.

In characterizing the activities of the American Federation of Labour the historians of the American trade union movement invariably arrive at one conclusion. They admit that throughout its history the American Federation of Labour pursued not a "neutral" line, but a clearly defined line of adaptation to the policy of the ruling class. This, in turn, inevitably led to a constantly growing process of coalescence of the leading upper circle of the American Federation of Labour with the employers and the machinery of state, and to a widening of the gulf between the labour leaders and the general trade union membership.

A yawning chasm opened between the everyday practice of the American Federation of Labour and the democratic principles which it proclaimed. Very often so-called provisionalist reigns in the internal government of the American trade unions. This term covers up a system of appointing from above officials who exercise undivided sway in the lower organizations. This practice is, of course, in crying contradiction to the elementary requirements of trade union democracy. With the aid of these appointed officials the leading trade union bureaucrats dictatorially handle practically all trade union affairs. According to the report of the "independent" miners' union, from whose ranks Green, the President of the American Federation of Labour, sprang, organizations covering seventy-one per cent of the membership are governed by trade union officials appointed from above and never elected by anyone.
These are official figures, and are no doubt an underestimate.

Under these conditions a type of leader predominates in the unions affiliated to the American Federation of Labour who regards his organization practically as his own private commercial enterprise. As an American journalist has expressed it, a leader of this type cannot tolerate the idea that trade union officials whom he appoints and whose pay he controls should read his edicts without going into raptures over them.

Commenting on such fairly widespread phenomena, the American journal Fortune stated rather cynically:

"To make an industrial union or a group of them you need not a set of social objectives so much as a flexible tongue, a ready opportunism and a pitiless hand."

The absence of democracy within the trade union movement and of control and free criticism on the part of the membership leads to phenomena of a revolting kind. The extent to which corruption is rife among the leaders of the trade unions affiliated to the American Federation of Labour is well known. The American press has quoted and continues to quote numerous facts proving that trade union officials have connections with the criminal world. Cases have even been known of gangsters climbing into responsible trade union posts, rifling the trade union coffers, concluding deals with the employers and terrorizing the membership. Quite recently the Chicago Daily News, exposing the conditions prevailing in the American Federation of Labour, wrote:

"The highest A.F. of L. executives tolerated the gangsters among the A.F. of L. officials until the government prosecuted and imprisoned the gangsters for criminal activities."

In spite of these facts, it is precisely in A.F. of L. quarters that we hear hypocritical sermons on trade union "neutrality," "independence" and "democracy!" The practical object of the slander these quarters spread about the Soviet trade unions is obvious. They want to sow among the American people suspicion and distrust towards the Soviet workers and their trade unions, to frustrate the idea of international co-operation and international unity among the trade unions of the democratic countries.

We are pleased to note that many organs of the press and men prominent in trade union and public affairs in the United States condemn the campaign against the Soviet trade union movement conducted by the reactionary leaders of the American Federation of Labour. For example Lahey, the commentator of the Chicago Daily News, wrote recently:

"It is disconcerting to think what a noise would have been raised had the Russian trade unions kept passing resolutions denouncing the A.F. of L. for supporting capitalist private enterprise and even entering into collusive contracts with the monopolists."

This sound observation needs no comment.

* * *

The Soviet workers are sparing no efforts to strengthen their socialist motherland. The Soviet trade unions, unreservedly support their workers' state in the interests of the working class. Only malicious anti-Soviet slanderers can draw from this the conclusion that the Soviet trade unions are not voluntary, independent and democratic workers' organizations. And only malicious people who are striving to sap the foundations of international working-class unity can proclaim, as the leaders of the American Federation of Labour do, that it is impossible to sit under one roof with the Soviet trade unions.

Incidentally, these splitting designs were, as we know, unanimously condemned by the trade union organizations that were represented at the World Trade Union Conference held in London last February, including the largest democratic trade unions of America. Striving to isolate the Soviet trade unions, the reactionary splitters among the leadership of the American Federation of Labour succeeded only in isolating themselves. The Soviet trade unions occupy their appropriate place in the ranks of the international trade union movement.
RECENTLY certain organs of the press in the Allied and neutral countries have commenced very energetic researches into the question of what democracy is. These researches by no means bear a purely abstract character. On the contrary, they have been prompted by obvious dissatisfaction with the very concrete forms in which the will of the peoples has been finding expression in a number of countries of liberated Europe; and the terminological researches of the dissatisfied authors usually result in one and only one discovery, viz., that there is a fundamental difference between two "conceptions" of democracy, i.e., Soviet and Anglo-Saxon.

Thus the English Liberal Manchester Guardian says that "it would seem to be necessary to have some international agreement on the meaning of certain fashionable expressions," and goes on to explain which fashionable expressions it refers to. It would like to know "what is a democrat, a Hitlerite and a fascist? And no less important, what is an anti-fascist?" Another English newspaper, the Conservative Observer, in an article by its reviewer who writes under the very promising nom de plume "Student of Europe," expresses itself even more definitely. It asserts that in the Soviet Union "democracy appears to mean something different from and in some respects even opposite to what the English-speaking world understands by the term." To these "differences of definition" the newspaper attaches "very great political importance."

It cannot be denied that there is an extremely important difference between the democracy that prevails in the Soviet Union and that which exists in a number of other countries. That there is a difference between the social systems and ideologies of the U.S.S.R. and the Anglo-Saxon countries is beyond dispute. It is equally beyond dispute, however, that this difference should not serve as an obstacle to firm and durable co-operation among the Allies. Of course, a country which knows not the exploitation of man by man, a country in which not only political but also economic equality prevails, a country in which democratic liberties are not only proclaimed de jure but are actually guaranteed de facto by the material conditions of social life, a country in which genuine equality of nations exists and indestructible friendship between these nations has been created—such a country has undoubtedly made great progress along the road of democracy. It is also true that Soviet democracy cannot be regarded as identical with, say, English democracy. That the economic basis of society in the Soviet Union is different from that in England is common knowledge, and this directly affects the question of democracy, since it is precisely the economic system of the Soviet Union that guarantees the citizens of our country the opportunity of exercising their democratic rights, including such fundamental and vital rights as the right to work, the right to education, freedom from exploitation and from national or race discrimination, etc. It must not be forgotten that English democratic rights are enjoyed only by the inhabitants of the metropolitan country, whereas the far more numerous inhabitants of the British colonies, whose number is ten times as large as that of the population of the metropolitan country, are still vainly waiting for the democratization, the freedom and independence of their countries. Under these circumstances the difference between Soviet democracy and, for example, English democracy is, of course, not only a "difference of definition." Nevertheless, this does not mean that Soviet people and democrats in other countries cannot find common ground and a common criterion of what should be regarded as democratic and what anti-democratic.

It is particularly easy to dispel doubts on this score at the present time when the war against the brown plague of Hitlerism is still in progress and when the cornerstone of the future world order which will make a recurrence of fascist aggression impossible has to be laid; for in our days democratization is revealed in the struggle against fascism. In our days a democrat is one who resolutely and relentlessly fights fascism. A democrat is one who not only in words but also in deeds is prepared to wage the struggle until all fascist elements and all fascist influences are completely extirpated, for the pernicious nature of fascism, the monstrous danger it represents to the freedom and the very lives of the peoples, is clear to every right-thinking man.
Freedom for the peoples means death to fascism.

It is on the recognition of this general principle—on which Soviet people and sincere supporters of democracy in other countries can find common ground—that the decisions of the Crimea Conference rest. The Three Great Allied Powers pledged themselves to help the peoples of liberated Europe “to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems.” They also made provision for a policy which will “enable the liberated peoples to destroy the last vestiges of Nazism and Fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice.” The Three Great Allies agreed to help the peoples where conditions require “to form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people.”

Thus, the Crimea agreements recognize the need for a democratic solution of all the urgent and important problems that arise as a result of the liberation of Europe from the destructive fascist tyranny. One would think that the clarity of these decisions, permeated as they are with the spirit of respect for the democratic rights of the European nations, would preclude the possibility of all misinterpretation. But as the saying goes, even the multiplication tables could be interpreted in different ways if it suited anybody’s purpose to do so.

Many newly hatched champions of democracy appear to argue that to achieve the complete triumph of democracy it is simply necessary to restore all the forms of political life that existed in the European countries before the present war. It is sufficient to glance back at the past to convince oneself of the unsoundness of such an argument. It is no secret that in a number of European countries—not to speak of fascist Germany, and Italy, of course—the political system that prevailed before the war had very little in common with democracy.

It is sufficient to recall, for example, the regime that existed in pre-war Poland. This regime arose as a result of a violent coup d’état against the people, brought about by Pilsudski and his clique in 1926. The fascist Constitution of 1935, the inhuman national oppression of 31,000,000 Ukrainians, Byelorussians and Lithuanians, the disfranchise-ment of the workers, peasants and progressive intelligentsia, the feudal latifundia, nearly as large as whole counties, owned by the Radziwillis and Sapiehas, the notorious concentration camp in Bereza Kartuska and the Brest Central Prison in which were incarcerated all those who dared to raise their voices against the rule of the corrupt clique of reactionary politicians, the venality and obscurantism in all spheres of domestic politics, the reckless flirting with Hitler Germany and the constant anti-Soviet intrigues in the sphere of foreign policy—such are the most memorable features of that regime, of the restoration of which the bankrupt Raczkiewicz-Arciszewski clique, their abettors, and their patrons in reactionary circles in the Allied countries, are still dreaming.

It is common knowledge that democracy in countries like Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria, fared no better. During the two decades between the First and Second World Wars, the reaction which reigned in those countries strangled the vital popular forces. Not only was the Communist Party driven underground, but every expression of progressive political thought was severely punished. Race hatred and brutal chauvinism were systematically cultivated; imperialist tendencies and great-power plans of aggression were encouraged. Under these conditions, the carpet-baggers of Hitler imperialism, at the proper moment, quickly found common ground with the reactionary ruling cliques of these small countries who unhesitatingly flung their peoples into the bloody vortex of the war of aggression unleashed by the Germans.

