

For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy!

Bucharest. Organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1954

PRICE 3d (8 cents)

No. 49 (317)

For Peace and Collective Security in Europe

A Conference of European states on ensuring peace and security in Europe was held in Moscow between November 29 and December 2. A representative of the People's Republic of China was present in the capacity of an observer. Held in an atmosphere of cordiality and friendship the Conference demonstrated the unswerving will of the peace-loving states to uphold the cause of peace and ensure European security.

The participants in the Conference considered in detail the situation which has arisen in Europe as a result of the signing by certain Western states of the separate Paris agreements on remilitarising Western Germany and incorporating it in military alignments directed against the peace-loving states in Europe. The Conference unanimously endorsed a Declaration—a document of great international importance, containing a profound and detailed analysis of the present international situation and showing the only correct path to the settlement of the German problem and establishment of a system of collective security in Europe.

The Declaration stresses that the ratification of the Paris agreements, which the U.S.A., Britain and France want to push through at any cost, and the implementation of these agreements would bring about a serious aggravation of the situation in Europe since it would not only create still greater obstacles in the way of solving the German question and restoring the unity of Germany as a peace-loving and democratic state, but would also counterpose one part of Germany to the other, converting Western Germany into a danger centre of a new war in Europe.

In defiance of the clearly expressed will of the peace-loving peoples the Paris agreements give a free hand to the militarists and reactionaries in Western Germany and further endanger the security of the European countries. They envisage the building up of a half million-strong army in Western Germany under the command of Hitlerite generals who only recently were the organisers and accomplices of fascist aggression against the peoples of both Eastern and Western Europe. They are putting atomic weapons into the hands of those who only recently implanted the bloody Hitler "new order", brought death and destruction to Europe and set themselves the aim of exterminating whole nations, of those who in the death camps exterminated millions of civilians—Poles, Russians, Ukrainians, Czechs,

of the Paris agreements. They need the restoration of German militarism as the basis for a deal with the German militarists, and, with the help of the military groupings they are building up, to exert greater pressure on the Soviet Union and other peace-loving states in Europe.

But the ruling circles of the Western Powers should have realised long ago that no threats can intimidate the Soviet people, that one cannot scare the democratic countries, where power is exercised by the working class in alliance with the working peasantry and which are successfully advancing along the path of building Socialism. The peoples of these countries have confidence in their strength and inexhaustible resources. Never before have the forces of peace and Socialism been so powerful and united as now!

The settlement of the German question is the basic task in strengthening peace in Europe. The Declaration of the Moscow Conference stresses that to solve this problem it is necessary first of all to abandon the plans for the remilitarisation of Western Germany and its incorporation into military groupings, which would remove the main barriers on the path of the reunification of Germany on a peaceful and democratic footing; to come to an agreement on holding free all-German elections in 1955 and on this basis forming an all-German Government of a united, democratic and peace-loving Germany. It is only under such conditions that the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany will become possible, this being essential for consolidating peace in Europe.

Genuine security in Europe, the Declaration emphasises, can only be ensured if, instead of setting up closed military groupings of certain European countries spearheaded against the others, a system of collective security in Europe is established. Such a system of security based on the participation of all European countries, irrespective of their social and state system, would make it possible for the European countries to combine their efforts in the interests of ensuring peace in Europe. It goes without saying that the German people must be ensured the right of an equal partner in solving this task which is of importance for the whole of Europe.

The establishment of a system of collective security in Europe fully corresponds to the needs of strengthening international cooperation in conformity with the principles of respecting the independence and sovereignty of big and small countries and non-interference in their home affairs.

The participants in the Moscow Conference fully subscribed to the principles formulated in the draft "General European

COMMUNIQUE of the Moscow Conference of European Countries on Ensuring Peace and Security in Europe

The Conference of European Countries on Ensuring Peace and Security in Europe took place between November 29 and December 2 in Moscow. The participating countries are the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the People's Republic of Albania.

The following representatives of the above-mentioned countries took part in the Conference:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics — V. M. Molotov (head of the delegation), First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR; A. A. Gromyko, First Deputy Foreign Minister; A. M. Puzanov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR; N. T. Kalchenko, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR; K. T. Mazurov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Byelorussian SSR; V. T. Latzis, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Latvian SSR; A. A. Miurisep, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Estonian SSR; M. A. Gedvilas, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Lithuanian SSR; and V. A. Zorin, Deputy Foreign Minister;

The Polish People's Republic — Josef Cyrankiewicz (head of the delegation), Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic; Marjan Naszkowski, Deputy Foreign Minister; and Waclaw Lewikowski, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the USSR;

The Czechoslovak Republic — Viliam Siroky (head of the delegation), Prime Minister; Vaclav David, Foreign Minister; Emanuel Slechta, Minister of Construction; Josef Plojhar, Minister of Health; and Jaromir Vosahlik, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the USSR;

The German Democratic Republic — Otto Grotewohl (head of the delegation), Prime Minister; Walter Ulbricht, Deputy Prime Minister; Lothar Bolz, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs; Otto Nuschke, Deputy Prime Minister; Dr. Hans Loch, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Finance; Berthold Rose, Secretary-General of the Democratic Peasant Party of Germany; and Rudolf Appelt, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the USSR;

The Hungarian People's Republic — Andras Hegedüs (head of the delegation), First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers; Janos Boldoczki, Foreign Minister; Endre Sik, Deputy Foreign Minister; and Ferenc Münnich, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the USSR;

The Rumanian People's Republic — Stoica Chivu (head of the delegation), First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers; Simion Bughici, Foreign Minister; Grigore Preoteasa, First Deputy Foreign Minister; and Ion Rab, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the USSR;

The People's Republic of Bulgaria — Anton Yugov (head of the delegation), First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers; Georgi Traikov, First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers; Mincho Neichev, Foreign Minister; and Carlo Lukanov, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the USSR;

The People's Republic of Albania — Manush Muffiu (head of the delegation), Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers; Behar Stylla, Foreign Minister; and Mihal Prifti, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the USSR.

Chang Wen-tien, Deputy Foreign Minister and Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the USSR, took part in the Conference as an observer from the People's Republic of China.

The participants in the Conference thoroughly considered the situation which has arisen in Europe in connection with the signing of the separate Paris agreements by certain Western states on the remilitarisation of Western Germany and its inclusion in the military groupings directed against the peace-loving countries of Europe.

The Conference proceeded in an atmosphere of cordiality and friendship and showed complete unanimity in relation to the measures it will be necessary to undertake in the interests of ensuring peace in Europe in the event of the Paris agreements being ratified.

The Conference adopted a joint Declaration of the Governments of the USSR, the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the People's Republic of Albania.

THE SIGNING OF THE DECLARATION

At 6 p.m. on December 2, the joint Declaration of the Governments of the USSR, the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the People's Republic of Albania was signed in the Kremlin. It was signed:

for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics — V. Molotov
for the Polish People's Republic — J. Cyrankiewicz
for the Czechoslovak Republic — V. Siroky
for the German Democratic Republic — O. Grotewohl
for the Hungarian People's Republic — A. Hegedüs

for the Rumanian People's Republic — S. Chivu
for the People's Republic of Bulgaria — A. Yugov
for the People's Republic of Albania — M. Muffiu
All members of the delegations of the countries which took part in the Conference and Chang Wen-tien, the representative of the People's Republic of China, who attended as an observer, were present at the signing of the Declaration.

The signing of the Declaration took place in the presence of Comrades N. A. Bulganin, K. E. Voroshilov, L. M. Kaganovich, G. M. Malenkov, A. I. Mikoyan, M. G. Pervukhin, M. Z. Saburov, N. S. Khrushchev, A. N. Kosygin, V. A. Malyshev, I. F. Tevosyan, M. A. Suslov, Marshal A. M. Vasilevski, Marshal G. K. Zhukov and others.

DECLARATION

of the Governments of the USSR, Polish People's Republic, Czechoslovak Republic, German Democratic Republic, Hungarian People's Republic, People's Republic of Bulgaria and the People's Republic of Albania

ation of these agreements would bring about a serious aggravation of the situation in Europe since it would not only create still greater obstacles in the way of solving the German question and restoring the unity of Germany as a peace-loving and democratic state, but would also counterpose one part of Germany to the other, converting Western Germany into a danger centre of a new war in Europe.

In defiance of the clearly expressed will of the peace-loving peoples the Paris agreements give a free hand to the militarists and revanchists in Western Germany and further endanger the security of the European countries. They envisage the building up of a half million-strong army in Western Germany under the command of Hitlerite generals who only recently were the organisers and accomplices of fascist aggression against the peoples of both Eastern and Western Europe. They are putting atomic weapons into the hands of those who only recently brought death and destruction to Europe and set themselves the aim of exterminating whole nations, of those who in the death camps exterminated millions of civilians—Poles, Russians, Jews, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, French, Serbians, Czechs, Slovaks, Belgians, Norwegians and others—and who now again declare their revenge-seeking plans in Europe.

By reviving German militarism and giving the militarists actual control and emergency powers the Paris agreements pave the way for establishing in Western Germany a regime of military dictatorship. Profoundly alien to the interests of the German people, these agreements are directly designed against the German working class, against the democratic forces in Western Germany. They signify nothing but a blunt refusal to settle the German problem, to restore the unity of Germany for a long time to come. It is precisely the plans for remilitarising Western Germany and incorporating it into military groupings which at present constitute the main obstacle to the national reunification of Germany.

By signing the Paris agreements the ruling circles in the U.S.A., Britain and France have embarked on the dangerous course of reviving German militarism, have entered into an open military alliance with the German revanchists. Such an aggressive alliance cannot serve the interests of peace and security. Its formation makes for the aggravation of the entire situation in Europe and greatly intensifies the threat of a new world war. The restoration of Germany's unity and the ensurance of peace in Europe dictate that the revival of German militarism be rendered impossible.

It is quite obvious, however, that the ruling circles of the Western Powers are interested not in the unity of Germany but in the possibility of utilising its Western part in fostering their aggressive aims. All kinds of tricks are being employed to hoodwink the public. They say that the Paris agreements contain some kind of "guarantees" which allegedly prevent any possible aggression by German militarism. It is common knowledge, however, that such "guarantees" were given in the past, too, but they did not stop Nazi Germany from unleashing World War II. The assertions of the ruling circles of the Western Powers to the effect that a new military grouping is necessary for the security of its member-states are also groundless and false, since it is well known to everybody that no one threatens these states.

No matter how the ruling circles of the Western Powers try to justify the formation of military groupings with the participation of a remilitarised Western Germany they will fail to conceal the true meaning

of an all-German Government on the basis of a united, democratic and peace-loving Germany. It is only under such conditions that the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany will become possible, this being essential for consolidating peace in Europe.

Genuine security in Europe, the Declaration emphasises, can only be ensured if, instead of setting up closed military groupings of certain European countries spear-headed against the others, a system of collective security in Europe is established. Such a system of security based on the participation of all European countries, irrespective of their social and state system, would make it possible for the European countries to combine their efforts in the interests of ensuring peace in Europe. It goes without saying that the German people must be ensured the right of an equal partner in solving this task which is of importance for the whole of Europe.

The establishment of a system of collective security in Europe fully corresponds to the needs of strengthening international co-operation in conformity with the principles of respecting the independence and sovereignty of big and small countries and non-interference in their home affairs.

The participants in the Moscow Conference fully subscribed to the principles formulated in the draft "General European Treaty on Collective Security in Europe" submitted by the Soviet Government and called upon all European countries jointly to consider these proposals which are in accord with the requirements of ensuring a lasting peace in Europe. They expressed readiness to study any other proposals on this question with a view to elaborating a draft Treaty on European Collective Security that would be acceptable to all countries concerned. Only the collective efforts of the European countries can lay the basis for a lasting and durable peace in Europe.

But if the restoration of aggressive German militarism becomes a reality, if the military groupings of certain West European countries increase their armies, air forces and other armaments, the other countries of Europe will inevitably be compelled to take effective measures to counterpose to the aggressive forces of the military bloc of Western Powers their joint might, to protect the peaceful labour of their peoples, guarantee the inviolability of their borders and territories and assure their defence against possible aggression. Every attempt to attack, unleash war and interfere with or interrupt the peaceful life of the peoples of the democratic camp will encounter a crushing rebuff!

The policy of the countries of the democratic camp which is aimed at strengthening peace and general security, and the measures mapped out by the Moscow Conference correspond to the interests of all peace-loving peoples. They will be definitely approved by everybody who cherishes peace and security in Europe. They will promote the further, still more powerful consolidation of the peace-loving forces in the struggle for peace and security.

The struggle against the Paris agreements has entered a decisive stage. The Communist and Workers' Parties, the most consistent fighters for the interests of peoples, consider the Declaration of the Moscow Conference to be an important contribution to the cause of peace, to be a document of immense mobilising significance. They consider it to be an important task to bring this Declaration to all sections of the population of their countries, rally the broadest popular masses and all the peace-loving forces for a resolute and selfless struggle and for vigorous activity against the ratification of the Paris agreements and against the revival of German militarism.

The serious threat to peace and the security of the peoples which the Paris agreements represent can and must be prevented!

Minister of Health; and Iaromir Vosahlik, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the USSR;

The German Democratic Republic — Otto Grotewohl (head of the delegation), Prime Minister; Walter Ulbricht, Deputy Prime Minister; Lothar Bolz, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs; Otto Nuschke, Deputy Prime Minister; Dr. Hans Loch, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Finance; Berthold Rose, Secretary-General of the Democratic Peasant Party of Germany; and Rudolf Appelt, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the USSR;

THE SIGNING OF THE DECLARATION

At 6 p.m. on December 2, the joint Declaration of the Governments of the USSR, the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the People's Republic of Albania was signed in the Kremlin. It was signed:

for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics — V. Molotov
for the Polish People's Republic — J. Cyrankiewicz
for the Czechoslovak Republic — V. Siroky
for the German Democratic Republic — O. Grotewohl
for the Hungarian People's Republic — A. Hegedüs

for the Rumanian People's Republic — S. Chivu
for the People's Republic of Bulgaria — A. Yugov
for the People's Republic of Albania — M. Muftiu

All members of the delegations of the countries which took part in the Conference and Chang Wen-tien, the representative of the People's Republic of China, who attended as an observer, were present at the signing of the Declaration.

The signing of the Declaration took place in the presence of Comrades N. A. Bulganin, K. E. Voroshilov, L. M. Kaganovich, G. M. Malenkov, A. I. Mikoyan, M. G. Pervukhin, M. Z. Saburov, N. S. Khrushchev, A. N. Kosygin, V. A. Malyshev, I. F. Tevosyan, M. A. Suslov, Marshal A. M. Vasilevski, Marshal G. K. Zhukov and others.

DECLARATION

of the Governments of the USSR, Polish People's Republic, Czechoslovak Republic, German Democratic Republic, Hungarian People's Republic, Rumanian People's Republic, People's Republic of Bulgaria and People's Republic of Albania

The representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the People's Republic of Albania, with the participation of an observer from the People's Republic of China, have met in Moscow to examine the situation which has arisen in Europe as a result of the decisions of the London and Paris Conferences of certain Western Powers.

The Governments of the Powers that are participating in the present Conference regret that not all the European countries deemed it possible to take part in discussing the situation. Nor did the United States of America, France and Great Britain, the instigators of the London and Paris agreements, take part in the Conference. Their reply of November 29 speaks of a desire to ratify the Paris agreements at any cost.

The Paris Conference has resulted in the signing, on October 23, of agreements in relation to Western Germany. This was preceded by the London Conference of nine powers, namely the U.S.A., Great Britain, France, Western Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg and Canada. The agreements envisage the remilitarisation of Western Germany and its involvement in military groupings—the North Atlantic bloc and the newly organised so-called "West European Union".

Quite recently attempts were made to restore German militarism through the remilitarisation of Western Germany under the signboard of the notorious EDC. These attempts failed, coming up against the natural resistance of the European peoples, above all the French people. Now there is an attempt to restore German militarism under another signboard and to achieve this end everything is being done to precipitate the ratification of the Paris agreements.