Nor can the regimes in prewar Yugoslavia and Greece be described as democratic from any point of view. In Yugoslavia, for example, during the elections to the Skupschina, which were carried through by the Stojadinovic government in December 1938, a number of candidates on the official ticket were declared elected although they had polled only ten or twenty votes, whereas opposition candidates, who had polled votes running into tens of thousands, were declared not elected. In Greece the fascist dictatorship of Metaxas was rampant for a number of years before the present war. The Australian author Aldridge, who was in Crete with the Allied expeditionary force in the spring of 1941, shows fairly clearly in his novel *The Sea Eagle* that the struggle the Greek partisans waged against the “Ironheads,” as they called the German invaders, was a direct continua-
tion of the self-sacrificing struggle they had formerly waged against Greek fascism against the brutal Metaxas regime.

Our picture would be incomplete if we did not mention also the notorious democracy of Finland. Of what worth was pre-war Finnish democracy, which gave the Finnish warmongers every opportunity to plunge the country into two disastrous wars against the Soviet Union? No sane person can deny that this is an extremely important criterion of the regime that prevailed in Finland. To characterize this regime it is sufficient to recall the fact that it had outlawed the party which now, at the very first elections held under something like free conditions, polled one-fourth of the total vote, in spite of the fact that it had neither the time nor the opportunity to make preparations for the election campaign.

Such was the situation in a number of East-European countries. But even in West-European countries which have old democratic traditions the political structure in the pre-war years was so honeycombed with reaction that the fascist agents were able, unhindered, to intrigue against the people and to weave their net of treachery and national betrayal. This was the situation not only in France, but also in Denmark, Norway, Belgium and Holland. As for the countries of the Iberian Peninsula, the anti-popular regimes established there were as like the fascism of Hitler and Mussolini as peas in a pod.

This obviously unsatisfactory state of affairs as regards democracy in many countries on the European continent primarily explains Hitler's easy victories in the first stage of the war, before he attacked the Soviet Union. Had democracy not been so enfeebled, had it really reigned in pre-war Europe, the world would have been saved from the tragedy of Dunkirk and from the humiliating farce in the Compiègne Woods, from the long years of domination of the Hitler invaders in a number of West-European countries, and from a large share of the extremely heavy sacrifice the freedom-loving peoples were obliged to make on the altar of the struggle against the German fascist aggressors. Hardly anybody would dare deny today that Germany's initial victories were not due to the "invincibility" of the German fascist army or to the "brilliant intuition" of the corporal strategist Hitler. But these victories were not accidental—such accidents don't happen. Fundamentally, as all thoughtful and unbiased observers belong-

ing to the most diverse political camps admit, they were due to the fact that democracy was on the decline in the countries which became Hitler's victims, and stranded in those which became his allies. On the other hand, as a result of the notorious Munich policy of abetting the aggressor, the great democratic powers of Western Europe—Great Britain and France—were not prepared to offer resistance to the German fascist hordes.

Is it surprising, then, that the peoples of the liberated countries of Europe want to have a democracy free from the fatal defects it suffered from in the pre-war years, a democracy renovated and pulsating with youthful vitality? A democrat is one who bravely looks ahead and not one who furiously looks back. Such, indeed, were the great democrats and popular leaders of whom the civilized nations are proud. The peoples who have passed through the ordeal of the most arduous of wars want their will, their desire for a progressive policy which will ensure a durable peace and international security, to be really respected.

The will of the people finds different expression in different countries, but the European—and not only the European—peoples have drawn very similar conclusions from their experience of the present war. They want to build up their political and social life in such a way as to leave no loopholes for fascism. It is not only a matter of extinguishing the remnants and all influence of present-day fascism, but of creating conditions that will prevent the birth of a new fascism. The peoples do not want a resumption of reckless policies in foreign affairs, including reckless policies directed against the Soviet Union. Lastly, the peoples, and those of a number of countries in Eastern Europe in particular, wish to settle such burning questions affecting their lives as the abolition of feudal and semi-feudal relations in the agrarian system and of national oppression and strife between nations.

Can it be denied that the break-up and distribution of the feudal latifundia among the small peasants is a democratic measure or that the struggle against agrarian reform is a struggle against democracy? Can it be denied that the path of peace and friendship between nationalities which has now been taken by Yugoslavia and Rumania, for example, is a democratic path or that the forces which, like the Serbian and Croatian
Thus, no special researches are needed to determine who are the friends of democracy and who its foes. From the democratic point of view—and in this case it makes no difference whether one takes the stand of Soviet democracy or that of Anglo-American democracy—it cannot be denied that gentlemen like Radescu in Rumania, Linkomies, Tanner and Ryti in Finland, Raczkiewicz and Arciszewski among the Polish émigrés, and the corresponding political figures in other countries, are the foes of democracy, are pro-fascists, and that those who support these elements are acting against the interests of the people. Obviously, the road of “democrats” of this type is not the road of the Soviet Union, nor can it be the road of sincere champions of democracy in other countries.

The pseudo-champions of democracy often advance the argument which the Observer’s “Student of Europe” formulated in the following way:

“In Western usage, freedom of opposition and free competition of several parties for the votes of the people (including upper and middle classes) are of the essence of democracy.”

From this the conclusion is drawn that the rallying of the forces of the people in a united front against pro-fascist groups and tendencies is a violation of democracy, that it leads to totalitarianism, and so forth. It is not difficult to expose the hypocrisy of this argument. Why, indeed, should not the forces of the people in the countries just liberated from the Nazi tyranny organize and form a united front in the struggle against the beaten but not yet vanquished foe? Why should they, to please dubious “students” and still more dubious friends of Europe, engage in “free competition,” in other words, split up their forces and thereby weaken them when the enemy is continuing to weave his intrigues and is striving to recapture his lost positions by every means in his power? In “Student of Europe’s” country the political parties decided to abstain from “free competition” at elections for the duration of the war in the interests of the common struggle against the enemy, in the interests of uniting all the forces of the nation for this struggle. If this is the case in a powerful country like Great Britain, how much more imperative is it to rally all the democratic elements in a united front in the liberated countries of Europe which have only just entered upon a new path.

chauvinists, or the Rumanian “historical parties,” are fighting to prevent a solution of the national problem are thereby exposing themselves as downright enemies of democracy?

The pseudo-champions of democracy reveal their true colours most glaringly when they talk about Poland. From the point of view of democracy, the so-called Polish problem is absolutely clear. The Polish people, liberated from the German fascist yoke, are building up their new life on democratic principles. The work of restoring Polish statehood is being directed by the Provisional Government which is now functioning in Poland, and which is headed by leaders of the four Polish democratic parties who came to the fore in the course of the self-sacrificing struggle the Polish patriots waged against the Hitler invaders. This Government is exercising power throughout the entire territory of Poland; it is supported by the people and is carrying out their will. But the pseudo-champions of democracy are conducting a fierce and unscrupulous campaign against the Provisional Polish Government, while at the same time pleading the cause of the bankrupt politicians in the émigré Raczkiewicz-Arciszewski clique. They are indignant when the Polish reactionary émigré camp is called pro-fascist. But what else can it be called? Everybody knows that this camp played a baneful role in pre-war Poland and bears grave responsibility for the disaster of September 1939. Venting their spite and hostility towards the Soviet Union in every possible way, and basing all their calculations on the possibility of disagreements arising among the Allies, these people have been acting as the mouthpieces and abettors of the German fascists throughout the whole period of the war. Lastly, if any more proof were required that these reactionary politicians who have become completely divorced from their country are the bitterest enemies of democracy, they themselves have provided it by their hostility towards the Crimea decisions. Why do they so fiercely attack the agreement reached in the Crimea? Because that agreement is based on democratic principles, and the Polish reactionaries are perfectly well aware that they are utterly played out unless the former anti-popular regime is restored in Poland, unless there is a return to the fascist Constitution of 1935, and unless the basis of feudal landownership is preserved.
Can these peoples forget that it was precisely disunity in the democratic camp, the division of the democratic forces, that was one of the most important factors in the establishment of fascist regimes in a number of countries? The fascists were able to turn to their advantage the fact that the democratic elements in many countries of pre-war Europe were unable to find common ground. In particular, even supporters of democracy were sometimes so blinded by anti-Communist prejudice that they emphatically refused to have any dealings with the Communists, losing sight of the fact that thereby they were splitting the anti-fascist front and easing the task of fascism. The bloody lessons of the past few years have taught not only that a split is harmful but also that the unification of the popular forces is beneficial. The Communists fought the Hitler invaders side by side with the representatives of all the patriotic, all the anti-fascist parties, groups and trends. The result was united action, cemented with the blood of the best fighters for freedom. The peoples of the liberated countries of Europe do not now wish to repeat the fatal blunder of pre-war policy, they do not wish to pursue the path of splitting the democratic forces. It is not for nothing that the Crimea decisions speak of ensuring national unity in the liberated countries of Europe. But unity can be achieved only by uniting the popular forces and not by splitting them, by uniting all the genuine democrats and not by inciting some democratic elements against others.

Democracy is a historical phenomenon. One cannot speak of one, unchangeable democracy for all times and for all peoples. As is the case with every phenomenon in social life, democracy develops and goes forward. Present-day democracy bears little resemblance to the democracy, say, of ancient Athens; and the present political system of Great Britain, for example, differs very much from the system which existed in that country in Cromwell's time. Even on the basis of the same social and economic system extremely diverse forms of democratic statehood arise. Hence, it would be quite hopeless to demand that democracy should be built up in all countries of Europe on the British or American model. This would be a totally unwarranted attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of other peoples, an attempt to impose definite political canons upon them from outside. Such an attempt would, of course, have no chance of success, because it would contradict the very spirit of democracy, would contradict the indisputable right of the peoples "to create democratic institutions of their own choice."

Does this mean that sincere champions of democracy need not now, when the fate of German fascism is already sealed, concern themselves with what is taking place outside their countries? It would be, to say the least, premature to draw such a conclusion. Quite apart from the universally known cases of the grossest violation of democracy in European countries like Greece, it is sufficient to recall the state of affairs in the colonial world. To this day, as is well known, there is not even a whiff of democracy in the colonial countries, where a very large part of the population of the globe reside. This is where those who come out as champions of democracy should direct their zeal.