Under such circumstances the Governments of the Powers participating in the present Conference consider it essential to draw the attention of all European states to the fact that the implementation of the Paris agreements would seriously aggravate the international situation in Europe. It would not only create new and even greater obstacles to the settlement of the German question and the restoration of the unity of Germany as a peace-loving and democratic state but would counterpose one part of Germany to the other, turning Western Germany into a dangerous centre of a new war in Europe. Instead of promoting the peaceful settlement of the German question these agreements give a free hand to the militarists and revenge-seekers in Western Germany, thus increasing the threat to the security of the European peoples.

The Paris agreements are at direct variance with the possibilities which have recently opened up for further lessening world tension. Thanks to the efforts of the peace-loving countries the war in Korea was ended in the middle of last year. The Geneva Conference led to the cessation of the eight year-old war in Indo-China and to a certain normalization of the situation in this region of the world. One cannot but note a certain progress at Uno in the negotiations for an all-round reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons. All this has been achieved despite the attitude of the aggressive circles of certain powers which seek to aggravate the international situation.

Meanwhile, at the very time when the possibilities for the settlement of pressing world problems have improved, the ruling circles of the countries that participated in the London and Paris Conferences have taken the dangerous path of reviving German militarism, ignoring the consequences of such a step.

The Paris agreements envisage the establishment of a half million-strong West German army. The strength of this West German armed force is five times that of the army the whole of Germany was allowed under the Versailles Treaty, though it is known that the then 100,000-strong Reichswehr became the basis for building the Hitlerite army of many millions.

The German militarists do not conceal even now that they are calculating to increase the West German army and to raise the number of divisions from 12 to 30 and subsequently

to 60. The creation of an army in Western Germany will mean in fact its domination over the armies of the other participants in the "West European Union". This will inevitably lead to the armed forces under the command of the West German militarists occupying a dominant position in Western Europe.

The danger arising from the creation of a West German army becomes clear from the very fact that the chief positions in it are being taken by the former Hitler generals who not long ago were the organisers and accomplices of fascist aggression against the peoples of both Eastern and Western Europe.

In defiance of international agreements envisaging the liquidation of the German war potential, the war industry is being openly restored in Western Germany. The Ruhr's heavy industry is being geared more and more to the production of armaments. We should not forget that this is the same Ruhr that has more than once been the main arsenal of weapons for the aggressive wars of the German militarists.

Furthermore the Paris agreements clear the way for conducting atomic research, thus making possible the production of atomic and hydrogen weapons in Western Germany and the supply of atomic weapons to it by other countries. Under these agreements the West German army is given the opportunity of having atomic weapons.

This signifies that atomic weapons will be in the hands of those who not so long ago, implanting the bloody Hitlerite "new order", sowed death and destruction in Europe and set themselves the aim of annihilating entire nations. It is they who in the death camps destroyed millions of civilians—Poles, Russians, Jews, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, French, Serbians, Czechs, Slovaks, Belgians, Norwegians and others.

This signifies that atomic weapons will be in the hands of those who are already talking of their revenge-seeking plans in Europe. The implementation of these agreements will intensify, in a large measure, the threat of an atomic war of extermination with its dire consequences for the peoples, particularly in the most densely populated parts of Europe.

The expectations that the incorporation of a remilitarised Western Germany into the West European military union will make it possible to restrain the growth of German militarism within certain limits give rise to legitimate mistrust on the part of the European peoples. Such attempts were made before, but they failed. Peace cannot be ensured in Europe by opening the way for the revival of German militarism and being lulled by so-called guarantees against it, guarantees which are quite obviously ineffective. Peace in Europe can be guaranteed only if the resurgence of German militarism is made impossible.

The remilitarisation of Western Germany means that the role and influence of the militarist and revanchist forces there will steadily increase. The inevitable consequences of such a situation would be the further curtailment of democratic freedoms in Western Germany and its conversion into a militarist state. It is characteristic that while in the Paris agreements nothing is said about ensuring democratic rights for the population of Western Germany, they contain undertakings by the West German authorities to adopt laws on "a state of emergency", which is clearly directed against the democratic rights and freedoms of the population.

The Paris agreements, by restoring German militarism and giving the militarists actual control and emergency powers, open the way to establishing a military dictatorship in Western Germany. These agreements are not only alien to the interests of the German people, they are aimed directly against the German working class, at stifling the democratic forces in Western Germany. The conditions which the Paris agreements envisage for Western Germany are to a great extent reminiscent of the situation which obtained in Germany not long before the Hitlerites came to power. It is common knowledge that the powers possessed by Hindenburg, when President of Germany, to declare a "state of

(Continued on page 2)

DECLARATION

of the Governments of the USSR, Polish People's Republic, Czechoslovak Republic, German Democratic Republic, Hungarian People's Republic, Rumanian People's Republic, People's Republic of Bulgaria and People's Republic of Albania

(Continued from page 1)

emergency" were utilised by the German militarists for liquidating democratic rights and freedoms, for smashing working-class organisations and for establishing a fascist dictatorship in Germany.

The Paris agreements speak of "terminating the occupation regime" and granting Western Germany so-called "sovereignty". In reality, however, under the Paris agreements the "sovereignty" of Western Germany amounts to granting the West German militarists and revanchists the right to raise an army which the initiators of the Paris agreements are counting on using as cannon fodder for their own ends. At the same time the Paris agreements are forcing on Western Germany continued occupation of her territory, up to 1998, by the troops of the U.S.A., as well as Britain and France, and thus envisage the conversion of Western Germany into the main springboard serving the aggressive aims of the U.S.A. in Europe. In such circumstances it is easy to assess the worth of declarations on the so-called "sovereignty" of Western Germany, particularly if it is taken into account that under the Paris agreements the main articles of the enslaving Bonn agreement remain in force.

The Paris agreements, contrary to the statements made by certain statesmen in Western countries, cannot be regarded otherwise than as a virtual refusal to settle the German problem, as a refusal to restore the unity of Germany on a peace-loving and democratic basis for a long time to come. The plans for the remilitarisation of Western Germany and for including it in military groupings are, at the present time, the main obstacle to the national reunification of Germany. This means that the elimination of such an obstacle would make it possible for the four powers to reach agreement on re-establishing the unity and sovereignty of Germany and for carrying out for this purpose free all-German elections with due consideration for the interests of the German people.

According to the calculations of the Bonn politicians about 100 billion marks will be required to raise and equip the West German army of 500,000, the whole burden of which will fall on the shoulders of the working people of Western Germany, primarily on the shoulders of the working class, and this cannot but result in a sharp deterioration of their standard of living. The remilitarisation of Western Germany promises advantages only to the West German monopolies and the big monopolies of the U.S.A., Britain and France that are closely linked up with them and that are already now anticipating huge profits from deliveries of arms for the West German army that is being formed. These dealers in arms have more than once feathered their nests through war, which has brought nothing but untold suffering and privation to the peoples of Europe.

Now the same thing is happening as before the second world war, when the German concerns forged arms for Hitlerite aggression with the support and direct participation of foreign monopolies, and American monopolies in particular. Now the influence of those capitalist monopolies which at one time helped to prepare and unleash World War II is making itself felt more and more in the organs of U.S. state power.

The Paris agreements attest to the fact that now, too, the ruling circles of certain powers and, first and foremost, the United States of America, bank on the revival of German militarism and want to use the remilitarisation of Western Germany in carrying out their imperialist plans. A military bloc of the aggressive circles of the U.S.A., Britain and France with German militarism is being set up by these agreements. They represent a deal clinched behind the backs of the German people and of the peoples of other European states with whom, as is known, there was no consultation in the course of the preparation of these agreements.

Such an aggressive bloc cannot serve the interests of peace and security in Europe. Its formation aggravates the entire situation in Europe and greatly intensifies the threat of a new world war.

The establishment of a new military bloc is contrary to the 1944 Franco-Soviet Treaty on Alliance and Mutual Aid and the 1942 Anglo-Soviet Treaty on Postwar Co-operation and Mutual Aid, which envisaged the adoption of joint measures by France, Britain and the Soviet Union that would render another aggression on the part of German militarism impossible. It is also contrary to the international agreements of both the states participating in this Conference and of other states, agreements which have the purpose of ensuring peace and security for all European countries. The remilitarisation of Western Germany and its inclusion in military groupings is incompatible also with the international undertakings not to permit the resurgence of German militarism, which the U.S.A., Britain and then France assumed under the Potsdam Agreement. Such a violation of obligations assumed by the U.S.A., France and Britain under these treaties and agreements undermine confidence in relations between states and is in flat contradiction to the interests of the security of the peoples of Europe.

The reasons given for building up this new military grouping are that it is essential for the security of the states participating in the bloc, although, in fact no one is threatening them. Attempts are being made to justify the remilitarisation of Western Germany and its inclusion in military groupings of certain Western countries by assertions that relations with the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies must proceed "from positions of strength". At the same time it is alleged that such a policy would contribute to creating more favourable conditions for negotiations and settlement of outstanding international problems. The advocates of this policy, which has now been sufficiently discredited, do not conceal that they would like to impose on other states decisions that are advantageous to imperialist circles of certain Western Powers. In reality this reflects the striving of these circles to establish world supremacy. It should not be forgotten, however, how similar attempts by claimants to world supremacy ended up.

It is common knowledge that military groupings of certain European states, counter-

security in Europe. Such a system must provide for consultation at any time when, in the opinion of any of its member-states, there is a threat of an armed attack in Europe, with a view to adopting effective measures to remove this threat. In order to be effective this system must stipulate that an attack on any or some of the European countries will be regarded as an attack on all the member-states to the appropriate General European Treaty and that every member will give aid to the state attacked, by all means in its power, including the armed forces, for the purpose of restoring and maintaining peace and security in Europe.

The establishment of this kind of general European system of collective security would completely correspond to the requirements of strengthening international co-operation in accordance with the principles of respecting the independence and sovereignty of countries, big and small, and non-interference in their home affairs. The setting up of such a system would likewise greatly facilitate the settlement of the German problem because it precludes the conversion of Western Germany into a militarist state and provides conditions making for the restoration of the unity of Germany.

The organisation of collective security in Europe and the unification of Germany on peaceful and democratic lines is the way to guarantee the development of Germany as one of the big powers. As distinct from the militarist path of development of Germany in the past, a path which repeatedly led to the most dire consequences for the German nation, the reunification of Germany in conditions of collective security in Europe will open up broad vistas for the upsurge of Germany's civilian economy, industry and agriculture and for developing broad economic relations with other countries, especially with the countries of Eastern Europe and Asia with their huge population and inexhaustible resources. The development of Germany in a climate of peace and extensive economic relations with other countries would provide broad markets for its industry, ensure employment and promote the improvement of living standards in Germany.

The future of Germany as a big power is thus directly dependent on whether it will take the path of peaceful development and co-operation with all other European countries or go along the path of preparations for a new war. The path of peaceful development and international co-operation, which the German Democratic Republic has taken, leads to the regeneration of Germany and its flowering. The other path, along which the militarists are seeking to take Western Germany, leads to a new war and thus to its conversion into a zone of fire and destruction.

All this shows that the true national interests of the German people are inseparable from the interests of peace and the establishment of an effective system of European collective security.

The states participating in the present Conference fully subscribe to the principles formulated in the draft "General European Treaty on Collective Security in Europe" submitted by the Government of the USSR and call upon all European countries jointly to study these proposals which are in accord with the requirements of ensuring lasting peace in Europe. They also express readiness to examine any other proposals on this question with a view to working out a draft Treaty on European Collective Security that would be acceptable to all countries concerned.

The countries participating in the present Conference are deeply convinced that European security, based on the above-mentioned principles and strengthened by friendly relations between European countries, would put an end to the situation where Europe is periodically subjected to devastating wars with their incalculable losses for the peoples of Europe.

In the near future the parliaments of some Western countries are to consider the ratification of the Paris agreements. Official quarters of certain countries are bringing increasing pressure to bear upon parliaments and the public to push through the ratification of these agreements.

In this connection the Governments of the USSR, the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the People's Republic of Albania deem it their duty to draw the attention of all European countries, especially those which signed the Paris agreements, to the fact that the ratification of these agreements would constitute an act directed against the preservation of peace and at preparing a new war in Europe. Ratification would greatly complicate the situation in Europe and would undermine the possibilities of solving outstanding European problems, first of all the German problem.

Aggravating the danger of war, the ratification and implementation of these agreements would represent a threat to the national security of the peace-loving countries of Europe, especially to the countries bordering on Germany.

This threat stems from the fact that the countries which signed the Paris agreements are stepping up, to an increasing degree, the military and economic measures against the peace-loving countries of Europe. Now they have gone so far that they have entered into a military bloc with German militarism and are beginning to remilitarise Western Germany themselves and threaten the continued peaceful existence of states which do not belong to their military groupings. The armed forces of the states participating in the Paris agreements will now include the West German army headed by Hitlerite generals. In these circumstances the continued implementation of the "positions of strength" policy will rely directly on German militarism that is being resurrected and this brings the danger of a new war in Europe much closer.

The situation that has been created places on the order of the day the task of combining the efforts of the states represented at this Conference with the object of ensuring their security. In the interests of their security the peace-loving states are being compelled to

Redouble Efforts for Working-Class Unity in Struggle Against Military Agreements

After the Premier's visit to the U.S.A., a few weeks before the vote in the National Assembly on the ratification of the London and Paris agreements, the battle between

Maurice Thorez
General Secretary,
French Communist Party

the forces of peace and those who advocate the revival of German militarism has become more acute in our country.

As is clear from the Franco-American communiqué on the negotiations in Washington the aggressive circles plan to precipitate the decision of the French Parliament. Yet ratification would aggravate the danger of a new war. It is tantamount to the immediate creation in Western Germany of a formidable military machine. It means that the rulers who want to impose ratification flatly refuse to co-operate in the establishment of an effective system of collective security in Europe. It is incompatible with any sincere desire to restore the unity of Germany as a peace-loving and democratic state, which is of obvious interest to France. This is what is at stake.

To win this battle it is essential to do even more to rally all the forces of the working class and the entire people.

Indeed, what will count in the long run, what will tip the balance for or against these agreements, is not the cunning machinations of statesmen in Paris and Washington, not the declarations of satisfaction by the American rulers to their French visitor, but the will of the masses, of all the democratic and national forces.

The success in Geneva and the rejection of EDC were for France the result of the struggle of the masses, the result of the efforts of all peace supporters. "It was necessary to face reality", Monsieur Mendès-France admitted himself in one of his numerous speeches to the Americans.

Nevertheless the Premier plumed himself on the confidence which these big peace victories won for him among the middle classes and even among some of the workers, who were taken by surprise. He took advantage of this in order again to pull out German rearmament—condemned by our people when they defeated the EDC treaty—this time in another form.

But it would be a mistake to believe that the success of this fraudulent undertaking is determined in advance, that it will necessarily culminate in ratification and that Mendès-France will be able, in the words of one reactionary newspaper, "to re-establish continuity" with the policy of the ministers who preceded him, with the policy of the Marshall Plan, the Atlantic pact and the entire war policy pursued from 1947 to 1954.

The French people remember the lessons of history.

In particular, they remember why France signed the Franco-Soviet mutual assistance treaty, the tenth anniversary of which they will celebrate in a few days' time. They know that by reason of their geographical position agreement between the two peoples has always been essential to hold German militarism in check.

The ruling circles of our country did not take this lesson into account before World War II. Following that

self confronted with the bitter pill of German rearmament in another form.

Discontent is growing. The middle classes, the non-proletarian working people and, in

the first place, the peasants seek to unite with the working class against this imminent danger.

The fine phrases and cunning devices of the rulers can but have a momentary effect. What matters in the long-run is the opinion of the people, who are the only creators of history. And our people are once more realising their responsibilities for the country's destinies.

The masses are beginning to display immense determination, they are beginning to move. As a result of this, here and there, politicians are opposing German rearmament. Their statements are not simply an expression of their personal opinion. They testify particularly to the deep changes now taking place among the social classes and strata they speak for.

There is the same situation in neighbouring countries. The feelings of the British workers compelled the Parliamentary Labour Party to abstain, with other M.P.s, from voting on ratification. Thus only 40% of the M.P.s endorsed the military agreements.