When, however, they strike a Hamlet pose and express doubts about the liberated countries of Europe which have taken the path of political renovation, their concern appears affected and out of place. We must not forget the manoeuvres of the German fascist provocateurs. It is common knowledge that the latter at once proclaim every event connected with the democratization of political life in any country on the European continent as a "Kerensky regime," and "bolshevization." The Hitlerites affix the label "Kerensky" indiscriminately to political leaders of the most diverse complexion, and brand as "bolshevization" every progressive measure, every democratic reform, every step taken to punish the war criminals and traitors to their country. It is not difficult to see through the Hitlerites' manoeuvres. They harp on the old, tiresome string that the only alternative to fascist rule in Europe is "bolshevization," that fascism is the only conceivable "bulwark against bolshevism." It is well known that the English-speaking countries did not allow themselves to be caught by this bait even when Germany was at the zenith of her power. Still more transparent are these provocative tactics now, when the doom of fascist Germany is not only inevitable, but imminent. Who, except the played-out Hitler adventurers, stands to gain by convincing the British and Americans that the European continent is faced with only one alternative, viz., either fascism or the Soviet system?
The German imperialists are already making their preparations for a third attempt to achieve world domination. To thwart their crafty designs, the sternest vigilance must be maintained towards the perfidious enemy, and democratic states strong in their unity must be set up in the liberated countries of Europe. Only those who place the selfish interests of groups above the national interests of their country can wish the difference in ideology and character between the social system of the Soviet Union and that of its Allies to prevent the three leading great powers in the anti-Hitler coalition from marching together in solving the problems affecting the arrangement of the post-war world. The stern experience of the period forward has always borne witness to the elements which try to mark time and sometimes imagine that they are able to turn back the wheel of history. Sometimes these elements succeed in temporarily stemming the tide of progressive development of whole nations.

It is precisely such a picture of continuous attempts to hold up the economic, political, and cultural development of a whole nation that is observed in China today. On the perpetuation and even aggravation of the backwardness of the country are concentrated all the activities of the Japanese invaders and their henchmen in the occupied regions of China. They have killed almost the entire manufacturing industry in China proper. They have unearthed the mummy ideas of the Middle Ages and are foisting them upon the people as their spiritual sustenance. They have revived absolute despotism and economic tyranny, and are methodically duping the people with drugs. In their efforts ideologically to enslave the Chinese people they do not hesitate to speak in the name of the great revolutionary fighter and Chinese patriot Sun Yat-sen. As their political compradors and agents they employ thousands and tens of thousands of men and women, who have betrayed the principles of Sun Yat-sen and their country, and strive

**Whither China?**

V. AVARIN

There is no doubt that the year 1945 will go down into history as a year of great events and great decisions. This year the avenging sword of the freedom-loving nations will descend on the head of German fascism. This year should see the erection of the magnificent edifice of fruitful post-war co-operation among the peace-loving countries with the object of ensuring peace for the longest possible period. The peoples of Europe liberated from fascist slavery are healing their wounds while fighting to eradicate the corrupting influence of fascism and to restore political life on democratic lines.

In the light of present events and the prospects of human progress it is opportune to ask: what path will China take? What is the destination of the Chinese nation, those four hundred million people who possess such a great past and such an abundant latent strength, which is fettered for the time being by the social and political conditions at present prevailing in that country? In answer to this question, all those who know, love, and respect the Chinese people will be compelled sorrowfully to admit that recent events have not helped to dispel their anxieties concerning China's political prospects. The mighty flood which carries mankind between the First and Second World Wars has shown what grave danger lurks in the absence of unity among the peace-loving nations. In the light of this experience it is clear that the groundless prejudices against the democratic regimes in the liberated countries of Europe may become a serious barrier to the establishment of lasting peace among the nations and of general security.

The present war must be consummated in such a way that no loopholes are left for the re-emergence of the forces of fascism and aggression. This is in the interests of all the peace-loving peoples who are engaged in the common struggle against Hitler Germany.
by hook or by crook to win the favour of the invaders by acting as puppet rulers in Nanking, Shanghai, Peiping and Canton. There is not a mean trick the Japanese will not stoop to to keep the Chinese people in slavery, in a state of cultural backwardness and of ideological degeneracy. This is not surprising. This policy is part and parcel of the program of creating a "new order" in Asia which the Japanese aggressors are pursuing in the occupied parts of China.

But what mortal sins have the Chinese people committed to deserve such treatment not only at the hands of alien conquerors but also of a large section of their own rulers? The Chinese are an industrious and capable people. Their cultural traditions can be traced far back in the ages. Have they not a right to occupy an honourable place in the family of the freedom-loving nations? But extremely influential elements among the ruling circles of China are stubbornly pursuing a policy of perpetuating the economic and political backwardness of the country. They openly oppose the democratization of the political regime, the strengthening of national unity, and all measures for effectively developing the country's war effort and for raising its economic and cultural level.

They have learnt nothing from the stern lessons they were taught at the front in 1944. How grave these lessons were may be seen from the statement made by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in summing up the military operations of the past year, which, he frankly admitted, had been "a year of severest trial and humiliation." "We sustained defeats," he said, "which cover the Army as well as the Government with shame."

Apparently the public outside of China, and partly in China, still fails to appreciate the full significance and consequences of the military defeats sustained by the Chungking armies last year, and which they are sustaining this year.

Establishing a continuous front from Peiping to Kwangchow through Kweiling, the Japanese forces cut out of the main territory of National China a region with a population of no less than one hundred million. This means that by the end of 1944 the Chungking government had practically lost half the manpower resources it possessed in the spring of 1944. It also lost a considerable part of its food, mineral and manufacturing resources. As Chiang Kai-shek admitted, over four hundred thousand men and officers of the Chinese regular army were left in the captured territories, and in many of the districts the Chinese administration remained. But can effective resistance to the Japanese be expected from these surrounded troops and from this administration, if the Chungking troops, which had direct connections with their bases and the support of the rear earned such bad reputations for themselves in the fighting of 1944? How supinely the Kuomintang generals succumb to difficulties and fall victims to the wiles of Japanese imperialism is shown by the fact that during the past three years' sixty-seven generals went over to the side of the Japanese. Significant also is the fact that out of the Kuomintang army of over half a million men, which found itself in the rear of the Japanese in the first years of the war, hardly anything had remained by the beginning of 1944. Many of the men and officers of this army betrayed their country and are now serving in the ranks of the armies of the puppet Nanking "president" Chen Kung-po, formerly a member of the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang, and for many years Minister for Industry in the Kuomintang government.

The inability of the troops in the isolated areas to fight the Japanese was already revealed last year when, in the beginning of October, three divisions of the Seventeenth Army abandoned the port of Foochow at the very first attack on the part of a relatively small Japanese landing force, or when the Japanese occupied the port of Wenchow and other points in Chekiang. On January 10, this year, the Japanese launched an attack on the section of the Canton-Hankow Railway that was still occupied by the Chinese troops and gained complete possession of it by the end of the month. Without much difficulty they occupied a number of other important districts and points in the isolated territories within a couple of months. In the province of Kiangsi they also captured the aerodromes which had still remained in the hands of the Chinese and Americans, and from which American aircraft had assisted military operations in the Pacific even this year.

It is quite probable that the Japanese do not intend to liquidate entirely the Chinese administration and the Chungking forces in the isolated provinces. But if that is the case, they will try to convert the Chinese leaders in these provinces into their agents and employ them as instruments in the struggle against the genuine people's partisan move-
ment, and in exploiting the economic resources of these vast isolated regions. In the present strategic and political situation it is not in Japan's interest to have the desertion of Chinese traitors to her side made public. It would be far more to her advantage if these traitors pretended that they were still loyal to the Ch'ungking government. Under the mask of Chinese patriots they could be far more useful to the Japanese in combating the growth of the democratic liberation movement and the organization of effective armed resistance on the territory in the rear of the invaders. News reaches us from China which gives grounds for the assumption that some of the generals in the isolated territories have already entered upon their duties as Chinese “Mihajlovices.” Thus, the Central Press Service reported on February 21 that in the district of Hoshan, in Kiangtung, south of the river Si-kiang, “armed clashes are taking place between Ch'ungking and Yenan troops.” It is characteristic that the Japanese received still earlier information about this. The Domei Agency reported as early as February 19 that in this district the “Ch'ungking” troops were compelled to retreat under pressure of people's partisans, and expressed particular alarm about the fact that the local inhabitants were energetically supporting the partisans.

It must not be forgotten that the Japanese military leaders are old hands at the game of political intrigue and diversion in China. For decades they have worked to link up their interests with the private interests of the Chinese militarists and reactionary politicians. The following may serve to illustrate the skilful way in which the Japanese utilize Chinese forces and resources with the aid of agents who occupied influential positions in the Chinese administration. In 1935-37 the Chinese authorities in the northern districts laid down a broad network of strategical dirt roads, fortified points (against the “Communist partisans”), aerodromes, anti-Communist organizations, and so forth. These were utilized with great effect by the Japanese troops in the very first month of their invasion of China in 1937.

It is extremely interesting to recall that the Japanese never raised any objection to the construction of the Kiangsi-Kweichow Railway. Traffic on this railway, the building of which cost the Chinese people a tremendous exertion of effort, was started in the beginning of 1944. In the autumn of that year Japanese troops and Japanese war material were transported over it. By capturing this railway the Japanese obtained an extremely important, ready-made, strategical communication on the mainland, far from the coast, leading deeply into the south-eastern regions of China. The extension of the railway from Luchow to Nanning will provide the Japanese with a continuous trunkline from the Korean ports to Singapore. The question naturally arises: was the construction of the Kiangsi-Kweichow Railway by the Ch'ungking government, and the latter's failure to ensure its protection, the result of strategical miscalculation or of the activities of Japanese agents in Ch'ungking? The Kiangsi-Kweichow line was practically a gift to the Japanese General Staff, for which they had been longing for years.

Most depressing of all is the economic situation in the regions still under the administration of the Kuomintang authorities. According to official returns, the index of commodity prices rose from 485 in December 1944 to 650 in January and to 875 in February this year. What is the cause of this rapid rise in prices? Is it not due, among other things, to the counter-offensive launched by the big bankers and reactionary usurers against the people and their demand for a democratic China?

The statement made by Chen Cheng, the new Minister for War, is also noteworthy. In the beginning of March he stated that the demobilization had already begun of a vast number of men and officers of the Chinese army and that five hundred thousand officers and men had already been demobilized, of whom two hundred and fifty thousand belonged to thirty-five disbanded army units, a hundred and thirteen thousand had belonged to 855 liquidated military institutions, etc.

This demobilization can scarcely be regarded as the beginning of China's withdrawal from the war. Evidently, under the aegis of Ho Ying-ching, the former Minister for War, the Ch'ungking forces had become encrusted with a vast number of useless, parasitic military institutions, which had merely given rise to a huge bureaucracy. Evidently, the number of rear units had also multiplied. Including them, Ho Ying-ching at one time counted the Ch'ungking armies as numbering five million men. But these units were totally unfit for active service, and were a deadweight on the backs of the Chinese people. Evidently, among the demobilized there is no small
number of ‘dead souls’ which the generals kept on their lists for the purpose of receiving their pay, rations and equipment. Window dressing, parasitism, bureaucracy, corruption and abuse of power are widespread not only in the army. In his New Year address Chiang Kai-shek said:

“The military defeats which we sustained last year revealed our political defeats and blunders. We must admit the inefficiency of our administration and our lack of organization and flexibility, which in no way conforms with wartime requirements.”

But is it possible to improve the administration and the whole system of government of China merely by incantations, exhortations and pious wishes? All observers who are familiar with realities in China will unhesitatingly answer that this is absolutely impossible.

Indeed, how can men who have been reared on the principle that “my personal well-being, the well-being of my family and of my relations stands above all else” be weaned by mere exhortations from a rule which they have imbibed with their mother's milk, if they are free from all control by the people? In the regions under the direct control of the Chungking government there is not a single member of a district administration who was elected by the people and whom the people have a right to control!

Sun Fo, the Speaker of the Legislative Yuan, and a prominent Kuomintang leader, stated in a speech he delivered last spring that “the Kuomintang constituted only an insignificant part of the people.” He was absolutely right. Right also are other Kuomintang leaders who say that their party is divorced from the people. Nevertheless, power in China under the Chungking government is the monopoly of the Kuomintang.

At the end of last year the Manchester Guardian, in a leading article which was very sympathetic to the Chungking government and the Kuomintang, was nevertheless obliged to admit that “the Kuomintang party tends more and more to become reactionary, almost fascist.”

In the above-mentioned speech, Sun Fo asked: “Why does public opinion in the United States and Great Britain criticize the state of affairs in China?” And he himself answered: “Because they think that China is on the road to fascism.”

Kung Kang, one of the oldest members of the Kuomintang and formerly private secretary to Sun Yat-sen, speaking at a meeting of the Democratic League and left members of the Kuomintang held in Chungking last November, stated in profound sorrow:

“We have returned to the despotism of past ages, when murder and tyranny over the people knew no bounds. If democracy is not introduced now, China will find herself on the brink of disaster.”

Perhaps these opinions of representative Chinese and foreigners are groundless? Perhaps these utterances are due to misunderstanding? If that is the case, why is news constantly coming from China of a kind that is calculated to confirm these bad impressions rather than dispel them? Representatives of the masses, including the democratic press, its editors and contributors, are still hounded and persecuted. In the districts controlled by the Kuomintang the anti-Japanese and democratic fighters are languishing in jail. The Kuomintang alone enjoys legality; only its press may publish what it pleases. And today, when all mankind is hurling curses at the German fascist butchers who drenched the world with blood, we read the following lines in the National Herald published in Chungking, of February 9, 1945:

“We greatly admire the German people and the German soldiers, their courage on the battlefield, their devotion to their leader and to the cause for which they are fighting.”

In a journal, which hypocritically bears the title Democracy, we read open praise of the political system of Germany! Is this fortuitous? Would it not be more correct to assume that the columns of these publications reflect the ideological kinship and political complicity with the German fascists of their conference in China?

In the light of all this, the democratic public of the freedom-loving nations learns with exceptional disquietude that the negotiations which were conducted last February between Chow En-lai, the representative of the Chinese Communist Party, and the Chungking authorities again proved fruitless. The proposals of the Chinese Communist Party may be summed up in the following main points: Political rights for the Chinese people; repeal of all laws which restrict the freedom and rights of the people; abolition of the dictatorship of the Kuomintang; legalization of anti-Japanese parties and political organizations; a conference of all parties and political groups to be called to discuss preparations for convening a National Assembly; formation of a democratic coalition govern-
ment and of a united command for the Chinese armed forces; recognition of the democratically elected local government bodies in all the liberated partisan districts; recognition of all the anti-Japanese armed forces in China; removal of the blockade of the Special Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Area; release of all anti-Japanese and anti-fascist political prisoners held in the prisons of the Ch'ing-k'ing government; liquidation of the Kuomintang's political secret service.

This program of democratic reforms and measures is not only the program of the Chinese Communist Party. It is advanced and energetically supported by all the political parties and groups which represent the people and are connected, in particular, with the Democratic League of China. Already in the autumn of last year the Yuemanipo wrote: "We must immediately release the people from the nightmare existence to which they are doomed and help them to take the illusory path of political regeneration. To achieve this we must first of all introduce democracy."

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek himself, in a speech he delivered on March 1, warned the reactionary diehards who are trying to keep the lock on the gates that lead to the progressive development of China, in the following words:

"The tide of public opinion which is demanding national unity and constitutional government is growing stronger and will soon become an irresistible force. Not a single political party can afford to ignore this force."

Nevertheless, as observers of Chinese political life assert, the reactionary diehards determine the strategy and policy of the Ch'ing-k'ing ruling circles in 1945 just as they did in 1944. This was vividly revealed in the rejection of all the proposals of the Chinese democrats embodied in the above-mentioned program of reforms. It was revealed also in the proposals, or rather the manoeuvres to which the leaders of the Kuomintang resorted, in answer to the democratic program for the establishment of national unity.

They rejected the proposals to form a democratic coalition government, to grant the people political rights, to liquidate the dictatorship of the Kuomintang and so forth, and instead proposed that representatives of the Chinese Communist Party and of other political parties be included in the Administrative Council of the Executive Yuan. But, as Chinese democratic circles point out, the Administrative Council exercises no real power. Power is exercised by other bodies. The Administrative Council is merely a screen, a stage decoration, behind and independently of which the dictatorship of the Kuomintang operates. Democratic circles emphatically refuse to become a screen for preserving the anti-popular dictatorship.

Democratic circles also qualify as a clumsy manoeuvre the announcement of the convocation of a National Assembly next November which, it is claimed, is to set up a constitutional government, and to which the Kuomintang will transfer all the prerogatives of power. It is proposed to convene this National Assembly when the population of extensive regions will still be bereft of political rights and liberties, when the democratic parties will still have no legal right to existence and activity, when the dictatorship of the Kuomintang will still prevail, when a vast territory will be under Japanese occupation and the inhabitants unable to take part in the election of representatives. A National Assembly convened under such circumstances cannot be a body representative of the people and expressing their will.

The reactionary elements are openly exerting every effort to prevent China from extricating herself from the political cul-de-sac into which they have driven her. This is particularly regrettable today, when the foundation is being laid for a world organization to ensure peace and security after the war, and when the Chinese people should also come forward in all their strength and occupy a worthy place in the commonwealth of freedom-loving nations.

Judging by utterances in the press, public circles in the freedom-loving nations which interest themselves in the military and political situation in China are not losing hope that in spite of the efforts of the reactionaries, and notwithstanding many unfavourable portents, China will succeed in setting up an efficient democratic government which will enjoy the support of the people, strengthen national unity and increase the country's war effort. Whether these hopes are justified or not, it is difficult to say; but one thing is clear: unless urgent measures for the democratization of the political life of the country and the creation of national unity are carried out, China cannot occupy the place in the comity of democratic nations that she ought.
O NLY three months have passed since the Red Army's winter offensive began, but what enormous changes have taken place in this short period! The victories achieved by the Soviet troops led to the complete liberation and reunion of Poland. It may be said without exaggeration that these months constitute an epoch in the life of the Polish people. At every step one sees evidence of profound change in the most diverse fields of public life. Irreversible processes have taken place which will determine the entire future development of the country. In the kaleidoscopic succession of events one can already clearly discern the features of the new, democratic Polish republic, differing radically from the pre-war Polish state, which from the moment it came into existence marched to the defeat and destruction it met with in September 1939.

First of all, the geographical contours of Poland have altered. Her borders have extended westward and she has thereby obtained at last natural, ethnographical frontiers. For the first time in her history Poland is becoming a solid national state in which all Polish lands are united. The new frontiers, which run along the Oder and the Neisse, and include the Baltic coast and the southern and western sections of East Prussia, will strengthen her independence and greatly enhance her economic and military potential. Poland will become a first-class industrial state. With the reunion of the ancient Western Polish lands she receives scores of coal pits and blast furnaces and hundreds of metallurgical and chemical plants at which Polish engineers, technicians and workers are employed. Poland has become the mistress of a large section of the Baltic coast with first-class ports. This opens up wide prospects for the development of shipping, commerce and industry and the building of a maritime fleet. Lastly, the Western regions represent an immense land fund consisting of the large estates of the German Junkers and Hitler chiefs. Here hundreds of thousands of landless and poor Polish peasants will settle and become a reliable bulwark against the German “Drang nach Osten.”

That is why, in the struggle to reunite the Western lands with Poland and to restore to them their Polish character, the entire Polish people rallied around the Provisional Government. This is proved by the immense demonstrations which were held in Warsaw, Cracow, Katowice, and other towns. Representatives of the most diverse sections of the population whom one meets express their immense joy at the restitution to Poland of her ancient lands which had been seized by the German robbers. The participation of the Polish Army in the liberation of the Western lands revived the national pride of the Poles which had been trampled upon by the arrogant German invaders. It is characteristic that even those circles of Polish society who at first adopted a wait-and-see policy towards the Provisional Government are now not only declaring that they support it, but are taking an active part in the practical work of assimilating the new lands. Many important and complicated tasks are arising in this sphere, and the Poles are setting to work to solve them with the greatest eagerness. The consequences of the prolonged and violent Germanization of the Polish towns and villages must be eliminated; the industrial and commercial enterprises, the machinery of administration, and so forth, must be purged of the Hitler scum and their hangers-on. It goes without saying that to carry out these tasks the most active assistance of the broad masses of the people is needed; and the people are rendering the Provisional Government this assistance in full measure. Thousands and thousands of peasants, workers, intellectuals, shopkeepers, artisans and manufacturers in all parts of Poland have expressed their willingness to settle in the new lands, and the Provisional Government is methodically meeting their wishes. The peasants of the Katowice and a number of other districts are, on their own initiative, and in spite of their own impoverishment, collecting food for the Polish population in the Western regions that was starving.