And this is despite the fact that the Labour Party Conference and the T.U.C. spoke out for ratification, not to mention the desire of the Labour leaders to fly to the help of the Tory Government on this question.

Will the French people, who suffered much more than the British people from German militarism, be any more enthusiastic than them about the resurrection of the Wehrmacht?

In the Bonn Republic the German workers are now once more faced with fascism, which is coming to life again. They oppose remilitarisation which would increase the forces of Nazism tenfold.

The Communist Party of Germany zealously fights against giving arms to the revenge-seekers. For this reason Adenauer seeks to ban our fraternal Party.

The Social Democratic Party of Germany unconditionally opposes these agreements. It declares that their approval would indefinitely postpone the peaceful reunification of Germany and would hand over political domination, already in the hands of the reactionaries, to the direct representatives of the general staff of militaristic junkers who, from Bismarck to those sentenced at Nuremberg, were the pillar of the German aggressive and plundering state.

The London and Paris agreements were also categorically denounced by the Congress of West German Trade Unions which unite, under Social Democratic leadership, some 5 million working people of diverse views.

Can anybody believe that the French socialist workers will be the only Socialists to take upon themselves the responsibility for agreeing to the revival of German militarism? Can anybody believe that they will betray their comrades in Germany?

The establishment of a new military bloc is contrary to the Franco-Soviet Treaty on Alliance and Mutual Aid and the 1942 Anglo-Soviet Treaty on Postwar Co-operation and Mutual Aid, which envisaged the adoption of joint measures by France, Britain and the Soviet Union that would render another aggression on the part of German militarism impossible. It is also contrary to the international agreements of both the states participating in this Conference and of other states, agreements which have the purpose of ensuring peace and security for all European countries. The remilitarisation of Western Germany and its inclusion in military groupings is incompatible also with the international undertakings not to permit the resurgence of German militarism, which the U.S.A., Britain and then France assumed under the Potsdam Agreement. Such a violation of obligations assumed by the U.S.A., France and Britain under these treaties and agreements undermine confidence in relations between states and is in flat contradiction to the interests of the security of the peoples of Europe.

The reasons given for building up this new military grouping are that it is essential for the security of the states participating in the bloc, although, in fact no one is threatening them. Attempts are being made to justify the remilitarisation of Western Germany and its inclusion in military groupings of certain Western countries by assertions that relations with the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies must proceed "from positions of strength". At the same time it is alleged that such a policy would contribute to creating more favourable conditions for negotiations and settlement of outstanding international problems. The advocates of this policy, which has now been sufficiently discredited, do not conceal that they would like to impose on other states decisions that are advantageous to imperialist circles of certain Western Powers. In reality this reflects the striving of these circles to establish world supremacy. It should not be forgotten, however, how similar attempts by claimants to world supremacy ended up.

It is common knowledge that military groupings of certain European states, counterposed to other European states, also existed in the past. On the eve of World War II Hitler Germany and fascist Italy created an aggressive military grouping which was joined by militarist Japan. The organisers of this grouping, known as the "anti-Comintern Pact", endeavoured to justify its creation by "ideological" motives. In fact, however, it turned out to be a screen behind which they sought to conceal the real aggressive character of this military bloc which was aimed at the achievement of world supremacy. It is common knowledge that the organisers of this military grouping bear the main responsibility for unleashing World War II.

Something similar is being repeated now when the organisers of new military groupings are endeavouring to justify their formation by references to the difference in the social system of the states. There is, however, about as much truth in their statements as there was in the statements of the creators of the "anti-Comintern Pact" who used this pact to prepare and let loose the last world war.

This testifies to the fact that the military groupings of certain Western states, with the participation of a remilitarised Western Germany, cannot serve the cause of peace and security in Europe, no matter what reasons are given to justify their formation. On the contrary, they seriously complicate the situation in Europe and will inevitably intensify the arms drive with all its grave consequences for all European and also non-European states.

If armies, air forces and other armaments are increased by these military groupings in Europe and things go so far as the revival of aggressive German militarism, then the other states in Europe will inevitably be compelled to take effective measures for self-defence, to avert an attack. It follows from this that all states interested in ensuring peace and security in Europe must strive to prevent the resurgence of German militarism and avert the possibility of an intensified arms race and must help to unite the efforts of all European states in the cause of ensuring security in Europe.

Recognising that the settlement of the German question is the chief task in strengthening peace in Europe the Governments of the USSR, the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the People's Republic of Albania consider that to bring about the solution of the German question it is first of all necessary:

to abandon the plans for the remilitarisation of Western Germany and its incorporation into military groupings. This will remove the main barriers on the path of the reunification of Germany on a peaceful and democratic footing;

to come to agreement on holding free all-German elections in 1955 and on this basis forming an all-German Government of a united, democratic and peace-loving Germany.

Then it will eventually become possible to conclude a peace treaty with Germany, which is essential for strengthening peace in Europe.

It must be admitted that the withdrawal of occupation troops from Eastern and Western Germany, as was proposed by the Soviet Union, would facilitate, to a great degree, the rapprochement of both parts of Germany and the restoration of its unity.

The ensuring of European security demands that the powers concerned reach agreement on the unification of Germany which is in accordance with the interests of the peace-loving peoples of Europe and of the German people themselves. The present course of the U.S.A., France and Britain, aimed at the remilitarisation of Western Germany and its involvement in military groupings, makes such an agreement impossible. This course not only does not help to ensure European security but in the eyes of the peace-loving peoples is the expression of a policy that threatens the peace in Europe.

Genuine security in Europe can only be ensured if, instead of setting up closed military groupings of certain European states counterposed to other European states, a system of collective security in Europe is established. Such a system of security based on the participation of all European countries, irrespective of their social and state systems, would make it possible for the European countries to combine their efforts in the interests of ensuring peace in Europe. It goes without saying that the German people must be ensured the possibility of being an equal partner in solving this task that is of importance for the whole of Europe. Such a system of collective security could be joined by the U.S.A. and other countries that have a responsibility for the settlement of the German question, which is of decisive significance for ensuring peace in Europe.

A general European system of collective security must provide for undertakings by the member-states to settle all disputes which may arise between them in accordance with the requirements of the United Nations Charter in order not to jeopardise the peace and

In this connection the Governments of the USSR, the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the People's Republic of Albania deem it their duty to draw the attention of all European countries, especially those which signed the Paris agreements, to the fact that the ratification of these agreements would constitute an act directed against the preservation of peace and at preparing a new war in Europe. Ratification would greatly complicate the situation in Europe and would undermine the possibilities of solving outstanding European problems, first of all the German problem.

Aggravating the danger of war, the ratification and implementation of these agreements would represent a threat to the national security of the peace-loving countries of Europe, especially to the countries bordering on Germany.

This threat stems from the fact that the countries which signed the Paris agreements are stepping up, to an increasing degree, the military and economic measures against the peace-loving countries of Europe. Now they have gone so far that they have entered into a military bloc with German militarism and are beginning to remilitarise Western Germany themselves and threaten the continued peaceful existence of states which do not belong to their military groupings. The armed forces of the states participating in the Paris agreements will now include the West German army headed by Hitlerite generals. In these circumstances the continued implementation of the "positions of strength" policy will rely directly on German militarism that is being resurrected and this brings the danger of a new war in Europe much closer.

The situation that has been created places on the order of the day the task of combining the efforts of the states represented at this Conference with the object of ensuring their security. In the interests of their security the peace-loving states are being compelled to take urgent measures to counterpose to the aggressive forces of the aforementioned military bloc of Western Powers the united might of the peace-loving states.

The states participating in this Conference declare that in the event of the Paris agreements being ratified they have decided to carry out joint measures in the sphere of organising the armed forces and their command as well as other measures necessary for strengthening their defence capacity in order to safeguard the peaceful labour of their peoples, guarantee the integrity of their frontiers and territories and ensure defence from possible aggression.

All these measures are in conformity with the inalienable right of states to self-defence, with the United Nations Charter and with previously concluded agreements and treaties directed against the resurgence of German militarism and at the prevention of new aggression in Europe.

The states participating in this Conference have agreed to re-examine the situation in the event of ratification of the Paris agreements in order to take the necessary measures to safeguard their security and in the interests of maintaining peace in Europe.