With what scorn the Poles speak of the bankrupt politicians in the London émigré clique who, through the mouth of Arciszewski, expressed opposition to the annexation of
Lower Silesia and Western Pomerania to Poland on the plea that “Poland did not need” these lands. Once again it was proved that these renegades have lost all ties with their country. They do not know what the Poles are thinking and feeling. They are betraying the national interests, the strivings and the aspirations of the people. A wide gulf lies between them and all their hangers-on, and the people of liberated Poland.

* * *

During the twenty years that pre-September Poland was in existence the peasants constantly demanded land, but not a single Polish government either could or would settle this question so vitally important for the country. At the present time the agrarian reform has been in the main carried out in Poland. By April 1 about half a million hectares of former landlord land passed to the peasants in the Cracow, Lodz, Warsaw and Białystok województwa as a result of the reform. In the territories liberated after January 12 this year the percentage of peasant families who were allotted land is approximately two and a half times as great as the percentage in the Lublin area. As many peasants in the newly liberated districts informed us, the reform was carried out at a much more rapid rate, in a more organized manner, and more effectively in these districts than in the Lublin region, although the area of land to be distributed was several times larger. This was due, firstly, to the greatly enhanced prestige of the Provisional Government and the improvement in its machinery of administration, and also to the exceptional activity displayed by the peasants themselves who were eager to divide up the land before the sowing season commenced. This spring the peasants are sowing their own land, and, considering the difficulties created by the shortage of draft animals, seeds and implements in the rural districts which have been devastated by the German invaders, the sowing is proceeding more successfully than might have been expected.

For the first time in Poland’s history the peasants have to deal with a government which not only promised but gave them land and is rendering them all possible assistance. Interest in the agrarian reform was not confined to the rural districts; it became a nation-wide affair. The workers, intellectuals and a section of the clergy took a most active part in carrying out the reform. Economic ties between town and country are only just being established, and renascent Polish industry, which is working primarily to supply the needs of the front, will not be able to immediately provide the rural districts with manufactured goods. Nevertheless, the Polish peasantry, fully appreciating the situation, regard it as their patriotic duty to keep the towns supplied. The vast masses of the Polish peasantry have become active and are taking an energetic part in public and political life. Tens of thousands of peasant activists who came to the forefront in the course of carrying out the agrarian reform have joined the ranks of the democratic parties and the Rady Narodowe, or People’s Councils. They are at the head of the peasant mutual aid societies. We have seen these new men and women of the Polish countryside. It is not surprising that they don’t want to have anything to do with the pre-September politicians, with the phantoms of the past. They are organizing the activity of the peasants; and this activity is great, and is constantly growing. The zeal with which the peasants have set to work to restore the cultural institutions in the rural districts is characteristic. In the Minsk-Mazowiecki district alone the mutual aid society has established and is maintaining two peasant high schools. Such a thing was absolutely inconceivable in pre-September Poland.

The agrarian reform has laid the foundation for the economic and cultural development of the Polish rural districts, for the strengthening of the political independence of Poland and for the consolidation of her genuinely democratic regime.

In this extremely important matter too the reactionary émigré politicians have been thrown overboard. The Arciszewskis, and others too, tried to scare the Polish peasants with the spectre of famine and chaos, which, they maintained, would be the inevitable consequence of the agrarian reform introduced by the Provisional Government. These bankrupts, who were carrying out the orders of the Polish land magnates, had the effrontery to describe as “absurd” the agrarian reform, which for the first time created for the Polish peasants conditions for a human existence. Their agents in Poland did not confine themselves to anti-popular propaganda. While the reform was being carried out in the Lublin area there were frequent cases of terrorist acts committed by the cutthroats...
of the so-called Armia Krajowa, who were operating on the orders of the rich landlords. These adventurers tried to intimidate the peasants and assassinated representatives of the democratic parties. In the territories liberated after January 12 these hostile mercenaries displayed far less activity and the peasants resorted to stern and swift measures to thwart their attempts to hinder the distribution of the landlords' land.

The Poles with whom we had occasion to converse expressed surprise that there were still people here and there who allowed themselves to be deceived by the Fairy tales told by the reactionary emigrants in the Arciszewski-Raczkievicz clique and by their accomplices about the "chaos and famine" which, they alleged, are raging in Poland. They pointed to the successful carrying out of radical reforms in the Polish countryside in such a short space of time as the best possible refutation of the hypocritical statements of these renegades.

The Raczkievicz-Arciszewski clique have given their agents the treacherous instruction to multiply and aggravate the difficulties confronting the Polish state and to sabotage the Government's measures to restore industry and to supply the population with food. But none but a handful of inveterate and incorrigible reactionaries respond to these criminal exhortations. The émigré clique counted on being able to drive the country to economic disaster and create political chaos in the midst of which they would be better able to wage their struggle for power, but these calculations have utterly collapsed.

It goes without saying that the results of the five years' rule of the Hitlerites in Poland are making themselves felt in every branch of the national economy. The people will still have to exert enormous efforts to raise the country out of the state of economic ruin; but the main thing is that they are responding to the measures taken by their Provisional Government to overcome this state of affairs with tremendous eagerness and enthusiasm.

The German invaders wrecked a large number of industrial enterprises, and particularly the railways, shipped part of the industrial equipment and raw materials out of the country, ruined the countryside and razed Warsaw to the ground. To cause inflation and to sap the economic strength of the country, they issued worthless paper currency, the so-called Cracow zlotys, to amounts running into billions.

In spite of all this, however, no unbiased observer can fail to see that the Provisional Government is coping with the situation notwithstanding all the difficulties. The restoration of industry has commenced; hundreds of enterprises, including a number of large works and pits in Silesia and textile mills in Lodz, have already been restarted. The Government's energetic financial measures have averted inflation. All the German enterprises have become the property of the Polish state. The state has taken over the largest enterprises in the key industries. Thanks to the patriotic labour enthusiasm of the wage and salaried workers the restoration of industry and the transport system is proceeding at a rapid rate. Work has commenced on the restoration of Warsaw. In the Silesia and Dombrowa coal fields hundreds of thousands of tons of coal have already been brought to the surface. Lodz is already ensured of coal supplies and during the last two weeks has doubled its output of finished goods.

In the Western regions of Poland the Provisional Government has returned the medium and small factories, shops and workshops to their lawful owners who had been robbed of them by the Germans. The Provisional Government is encouraging and assisting private enterprise in the country, is supplying manufacturers, artisans and merchants with raw materials and credits. All this is facilitating the rapid rehabilitation of industry and commerce and enables the Government to control and direct their growth. In spite of all its faults and defects the mechanism of the country's economic life has been set in motion. Its work is improving day by day; it is putting on speed and extending to new regions. This helps to rally all sections of the Polish people still more closely around the Provisional Government and puts the relations between the organs of the state and all groups of the Polish people on a business-like basis.

The country is passing through the first exhilarating months of the organization of the national forces. All sections of the people have awakened from the horrible nightmare of the Hitler occupation and have plunged into the new life. They are hastening to unite and set up their organizations. The trade union movement is growing at a tremendous rate and already unites an army of wage and salaried workers half a million strong. All over the country merchants and artisans are organizing and businessmen's associations are
being formed. Democratic labour legislation serves as the basis for regulating the relations between the workers and the factory administrations on new principles.

Notwithstanding the severe wounds inflicted by the Hitler invaders on the country, notwithstanding the ruin they caused, the Polish people are already making an appreciable contribution to the cause of achieving the utter defeat of Hitlerism. An important achievement of the Provisional Government was the formation and continual strengthening of an efficient army and its equipment with high-grade technical material. The Polish people and their Government understand perfectly well that the primary duty of the Polish state is to wage an armed struggle against the common enemy of the freedom-loving nations, to shoulder to shoulder with the Red Army, and that this struggle must be waged until the complete rout of Hitler Germany is achieved and the danger of German aggression is completely eliminated.

At the present time the Polish Army consists of several hundred thousand well-armed men, strongly united as the result of the battles they have fought for the liberation of their country, and thousands of officers who in patriotism and fighting experience are far superior to the officers of the old pre-September Polish Army. The technical equipment, the fire power, aircraft and tank forces of the new army are also far superior to the old. The Polish Army participated jointly with the Red Army in the gigantic offensive which liberated Poland. Shoulder to shoulder with the men of the Red Army Polish soldiers fought their way to the Baltic and hoisted the flag of the Polish state over the roofs of Gdansk, Gdynia and Kolobrzeg. The reactionary generals, who regarded themselves as indispensable, jointly with the Raczkiewicz Arciszewski clique, prophesied that without their aid no Polish army could be formed. Verily they proved to be bad prophets. On alien soil, far from their Polish motherland, these people are now hatching new plans for reckless adventures against the people. But these plans are fated to meet with the same ignominious failure that met all the previous intrigues of these schemers who are alien and hostile to their people and to the spirit which animates them.

* * *

Important changes have taken place in the political life of the country during the past three months. The increased activity of the population finds striking reflection in the rapid growth of all the democratic parties which are represented in the Provisional Government. Inter-party committees regulate the relations between the different parties on the basis of mutual loyalty and co-operation. At the head of and in the People's Councils there are members of the Polish Workers' Party, the Stronnictwo Ludowe, socialists and democrats, as well as a large number of men and women active in public affairs who are not affiliated to any of the existing parties. This serves to enhance the popular representative character of the People's Councils and links them with all strata of the population.

These organs of democratic self-government are to an increasing degree becoming effective centres of public opinion, initiative and control. As a result the young democratic machinery of state, resting on the all-embracing system of People's Councils, not only reaches every nucleus of public life, but is being reinforced by young and energetic members who are connected with the people. The Polish press, now free from the influence of reaction, is passing through a real renaissance. It quickly reacts to all questions of the day and freely expresses the opinion of the different strata of the public. With the reunion of the Western lands, the forces of Polish democracy have grown considerably. In those districts the influence of the democratic parties was far stronger than in the rest of Poland even during the struggle against the German invaders, and the efforts of the agents of the émigré "government" never met with any appreciable success. This explains the exceptional unanimity with which the Polish inhabitants of these districts welcomed the Provisional Government and its representatives and the support they rendered them from the very first day. It also explains why, in spite of all their efforts, the hangers-on of the Raczkiewicz-Arciszewski clique never succeeded in provoking a single untoward incident either in working-class Lodz or in highly industrialized Silesia and Dombrowa, in Pomerania or in Poznan. The Raczkiewicz-Arciszewski clique and their accomplices have the effrontery to claim that they "represent" the Polish public in these districts, but they are condemned even by those who are known for their conservatism, by representatives of Catholic circles, and so forth.

* * *
The Polish people welcomed the historic decisions of the Crimea Conference with tremendous enthusiasm and unanimity. This is proved not only by official statements and by utterances in the press, but also by the opinions one hears expressed in private conversation with the common people in all walks of life. Exceptional gratification was called forth by the decision of the Crimea Conference to recognize the now functioning Provisional Government as the basis for the formation, by the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland herself and from Poles abroad, of a government which will be recognized by all the Allied powers. The Polish press wrote that this was tantamount to the de facto recognition of the Provisional Government by the Allied powers.

At the same time the Polish public particularly noted that the Crimea decisions completely ignored the London émigré "government." The people of liberated Poland regarded this as incontrovertible proof that the anti-popular Raczkiewicz-Arciszewski clique and their accomplices have been completely removed from the political stage. Under these circumstances, the Polish people are surprised that reactionary émigré cliques are still allowed to cut their antics in the Allied countries and are still playing at being a "government." They ask in perplexity: How long will the Allied democratic powers continue to have dealings with these phantoms of pre-September Poland, with these bankrupts, who cannot and will not be allowed to return to the country?

The people of liberated Poland, now conscious of their strength, naturally do not wish to have any dealings with those who are responsible for the September catastrophe or even with those who follow their lead. Particular displeasure is roused here by the attempts of certain organs of the British and American press to garble the Crimea decisions and to interpret them in a spirit inimical to the interests of liberated Poland. The Polish people are convinced, however, that all the attempts of the advocates of the old and utterly decayed regime of the Polish reactionaries will be shattered by the impact of reality.

INTERNATIONAL LIFE

THE FIRST ROUND IN THE ELECTION FIGHT IN GREAT BRITAIN

In the beginning of April two members of the British Government—the Labourite Ernest Bevin, Minister of Labour and National Service, and the Conservative Brendan Bracken, Minister for Information—delivered speeches which the press appraised as the first signals of the approaching election campaign.

The last general election took place in 1935. A general election was to have taken place in 1940, but in view of the war emergency, the House of Commons, acting on constitutional grounds, prolonged its own existence for another five years. The same wartime circumstances led to a party "truce" and the formation of a coalition government, headed by Churchill. The approaching end of the war has brought up the question of a new general election and of the attitude of the different parties towards the likelihood of the formation of a new coalition government after hostilities cease in Europe.

It is believed that the elections will take place no later than the autumn. The Conservative Party, anxious to preserve its majority in Parliament, desires to extend the election "truce" to the post-war period and is advocating the formation of a new coalition government. The Labour Party takes up a different position. Last May its leaders declared their intention of conducting the forthcoming election campaign on the basis of a Labour program. Several months later, at a Labour Party meeting in Edmonton, the demand was already raised that efforts be made to win a majority in the next Parliament and that a Labour Government be formed.

These two different points of view were reflected in the speeches delivered by Bevin and Bracken.

Speaking at a Labour Party conference in Leeds, Ernest Bevin made a whole list of charges against the Conservative Party,
ing both domestic and foreign policy. He said:

"This Party, which has had a majority for over twenty years, with the short exception of two years and six months, completely failed to prepare for defence or adequately warn the country where it was heading. It ran a foreign policy which nearly brought us and the whole of civilization to the dust. Now they are hoping that the present generation of young electors know nothing about it and that those who are older have forgotten it."

In the opinion of the British press this speech was the harbinger of a fierce election fight. The Observer stated that "Bevin fired the first heavy artillery salvo in Labour's pre-election campaign." Commenting on Bevin's speech, most of the newspapers urged the necessity of hastening the general elections. "The breach between the parties is open and obvious," wrote the Daily Express. "The war is rapidly drawing to a close and the objections to the restoration of full political life in this country are fading away."

Two days later Brendan Bracken, the Minister for Information, spoke at a meeting of the London Conservative Association, and in the course of his address he defended "enterprise" and attacked "state control." Parrying Bevin's thrust at the Conservative Party's pre-war policy Bracken said:

"Mr. Bevin denounced the Conservatives for not warning the country that it was heading for war. But in March 1939 Bevin himself wrote: "The nation is organizing for a war that may never take place."

Bracken's speech gave a further impetus to the controversy that flared up in the columns of the English newspapers over the date of the new general election and the prospects of the formation of a coalition government. After a few days, however, passions died down and newspaper comment became more restrained.

Prime Minister Churchill expressed the opinion that calm had been restored. In answer to a question put to him in the House of Commons by the Labour member John Lawson as to whether peace had broken out on the political front Churchill said:

"There always has been peace and loyalty within, but as we are by general consent moving towards dispute between parties, it is obvious that divergencies of outward expression will occur. No statement has been made, or will be tolerated, or could be tolerated in the interests of representative government and ministerial association, which reflects on the actual policy pursued by the Government."

Thus, the first round in the election fight between the Conservative and the Labour Parties ended in a draw. Both sides sheathed their polemical swords, as if agreeing by common consent to continue the "truce" for some time longer and to limit themselves to recording existing disagreements.

According to the London radio commentator McGeachy, however, the opinion in England is that the coalition is merely an emergency wartime measure and, therefore, the cessation of party conflict is regarded as something like food rationing—a useful but certainly a temporary measure.

Judging by the speeches delivered by Bevin and Bracken, the period of operation of this measure is expiring.

**HITLER'S CATHOLIC AGENTS.**

At the very time when the Red Army was liberating Vienna from the fascist invaders the English Catholic Herald waxed eloquent about the "benefits" Hitler had conferred on Austria. It wrote as follows:

"Under the German occupation the country has been developed as never before. Good second-class petroleum has been discovered. The industries of the Danubian basin have been placed on a sound Pan-European basis. New industries have been established."

What is the meaning of this, to say the least, belated eulogy of the Hitler occupation by this Catholic newspaper? It is quite obvious that no advocates can now save the Hitler regime in Austria, or even in Germany. The fact is that the very idea that the peoples of Central Europe may freely decide their own destiny strikes the reactionary Catholics with horror. In order to deprive the peoples of the freedom they have just regained a plan is mooted to form a Central European, or Danube federation.

This plan envisages the preservation of Central Europe, as the above-mentioned newspaper puts it, of "the economic unity which Germany for her own purposes created among the Austrians and occupied satellite states." The Catholic Herald suggests that it would be a good idea to cap this federation with the Hapsburg crown, to be worn by the Archduke Otto. It tenderly expresses the hope that "the independent control of the monarch will limit the political excesses which, as the last two decades have demonstrated, are an eternal occasion of sin for dominating demagogues." If the worst comes to the worst, the newspaper would be content with "association."
without an Anointed of the Lord on the throne.

The one thing these Catholic hypocrites are concerned about is to prevent the actual free existence of the peoples of Central Europe; and they are determined to achieve this by hook or by crook. They are determined to save at all costs the quintessence of Hitlerism, that “economic unity” of Central Europe which is to be the basis of the preservation of Pan-Germanism minus the swastika. This “economic unity,” surmounted by a corresponding political superstructure, they regard as a guarantee of the erection of a powerful outpost of reaction in Central Europe.

But these insidious plans are not destined to be carried out. The peoples of Central Europe, to whom the Red Army has restored their freedom, will accept neither the Hapsburg monarchy nor its double in the shape of the disreputable Danube federation.

WITHOUT KITH OR KIN

Dziennik Polski—Dziennik Zolnierza, the official organ of the emigre Polish “government,” expresses extreme displeasure at the formation of the new Czechoslovak Government. And, it appears, what displeases these ex-Poles more than all is that in her relations with a number of neighbouring countries Czechoslovakia intends to display “the spirit of Slavonic friendship.” Jeering at this idea, the fascist scribes of this emigre sheet write:

“Acts of friendship such as the massacre of Serbs by Croatians, as the attacks of Bulgarians upon Serbs, and the fight the Slovak units waged against the Russians on the Eastern front are still fresh in people’s minds.”

“Forgetting” to mention that all these cases of black treachery—as well as Beck’s anti-Soviet policy in pre-war Poland—were the handiwork of Hitler’s hangers-on who betrayed their country, this Polish émigré newspaper states:

“The Slavonic idea is discredited in present-day Europe.”

Needless to say, it is not the Slavonic idea—the idea of the unity of the Slavonic peoples, born of blood and suffering in the struggle against German aggression—that is discredited, but the Hitler mouthpieces with Polish names, those creatures without national kith or kin, who mock and jeer at the destiny of the Slavonic peoples, including the Polish people, to whom they no longer belong.

In Dairen

Travel Notes
A. SUBBOTIN

I HAVE travelled through many parts of the world in the last year or two, but no country had such a depressing effect upon me as Northern China and Manchuria, and Dairen, the chief city in the Kwantung leased territory, in particular.

I was in Dairen last winter, on my way from Shanghai. This was my second visit to this town. I was there the first time four years ago, before the Japanese navy attacked Pearl Harbour, I could not help noticing this time how much the Japanese-occupied cities of Northern China and Manchuria bore the impress of the crisis of the Japanese empire, like the indelible traces of disease on the face of a chronically sick man.

Dairen—formerly known as Port Dalny—is a big and beautiful city situated on the tip of the Kwantung Peninsula. High greenish-yellow hills covered with sparse vegetation surround the city on all sides and hem it against the sea. The South-Manchurian Railway connects the port with Manchuria. The railway, the port and the old city of Dalny were all built by the Russians.

In 1905, the port and city were ceded to Japan under the Treaty of Portsmouth, and Dalny was renamed Dairen. As one enters Dairen, one sees on the left side of the railway blocks of buildings designed in typical Russian style. On the right side the Japanese built a new town, in accordance with plans which had been drawn up by Russian engineers.