The states participating in this Conference are fully determined to continue to insist on the creation of a system of collective security in Europe, being convinced that only the joint efforts of European nations can lay the basis for a durable and lasting peace in Europe. With this object in view they are prepared to co-operate in the future with other European states that express a desire to follow this path.

The Governments of the states participating in the Moscow Conference of European Countries on Ensuring Peace and Security in Europe are deeply convinced that their policy which is aimed at strengthening peace and general security, as well as the measures mapped out by this Conference, correspond to the interests of our peoples and those of other peace-loving peoples.

The peoples of the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania and the German Democratic Republic are engaged in peaceful creative labour. Their efforts are directed at further developing the economy and culture, at steadily raising the standard of living of the working people and, at the same time, at ensuring the effective defence of their great socialist gains. There is no force on earth capable of turning back the wheel of history and frustrating the building of Socialism in our countries.

The peoples of our states realise that the Paris agreements have substantially increased the danger of a new war. But they will not let the development of events catch them unawares.

Our peoples have confidence in their strength, in their inexhaustible resources. Never have the forces of peace and Socialism been so powerful and united as they are now. Any attempts to attack, to unleash a war and interrupt the peaceful life of our peoples will meet with a crushing rebuff. And then our peoples, backed by the sympathy and support of other peoples, will do everything to destroy the forces of aggression so that our right and just cause may triumph.

Our peoples want to live in peace and maintain friendly relations with all other peoples. And that is why, while doing everything to uphold the interests of peace and general security, they will do all that is necessary to ensure their continued peaceful line of development and the proper security of their countries.

for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics —

V. MOLOTOV

for the Polish People's Republic — **J. CYRANKIEWICZ**

for the Czechoslovak Republic — **V. SIROKY**

for the German Democratic Republic — **O. GROTEWOHL**

for the Hungarian People's Republic — **A. HEGEDÜS**

for the Rumanian People's Republic — **S. CHIVU**

for the People's Republic of Bulgaria — **A. YUGOV**

for the People's Republic of Albania — **M. MUFTIU**

Moscow, December 2, 1954.

But it would be a mistake to believe that the success of this fraudulent undertaking is determined in advance, that it will necessarily culminate in ratification and that Mendès-France will be able, in the words of one reactionary newspaper, "to re-establish continuity" with the policy of the ministers who preceded him, with the policy of the Marshall Plan, the Atlantic pact and the entire war policy pursued from 1947 to 1954.

★

The French people remember the lessons of history.

In particular, they remember why France signed the Franco-Soviet mutual assistance treaty, the tenth anniversary of which they will celebrate in a few days' time. They know that by reason of their geographical position agreement between the two peoples has always been essential to hold German militarism in check.

The ruling circles of our country did not take this lesson into account before World War II. Following the path of national betrayal they exposed France to the danger of annihilation by helping to strengthen the hegemony of Hitler.

And if France survived it was due, above all, to the defeat of Hitler Germany by the Soviet Union.

It was proved once again that agreement between the two countries is a necessity for French security, a necessity which arises at each turning point of history.

Our people know this.

It is downright insolence to say of the advocates of this policy that they envisage radical changes in French alliances. Are not those who make radical changes in the alliances the very same who intend to give arms back to the former enemy and invader for the purpose of preparing, with the help of the enemy, aggression against an ally, against the country with which we are linked by treaty and which saved us twelve years ago; by the historic victory of Stalingrad?

Have things gone so far that in the eyes of our rulers the "crime" of the Soviet Union is its proposal to convene a Conference on the question of European security prior to the remilitarisation of Western Germany, which would frustrate any possibility of settling outstanding European problems and speed up the arms race? Meanwhile it is just such a Conference that is desired by the French people.

Even those among the French who believed Mendès-France, even those whose sympathies he won are today opening their eyes and expressing alarm.

Voices are heard in these circles telling the Premier that his popularity is waning, that his supporters expected something else from him and that it was not really worth escaping the nightmare of EDC to find one-

unconditionally opposes these agreements, it declares that their approval would indefinitely postpone the peaceful reunification of Germany and would hand over political domination, already in the hands of the reactionaries, to the direct representatives of the general staff of militaristic junkers who, from Bismarck to those sentenced at Nuremberg, were the pillar of the German aggressive and plundering state.

The London and Paris agreements were also categorically denounced by the Congress of West German Trade Unions which unite, under Social Democratic leadership, some 5 million working people of diverse views.

Can anybody believe that the French Socialist workers will be the only Socialists to take upon themselves the responsibility for agreeing to the revival of German militarism? Can anybody believe that they will betray their comrades in Germany, that they will give a stab in the back to the workers of that country who are fighting against rearmament in particularly difficult conditions? No, the French Socialist workers will not want to undermine the international solidarity of the working people in this great battle. Nor can they ignore the best traditions of the French working-class movement: they will not renounce the courageous fight of Jaurès against the dodgy diplomacy of the warmongers.

★

In all circumstances the Communists uphold the interests of France because they are genuine internationalists, champions of equality for all nations. Guided by this great principle, our Party activists will spare no effort to mobilise, everywhere, in the difficult days ahead, the popular masses against the imminent danger threatening our country, for bringing pressure to bear upon the M.P.s.

Communist activists know that working-class unity is of overwhelming importance for bringing together all democratic and national forces, for rallying all people of the most diverse shades of opinion and social positions and belonging to all walks of life who urge immediate negotiations and express themselves in favour of European security and peace.

This is why they rejoice to see that unity of will against the London and Paris agreements is approaching realisation more and more among Socialist and Communist working people.

This is why, above all, they will redouble their efforts to ensure that all these great possibilities for working-class unity are immediately converted into actions to consolidate and extend the common struggle to avert the crime of ratification, to win another victory for peace.

(*"L'Humanité"*, November 27, 1954)

Local Elections in Hungarian People's Republic

Local elections took place in Hungary on November 28, the population displaying a high degree of political activity. According to the report issued by the Central Electoral Presidium, out of an electorate of 6,595,736, 6,423,480 or 97.4% went to the polls. Of those who took part in the election 6,290,541 or 97.9%, voted for the candidates of the Patriotic People's Front.

The elections once more demonstrated the high political consciousness and solidarity of the Hungarian working people who fully support the policy of the Government and the Hungarian Working People's Party which is aimed at strengthening peace and improving well-being.

TREACHERY WITHOUT PRECEDENT

(Letter from London)

Right now, as I am writing, every honest individual in England is up in arms. "Churchill" and "treachery" have become synonymous here for people of the most diverse political views and religious beliefs.

A week ago we were astounded by the cynical and callous revelation of a man who, at the most critical time in the history of our country, held in his hand the fate of millions of people battling against German fascism, the common enemy of the human race, a revelation that bears witness to his treachery, a treachery without precedent.

Speaking to his constituents in Woodford and licking his lips over every sentence of a prepared speech, Churchill let out a secret he had kept carefully under his hat for years. This outraged all decent people in Britain and disclosed the real reasons for rearming Western Germany. Churchill declared that "even before the war had ended and while the Germans were surrendering by hundreds of thousands and our streets were crowded with cheering people", he had telegraphed to Lord Montgomery, the Commander of the British Forces in Europe, directing him "to be careful in collecting the German arms, to stack them so that they could easily be issued again" to the Nazi thugs he himself had called murderers for use, if necessary, against his ally, the Soviet Army.

And not merely against the Soviet Army. Replying to a question put by Labour M. P. Sydney Silverman, Churchill declared that his telegram to Eisenhower on May 9, 1945, explaining his plan to keep the arms the Germans were surrendering, said: "We may have great need of these some day, and even now, they might be used, both in France and Italy." So in May, 1945, Churchill was ready to turn German arms not only against the USSR but against the French and Italians in the Resistance Movements.

History has never known such cynical treachery against an ally shedding its blood and making a decisive contribution to the fight for victory over the common enemy. This secret betrayal by an ally is particularly revolting when we recall Churchill's own words on the military feats of the Soviet Army which not only smashed the Nazis on the Eastern Front but helped the allied armies out of a serious situation.

People here know full well that when, in December, 1944, the German troops launched the big Ardennes offensive, hoping that it would turn out a second Dunkirk for Russia's allies, Churchill sent a telegram appealing for aid to the Supreme Command of the Soviet Army who immediately came to the help of the allied troops in trouble and launched a wide-scale offensive from the Baltic to the Carpathians. As a result Hitler hastily had to withdraw his troops from the Ardennes and transfer them to the Eastern Front. In this way the German offensive in the Ardennes was stopped and the allied armies saved from inevitable defeat.

This feat of the Soviet Army was recognised in Churchill's telegram to J. V. Stalin on January 17, 1945, which expressed gratitude and congratulations on behalf of the Government and himself on the gigantic offensive launched on the Eastern Front.

Churchill's Woodford speech is fresh proof that his activities during the Second World War were already dominated by the hatred of the Soviet Union. It is this same hatred that conditions his activities today, when he is forcing the country into

a dangerous alliance with yesterday's war criminals, criminals responsible for the untold sacrifices and sufferings of millions. What he failed to do in 1945 he wants to do today.

After ten years of the most rabid anti-Soviet propaganda Churchill considers it a good moment to let everyone know about his anti-Soviet plans, up to now carefully concealed from the British people, assuming that ten years of anti-Soviet slander have done their work and that we are likely to believe the lies about the "Soviet menace".

The anger of the British people shows, however, that Churchill has backed the wrong horse again. No applause but cries of "Shame! Shame!" That was the immediate reaction of many of those who heard his barefaced revelations and these words echoed in the hearts of millions of Englishmen who have no wish to be the "allies" of their one-time enemies, the murderers of yesterday.

"Churchill's speech", said Mr. George Cross, Secretary of the Ex-Service Movement for Peace, "reveals his betrayal of all the lads who fought in the last war."

"The revulsion among British workers against his statement", declared Alderman Jack Nicholson, Chairman of the Hull Labour Party, "will be enormous. And there will be the same revulsion against those Labour leaders who give support to Churchill."

While these lines are being written, statements are being made in the British press and by M.P.s to the effect that now he has made these disclosures the Prime Minister is no longer fit to lead the country towards lasting coexistence with the Soviet Union. "How can there be trust and goodwill in talks with the Russians when Churchill throws up these old suspicions?" asks the *Daily Mirror*. "His blunder makes nonsense of all he has said about a Big Power conference. ... Churchill has done a grave disservice to the cause—the achievement of lasting good relations with Russia", the *Times*, "certainly will not help to convince the Russians that the Western powers are straightforward in their declarations of peace".

S. O. Davies, Labour M.P., declared: "The S. O. Davies, Labour M.P., declared: 'The callous revelation of Churchill must fill every decent man and woman in this country with deep horror and disgust. It reveals something more—the traditionally instinctive hatred of Toryism and its variants in the House of Commons for the peoples of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies who have thrown away the oppressors who were the British Tories' friends."

Churchill's speech has quite definitely shattered the illusions of many people here who have always had it dinned into them that the "cold war" was the result of the postwar policy of the Soviet Union. They now understand that the "cold war" was being planned by Churchill and his American friends at the very time that hundreds of thousands of Russian, English and American soldiers were fighting against Nazi tyranny. Churchill's speech shows the real reasons why British and U.S. ruling circles are fighting tooth and nail for ratification of the London and Paris agreements which mean the resurrection of the Wehrmacht under the command of Hitler generals and the revival of German militarism a thirst for blood and revenge. And today millions of British people, with renewed force, shout "No!" to the plans for rearming Western Germany.

G. HORTON

London, November.

Polish People Unanimously Oppose Remilitarisation of Western Germany

The working masses and all peace-loving people in Europe heaved a sigh of relief when they heard about the collapse of the notorious EDC, an aggressive military bloc spearheaded against the Soviet Union, Poland and other countries of people's democracy. The Poles were also relieved to hear of this big defeat of the warmongers. But no thinking person in the country believed that this defeat put an end to the intrigues of the warmongers who are endeavouring, at any cost, to build an aggressive military bloc in Western Europe and restore the Wehrmacht as its striking force. The warmongers are not the type to abandon their criminal designs even in the face of such clear expressions of the peoples' will. As the saying goes—thrown out of the front door they are trying to get in through the back door.

The spokesmen of the Atlantic policy in London and Paris changed the worn-out signboard "European Defence Community" to "West European Union". But they are still trying to sell the same old thing to the peoples of Western Europe: the perpetuation of the division of Germany and the occupation of its Western part, the building of a revenge-seeking German army led by Hitler generals, the arms race, the intensification of war hysteria in Europe, the aggravation of the international situation and the deal of German and French monopolists for joint imperialist undertakings at the expense of the German and French peoples.

To hoodwink the broad masses of Western Germany, particularly the German youth, whom they would like to drive into the barracks, and to trick the other peoples of Europe the organisers of the new Wehrmacht, like the wolf in Little Red Riding Hood, are dressing themselves up as the "dear old grandmother".

No longer will the Wehrmacht be called by its own name. For camouflage purposes it will be christened the "Streitkräfte" (Armed Forces). They allege that it will have peaceful, defensive aims; no "Prussian goose-stepping", less of the old rigid discipline and so on; the new Wehrmacht is allegedly designed to guard Europe, defend Western civilisation etc.

But this farce can no longer deceive those it is intended for. The wolf's teeth in the Hitler jaws are only too obvious beneath the grandmother's bonnet.

Increasing numbers of demonstrations of West German workers and youth against remilitarisation, the beating-up suffered by Blank, the head of the so-called Security Department (in fact the Bonn war ministry), at an election meeting, the attitude of ordinary people towards remilitarisation expressed in the words: "I am against war", the significant results of the referendum among the peasants on the outskirts of Frankfurt on Main—all this bears witness to the fact that the German people are more and more realising the nature of these war plans and the immense danger they represent to the peace, security and life of the European peoples, including the German people themselves.

The Polish people, in particular, have no doubts about this. In the past forty years they have twice suffered the consequences of appalling and devastating occupation by German invaders. They were directly threatened with physical extermination during the Hitler invasion. The six million Poles whom the Nazis murdered in Auschwitz, Maidanek, Tremblinka and other death camps, the shot and hanged fighters of the resistance movement, the hostages and casual passers-by who were seized from time to time cannot be brought back to life. But millions of their relatives, neighbours and fellow countrymen remember what happened to them. Millions of people whom the Nazi invaders sought to doom to lifelong slavery at forced labour in Germany, hundreds of thousands of former concentration camp prisoners, who were released by the valiant Soviet Army, are alive today.

The Polish working people know the German imperialists and militarists very well. Maybe the assertions of Adenauer and his generals will have a soothing effect on this or that lord in Britain—assertions that the armaments of Western Germany will be controlled and subject to certain restrictions that war industry will not turn out heavy weapons for some years, that the West German generals do not plan to use atomic weapons (they only want to have them "for the sake of prestige") and that Western Germany will use only a limited quantity of atomic weapons.

But the Poles will not allow themselves to be deceived or lulled by these statements. They know the value of such "peaceful" declarations of aggressive German militarists from their own bitter historical experience. The Poles are well aware that the militarists speak the language of peace only when they are weak or want to mislead their opponents. But when they are strong they begin to use the language of aggression. The Polish people know that the so-called "restricting" agreements are mere scraps of paper to the German militarists, which they tear to pieces if it is necessary to their military plans. They also know that the number of projected West German divisions will easily be increased two or threefold, the more so if this meets with the support of the big American monopolies and the U.S. Government.

The Polish people realise with particular clarity the threat the remilitarisation of Western Germany represents to peace and the security of the peoples, since the plans of the German militarists and revenge-seekers are spearheaded directly against our country, against our borders along the Oder and the Neisse and our Western territories. The reactionary circles in Western Germany have not abandoned their dream of revenge and, with characteristic insolence openly conduct revanchist propaganda.

★
Stefan Jedrychowski
Vice-Chairman, Council of Ministers,
Polish People's Republic

★ ★

In order to allay the fears of the West European public that the formation of the Wehrmacht may result in drawing their countries into an aggressive war in the interests of the American and German imperialists, the West German revenge-seekers are declaring that they have abandoned methods of violence and intend to resort to "peaceful" methods in implementing their revanchist aspirations. What "peaceful" methods can there be when it is a question of seizing territories that are an integral part of the Polish People's Republic, territories without which the Polish people cannot survive and which, therefore, they will defend against any attack whatsoever?