The centre of Dairen is Ohiroba Square, from which trim, handsome streets radiate in all
directions. This is the Japanese part of Dairen. It differs very markedly from the districts where the Chinese live. The streets in the centre of the city are tidy and asphalted. There is plenty of greenery—squares, gardens and laid-out parks. In the spring this section of the city is gay with the blossoms of the sakura, the Japanese cherry. Here are located the Japanese public buildings, offices, banks, big shops, and the smart mansions of Japanese officials, military and rich merchants and industrialists. In the daytime the streets in the central part of the city are filled with a quaint and gaily coloured throng: Chinese and Japanese in national and European dress, Japanese women in bright kimonos with broad girdles and in clattering wooden clogs (geta), and women standing in queues with their infants securely strapped to their backs. Gaunt, yellow-faced, weary-looking and perpetually hungry rickshawmen speed past, drawing their vehicles.

In the Chinese section of the city the streets are narrow, crooked and dirty, and the stench is stifling, especially in the summer months. In the evening grimy and ragged coolies crowd around the maize cake vendors.

According to official statistics, the population of Dairen towards the end of July 1941 was over 690,000, of which 188,000 were Japanese and the rest mainly Chinese. There are very few Europeans now, and no Americans or Englishmen. There are about a hundred German "merchants" in the town, owners of various import and export houses, but now undoubtedly engaged in other affairs. There are also 700 or 800 Russian White émigrés. They may be easily distinguished in the street from the other Europeans by their shabby clothing.

The Chinese in Dairen are chiefly unskilled labourers—coolies, rickshawmen, petty artisans and the urban poor generally. All key positions are held by Japanese, and all the skilled workers in the factories are likewise Japanese. The Chinese are chiefly employed for auxiliary jobs. The Japanese are just now experiencing an extreme shortage of technical personnel. The question where to find people for industry and the railways is discussed both in the press and in private conversation.

In recent years the outward appearance of Dairen has markedly changed. This is particularly noticeable in the port. Equipped on modern lines, it is, after Shanghai, the second largest port on the whole coast from the Okhotsk Sea to the South China Sea. In the year immediately preceding the Japanese attack on America extensive work was undertaken in the port: new wharves were built, machinery installed, etc. There were always several dozen merchantmen from various countries lying in the roads. One of the few open ports in the Far East, Dairen played a big part in the trade of that region, and was of particular importance to the Japanese economy. Through this port passed nearly the whole of the export trade from Manchuria. Here American, Soviet, British, Dutch, Swedish and other vessels loaded soya bean, Pulatien peanuts, Kwantung apples, and other produce. The port hummed like a gigantic hive and stevedores were as active as bees hauling huge sacks and cases. Hundreds of Chinese junks, with their high, patched sails, dexterously weaved in and out among the steamships in the roads. The rattling of the cranes, the clanging of anchor chains, the piercing whistles of tugboats and launches merged with the siren calls of ocean steamers announcing to the port authorities their arrival in the roads. Activity in the port did not cease day or night. Now the port is dead. There are rarely more than three or four ships at their moorings. The winches are silent. The port is practically deserted. And only the shipyards, where vessels are being built to replenish the fast-diminishing Japanese merchant marine, are working at top pressure.

The outward appearance of Dairen has likewise changed. The city is dirtier, the throngs of British, American and Soviet sailors have disappeared, and nearly all the Chinese and European shops have shut down. The once gay shop windows and the colourful tiny Chinese stores now have their shutters down, or else are boarded up; and their doors are fastened with heavy padlocks. The Japanese imposed such heavy taxes on the Chinese merchants that they were either completely ruined or forced to give up business. Traders are closing down their shops and quitting Northern China. It is noteworthy, however, that they do not surrender possession of their premises—they evidently hope for "better times."

The tramcars in Dairen are now mostly run by Chinese youths. The drivers, conductors and ticket inspectors are all lads of 16-16. That misadventures, to put it mildly, sometimes occur is not surprising. True, accidents are rare, because the tramcars are few and they only run along the principal streets.
In the evening the city dies down. Theatres and cinema houses close at half past seven or eight. The city is blacked out. Only here and there at street intersections lamps burning at half power glimmer feebly. The bars, restaurants and dance halls in which Dairen used to abound are shut down. In the whole city there are only two or three saloons where, after waiting an hour or two in line, you may get a glass of beer, and that not always.

Cultural life in Dairen, generally of a low standard, is still lower now. According to official data, there were in 1942 only three secondary schools, one technical school, three business colleges, seven girls’ schools and seventeen elementary schools. Formerly there were European and Chinese clubs, a seamen’s club and a sports society. These are all closed down. There are five or six Japanese and another four or five Chinese cinema theatres, but they are poorly frequented. Firstly, the admission price—one and a half or two yen—is too high for the majority of the population, and, secondly, the films shown in these houses are extremely uninteresting. Particularly primitive and dull are the Japanese films. The only exceptions are the newsreels and scientific films, which are sometimes quite successful. But for a European a Japanese story film is real torture. The theme is usually borrowed from feudal times, from the life of the Samurai. If, by way of exception, the story is set in modern times there is a complete absence of action. Conversation is the only thing that takes place on the screen: Japanese are sitting in one room talking, then they pass to another room and go on talking—and there often enough the matter ends.

Chinese films are a little more lively and meaty. Their producers strive to imitate the Americans. It is noteworthy that the Chinese never visit the Japanese cinema, but that the Japanese often go to see Chinese films. Before the war American and British films were popular—now they are never shown. Of the European films, only some old French ones are sometimes shown. Both Japanese and Chinese eagerly go to see them.

There are Japanese and Chinese theatres in Dairen, although they have no permanent companies. Japanese actors come on tour, usually for two or three days, from Tokyo, Osaka or Kobe. These theatres perform light Japanese pieces and extremely inept political skits, lampooning Americans, British, and the Europeans generally.

Like any foreigner, I was naturally interested in the relations existing between the Chinese and Japanese populations of Manchuria. After all, Manchukuo was solemnly proclaimed by the Japanese a “sphere of co-prosperity.” The Japanese press zealously dilates on the advantages of the “new order” established in Eastern Asia and calls the Chinese “brothers in race and blood.”

One does not have to stay long in Manchuria to learn the truth about the “new order” and to ascertain the real state of the “sphere of co-prosperity” economically and politically.

It will be best, perhaps, to start with the economic side. Here is one of the very first impressions one gains. Soon after passing through the frontier station between Manchuria and the Kwantung province one sees along the railway line (the former Chinese Eastern Railway) near the station huge piles of grain and soya bean, nearly as high as a two-storied house, lying in the open, unpacked and without any covering. Soya bean has long been one of Manchuria’s staple products and her chief article of export. While Manchuria was outside the “sphere of co-prosperity,” the bean was exported to all countries of the world, including America, Britain and the Soviet Union. Not only can the soya bean be made up into “14 appetizing and nourishing dishes,” as the reader knows from the works of Ilf and Petrov, but soya is also used for the manufacture of powerful explosives. In 1943, it is said, the Japanese were still in a position to export soya bean from Manchuria. But they were unable to do so in 1944. The Manchurian peasants bring the bean to the railway stations and there it lies owing to the lack of rolling stock and packing material, and will evidently go on lying there until the first rains, which are bound to ruin it.

The state of the Japanese war economy is eloquently attested by the gardens and parks, which have been stripped of their fences, and by the iron lamp posts, which are to be seen lying here and there in the streets of Dairen. By way of collecting, not metal scrap this time (all stocks of that were exhausted long ago), but metal articles generally, the Japanese authorities in Dairen removed the iron fences from houses and parks, the iron treads from staircases in houses and office buildings, the traffic signs and the iron posts at street crossings, metal signboards, etc. After that they even began removing the radiators from houses and offices equipped
with central heating. This was all done, as I was told by Dairen inhabitants, eight or nine months ago. But having stripped away all this metal, the Japanese were unable to find transportation for it. It was all carried to the port where most of it lies to this day. The local inhabitants, who in the winter suffered cruelly from the cold in their homes deprived of central heating, could come and admire their radiators and pipes dumped on the wharfside. And some of the dismantled lamp posts are still lying around the streets.

Late one evening, in a half-empty streetcar, I got talking to my neighbour, an elderly Chinese railwayman. The track was in a bad state of disrepair and the car swayed violently. We both expressed the opinion that the track ought to be repaired. Taking advantage of a moment when there was no one near, my neighbour remarked:

"Not much chance of new rails being laid! We are removing the second track from the South-Manchurian Railway. And not only the rails, but even the sleepers. We used to build formerly, now we are tearing down. There is not enough metal for guns."

My neighbour added a few words about the hard times that have come to the Chinese, and then sidled away from me, evidently fearing eavesdroppers.

To all appearances, he was a fairly high-placed railway official, for his chest was lavishly ornamented with decoration braids, which are worn there instead of ribbons.

The poor Chinese, especially the peasants, are more outspoken in their complaints about the Japanese invaders. The overwhelming majority of the Chinese live in poverty. The coolies and workers engaged in arduous physical labour are chronically undernourished. One sees nothing on their tables except maize cakes, onions and radishes.

I was told that in the rural districts of the Kwantung province it was impossible in the summer to buy a head of cabbage or an onion. An acquaintance of mine once asked a peasant why he would not sell vegetables. The latter pointed to his small allotment and said:

"Look over there! Every plant, every bush is counted. Everything is registered. If I pull a single onion it will go hard with me...."

During harvest time, commissions, each consisting of a regular staff of officials accompanied by a policeman, wander through the peasants’ fields and allotments and decide how much produce is to be left to the peasants to prevent his family from dying of starvation. Everything else he is obliged to deliver to the government storehouses, receiving in return for his produce a miserably small sum not nearly enough to compensate him for his labour.

It is therefore not surprising that agriculture in the Kwantung province is in a deplorable state. The peasants do their utmost to sabotage the orders of the Japanese authorities and their attempts to mulct the countryside of all the produce they can. In 1944 all Japanese schoolchildren and housewives were put to agricultural work in order in some degree to ensure the supply of produce to the town. This attempt to find a substitute for the labour of the Chinese peasant did not, of course, result in any material improvement to the Japanese economy. The food situation is critical. The towns are poorly supplied. Bread is baked only for Europeans—it does not figure in the rations of the Chinese and Japanese population. All that the Chinese worker receives on his ration card is kaoliang—a local millet, of very low nutritional value—and maize. The Japanese are issued rice.

In the waiting room of one of the stations on the South-Manchurian Railway, I entered into conversation with a Chinese student, who said to me:

"The Japanese rob us and at the same time assure us that if we go hungry and ragged it is our own fault. They advise us to display more initiative and resource: they recommend that we make shoes of grass or 'invent' clothing which will not require the expenditure of cotton fabric."

This student also told me that the young Chinese who are educated in the Japanese-controlled schools in Dairen have an excellent knowledge of Japanese history and can enumerate all the Japanese dynasties, but that they know absolutely nothing about China, neither her past nor present.

For decades the Japanese military hammered into the minds of the youth that the Japanese were a superior and 'divine' race, and that all other nations, including the Chinese, were inferior human breeds. These theories have always governed the attitude of the Japanese conquerors towards the Chinese population. All the talk and all the agitation indulged in of late by the Japanese press about the "unity of the Asiatic races," about the Chinese being "blood brothers" of the Japanese, and so forth, are only a blind
Here is a scene I witnessed in the streets of Dairen on the first day of my arrival, and which I saw repeated several times: a Chinese stands in the middle of the street with head uncovered. A policeman is shouting and waving his arms threateningly at him. The Chinese goes forward and—kisses the semaphore post at the street intersection. It appears that he had infringed some traffic rule. The Japanese police in Dairen are not particularly delicate in their treatment of the Chinese. Peasants from the surrounding countryside, who are unfamiliar with the traffic rules, are always coming into Dairen, and even among the population of the city suburbs there are many who are not quite sure about these rules. Sometimes a policeman, with nothing better to do, will collect several such delinquents and make them stand in the middle of the street with bared heads until his shift is over.

Every Japanese treats as an inferior every Chinese, no matter what his station may be. He demands unreserved obedience and considers himself entitled to give any command he likes to the first Chinese he meets. The Chinese population is terrorized. When a Japanese boards a crowded tramcar he has only to stare expressively at the nearest Chinese for the latter instantly to leap to his feet and surrender his place. He knows that if he displays any tardiness the stare will be followed by a slap in the face. The Chinese are afraid to express their indignation openly, for they know that punishment will not be long in following, and they will be lucky if it is nothing more than imprisonment. Nevertheless, the real attitude of the population towards the Japanese invaders now and again manifests itself in fairly vivid forms. Typical are the scenes I have witnessed during air alerts. When American aircraft are on their way to bomb the Japanese islands, the alert is sounded in Dairen. The Japanese, men and women, as a rule, make hastily for the bomb shelters and refuges. But you should see the Chinese at such moments! They stop and stare after the fleeing Japanese and laugh without restraint.

When Japanese and Chinese line up outside a shop where some scarce article, cigarettes, say, is on sale, any Japanese may push any and all the Chinese out of the line and arrange a line for Japanese only. On the whole, the shops have very scanty stocks of goods, and these are of extremely poor quality. Many of the articles—underlinen, shirts, and women's kerchiefs—bear the sign: "Not sold to Manchurians." It should be said that "Manchurian" is the official name given by the Japanese to the Chinese living in the Kwantung province and in Manchuria.

As a fairly good illustration of the political "independence" which the Japanese promised Manchukuo, I might cite the practices prevailing in Manchurian government offices. The Chinese officials dare not make a move without the Japanese authorities. It is related that when you apply to them to make out some document the invariable reply is that it cannot be done at once and that you will have to come back a fortnight or so later. When you ask the reason for the delay you are told that the stamp first of some Japanese official, and then of some Japanese officer, is necessary. A Manchukuo government office cannot even use its own stamp; it is usually kept by a Japanese.

During my last visit I could not help noticing that the occupation authorities in Dairen were obviously depressed. Evidently this is due to the disastrous turn the war situation is taking for the Japanese. Not a trace was left of the truculence which the Japanese displayed roughly until the middle of 1943, when the Soviet-German front was still only a short distance from Moscow. At that time the Dairen newspapers dilated on the Hitlerites' successes and the cinema houses showed films extolling fascist Germany. The barometer of Japanese feeling kept falling, as we know, with the changes in the military and political situation.

When the Americans began their regular bombing of Japan proper, the occupation authorities in Dairen fell into deep dejection. The population of Dairen is very poorly and wrongly informed of the real situation at the front and of international affairs. Nevertheless, it is aware of the main trend of events. Furthermore, Japanese officials, more or less informed about the state of affairs, are latterly making no attempt to conceal their alarm. One observes among them an obvious dread of "what will happen" after the defeat of Hitler Germany. This dread is betrayed not only by the Japanese, but also by those Chinese who are connected with them, or who are in their service, such as officials, policemen and gendarmes...
April 1

The troops of the Third Ukrainian Front captured Sopron, an important stronghold in the German defences on the approaches to Vienna.

The troops of the First Ukrainian Front captured the town and fortress of Glogau (Glogow), on the left bank of the Oder.

The troops of the Second Ukrainian Front captured Tnavy, Hlohovec and Senec, covering the approaches to Bratislava.

Allied troops completed the encirclement of the Ruhr industrial region.

April 2

Red Army troops, jointly with Bulgarian troops, captured Nagykanizsa, the centre of the Hungarian oil industry, and also took Magyarovar.


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

Mrs. Clementine Churchill, President of the British Red Cross Aid to Russia Fund, arrived in Moscow.

April 3

The troops of the Third Ukrainian Front captured Wiener Neustadt, Eisenstadt, Neunkirchen and Gloggnitz, important strongpoints in the German defences on the approaches to Vienna.

The troops of the Second Ukrainian Front, jointly with Rumanian forces, occupied the town and railway station of Kremnica.

April 4

The troops of the Second Ukrainian Front stormed and captured Bratislava, the principal city of Slovakia.

A new Government headed by Zdenek Fierlinger was formed in Czechoslovakia.


April 5

The troops of the Second Ukrainian Front captured Malacky and Bruck, and also stormed and captured Prievizda and Banovec in the Carpathian zone.

The troops of the Fourth Ukrainian Front captured Ruzomberok, on the river Vah, in Czechoslovakia.

Marshal Josip Broz-Tito, President of the Council of Ministers of Yugoslavia, accompanied by I. Subasic, Yugoslav Minister for Foreign Affairs, Lieutenant General M. Djilas, Minister for Montenegro Affairs, and others, arrived in Moscow.


Japanese Prime Minister Koiso announced the collective resignation of the Cabinet.

The Extraordinary State Commission for Establishing and Investigating the Atrocities of the German Fascist Invaders and Their Accomplices issued a communiqué on the crimes committed by the German invaders in the Latvian Socialist Republic.

Allied troops cleared Kassel of the enemy and captured Karlsruhe.

The Chile Government declared war on Japan.

April 6

Marshal J. V. Stalin, President of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R., had a conversation with Marshal J. Broz-Tito, President of the Council of Ministers of Yugoslavia.

V. M. Molotov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., had a conversation with I. Subasic, Yugoslav Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Yugoslav forces stormed and captured Sarajevo, principal city of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

April 7

J. V. Stalin, President of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R., received Mrs. Clementine Churchill, President of the British Red Cross Aid to Russia Fund.

A new Government, headed by Admiral Suzuki, was formed in Japan.

In the salt mines south of Mühlenhausen, United States troops captured the gold reserves of the German Reichsbank.

At a meeting of the National Council of the Communist Party of Italy Palmiro Togliatti made a lengthy report on the political situation.

April 8

The Anatolian Agency published the Turkish Government's reply to the notice given by the Soviet Government of its denunciation of the Turkish-Soviet pact of December 17, 1925.

The Plastiras Government of Greece resigned.

Yugoslav troops liberated Breka.
April 9

The troops of the Third Byelorussian Front stormed and captured the fortress and principal city of East Prussia, Königsberg.

The Soviet Government's statement on Austria, and the appeal of Marshal Tolbukhin, Commander-in-Chief of the Third Ukrainian Front, to the inhabitants of Vienna, were published.

Great Britain, the United States and nineteen other American republics resumed diplomatic relations with Argentina.

Finnish Prime Minister Paasikivi handed the President the resignation of his Government.

Admiral Vulgaris formed a new Greek Cabinet.

April 10

Winston Churchill stated in the House of Commons that from the beginning of the war to the end of February, this year, the casualties suffered by the armed forces of the British Commonwealth amounted to 1,126,602, of which 306,984 were killed. War casualties among the civilian population of Great Britain amounted to 144,542, of which 59,793 were killed.

April 11

A Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Post-War Collaboration was signed between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

M. I. Kalinin, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., received Marshal J. Broz-Tito, President of the Council of Ministers of Yugoslavia.

J. V. Stalin, President of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R., gave a dinner in the Kremlin in honour of Marshal J. Broz-Tito, President of the Council of Ministers of Yugoslavia.

United States troops occupied Hanover.

The Provisional Government of the Polish Republic issued a decree introducing universal compulsory labour service.

April 12

At 8.36 p.m., Greenwich time, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States, died at Warm Springs, Georgia.

In conformity with the United States Constitution, Vice-President Harry Truman took up the post of President of the United States.

In the area of the Ruhr "pocket" the United States troops occupied Essen and Gelsenkirchen, and entered Bochum.

April 13

Troops of the Third Ukrainian Front, supported by troops of the Second Ukrainian Front, after stubborn street fighting, captured Vienna, capital of Austria.

Troops of the Second Ukrainian Front captured Hodonin, on Czechoslovak territory, on the western bank of the river Morava.

J. V. Stalin, President of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R., received U.S. Ambassador to the U.S.S.R. W. A. Harriman; V. M. Molotov, People's Comissar of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., was present at the interview.

American troops landed on Bohol Island (Philippines).

April 15

Troops of the Third Ukrainian Front captured on Austrian territory Sankt-Pölten, important road hub and formidable stronghold of the Germans' defences on the river Traisen.

Troops of the Second Ukrainian Front, in conjunction with troops of the Third Ukrainian Front, captured Korneuburg and Florisdorf, powerful strongpoints of the German defences on the left bank of the Danube.
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