It is obvious that the formation of a revanchist German army can only lead to a sharpening of world tension, prevent the unification of Germany and prove a great menace to the peace and security of the peoples, including the Polish people.

That is why all the Polish people unanimously uphold the negative attitude of the Soviet Union in relation to the plans for rearming Western Germany and, in unity and side by side with the Soviet people are striving for the unification of Germany and the establishment of a united, peace-loving and democratic German state. The Polish people warmly support the Soviet proposal for setting up a general European system of collective security as being a real guarantee for safeguarding and consolidating European and world peace.

The working people of Poland, the real masters of the Polish people's state, harbour no feelings of hatred for the German people. They have been educated in the course of the revolutionary movement—first the general democratic movement and later the working-class movement—on the traditions of profound internationalism. They believe, sincerely and deeply, in the possibility of peaceful coexistence and friendship between the peoples, even between those who have more than once quarrelled in the past, between all peoples, irrespective of their socio-economic and political systems.

These possibilities have been confirmed by our political, economic and cultural relations with the German Democratic Republic, the bulwark of the peace-loving forces of the German people, relations which are developing and expanding from day to day. This is evident from the series of agreements concluded with the German Democratic Republic, in particular the Zgozelec agreement of July 6, 1950, on the demarcation of the Polish-German state boundary. The trade turnover between our countries is increasing year by year, the GDR occupying one of the major places in our export and import trade.

Poland exhibits annually at the famous Leipzig Fair. Scientific, technical and cultural co-operation between our countries is developing successfully to our mutual advantage. We have concluded an agreement on navigation on frontier and inland waterways. We are making combined efforts to restore rail and road bridges over the Oder and the Neisse. Large areas in Germany and Poland along these rivers have repeatedly been saved from the disastrous consequences of floods by joint Polish-German efforts. Our sea-going shipping and our planes are often used to serve the needs of the German Democratic Republic and co-operation is successfully developing as regards fishing in the Baltic and the Gulf of Stettin. Polish enterprises are concluding trade transactions with West German enterprises. The advantages accruing to both peoples through peaceful, friendly coexistence and co-operation based on equality and respect for each other's interests are incalculable. The close co-operation between Poland and the GDR is the prototype of friendly, all-sided relations between Poland and the future united, peace-loving, democratic Germany.

Our peoples can live side by side in peace, harmony and friendship, developing their economy and culture and improving their well-being. But this can only happen if the will for peace triumphs throughout Germany, if the German people prevent a hotbed of aggression and war being established in Western Germany, if Western Germany relinquishes its aggressive and revanchist aspirations once and for all, if it relinquishes its aggressive plans with regard to Polish lands.

It must be understood in Western Germany that Poland is no longer the backward, weak and isolated country it was before 1939, when the capitalists and landlords held sway. People's Poland has stepped out onto the path of progress. In seven-league boots it is making good its age-old technical and economic backwardness. Enjoying enormous and selfless assistance from the great Soviet Union, the new social and state system in Poland is gaining in strength.

The Polish people long to live in peace and friendship with all other peoples. They have no territorial ambitions. But if the remilitarisation of Western Germany is realised and the peace and security of the peoples of Europe thus menaced, then Poland, like the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and other countries of people's democracy, will be forced to take essential measures to strengthen its defence capacity. The Polish public is in complete agreement with the statement made by V. M. Molotov, Soviet Foreign Minister, at the Conference of European countries on ensuring peace and security in Europe.

The Polish people do not lose hope that the peoples of Western Europe will prevent the implementation of the London and Paris agreements.

Unbreakable Unity of Czechoslovak People

The elections to the National Assembly and the Slovak National Council held on November 28 in Czechoslovakia once more explicitly showed what is so characteristic of the internal situation of the People's Democracies—the great and unbreakable unity of the people who are building a new life. 8,711,718 or 99.18% of the electorate voted; of these 8,494,102 or 97.89% cast votes for the candidates of the National Front.

This is definitely good news. It demonstrates the strengthening moral and

to the polls only under the force of law. Such indifference to elections is displayed now even more glaringly in the capitalist countries. The recent Congress elections in the U.S.A., where out of some 100 million electors only 42 million voted, bear witness to this.

How different is this from the situation in the people's-democratic countries! The

★
Zdenek Fierlinger
Member, Political Bureau,
Central Committee, Communist Party
of Czechoslovakia

★ ★

is somewhat unnatural and meaningless for the younger generation. The elections vividly showed once more that our people do not want the return of terrible economic crises, unemployment and increasing impoverishment of millions of the working people, moral decay and corruption. Our people do not want the return of those grim and tragic times when we lived

nopoly capital to smash the trade unions of the working people, to suppress the strikes of discontented workers by armed force, to tighten up colonial and semi-colonial fetters, to preach and uphold fascism and advocate war. That's what they call democracy and freedom!

We are proud that we have no such "freedom". Our Constitution prohibits the misuse of private property to the detriment of society, the preaching of Nazism and

People here know well that when, in December, 1944, the German troops launched the big Ardennes offensive, hoping that it would turn out a second Dunkirk for Russia's allies, Churchill sent a telegram appealing for aid to the Supreme Command of the Soviet Army who immediately came to the help of the allied troops in trouble and launched a wide-scale offensive from the Baltic to the Carpathians. As a result Hitler hastily had to withdraw his troops from the Ardennes and transfer them to the Eastern Front. In this way the German offensive in the Ardennes was stopped and the allied armies saved from inevitable defeat.

This feat of the Soviet Army was recognised in Churchill's telegram to J. V. Stalin on January 17, 1945, which expressed gratitude and congratulations on behalf of the Government and himself on the gigantic offensive launched on the Eastern Front.

Churchill's Woodford speech is fresh proof that his activities during the Second World War were already dominated by same hatred of the Soviet Union. It is this same hatred that conditions his activities today, when he is forcing the country into

the hands of a decent man and Churchill must fill his mind with deep horror and disgust. It reveals hatred of Toryism and its variants in the House of Commons for the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Peoples' Democracies who have thrown away the oppressors who were the British Tories' friends."

Churchill's speech has quite definitely shattered the illusions of many people here who have always had it dinned into them that the "cold war" was the result of the postwar policy of the Soviet Union. They now understand that the "cold war" was being planned by Churchill and his American friends at the very time that hundreds of thousands of Russian, English and American soldiers were fighting against Nazi tyranny. Churchill's speech shows the real reasons why British and U.S. ruling circles are fighting tooth and nail for ratification of the London and Paris agreements which mean the resurrection of the Wehrmacht under the command of Hitler generals and the revival of German militarism athirst for blood and revenge. And today millions of British people, with renewed force, shout "No!" to the plans for rearming Western Germany.

London, November.

G. HORTON

IN DEFENCE OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY

It was obvious from the very beginning of the court proceedings against the Communist Party of Germany, which opened in Karlsruhe on November 23, that the Bonn authorities, following in the footsteps of the Hitlerites, are out to ban the Communist Party. With full justification, the German democratic public look upon this disgraceful frame-up trial as an attempt to duplicate the Leipzig frame-up around the "burning of the Reichstag", which the Nazis organised in 1933 with the purpose of outlawing the Communist Party and smashing all democratic organisations.

The written statement of Comrade Max Reimann, Chairman of the CPG, particularly infuriated von Lex, the Bonn Government's official representative at the trial. The statement read in part: "The Communist Party and its representatives are spokesmen voicing the will of the nation for understanding between Germans and for free, democratic, all-German elections. By banning the CPG the Federal Government wants to bar the way to all-German elections. That is the whole meaning of this trial."

On von Lex's demand Wintrich, the presiding judge, prevented the document from being read to the end. In the speech he made on behalf of the Government von Lex demanded that the CPG be disbanded and outlawed. He demanded that it should be forbidden to set up similar organisations and that the property of the CPG should be confiscated in favour of the state. Von Lex's vicious attacks were spearheaded not only against the CPG but also against the entire working-class movement in Western Germany, particularly against the right to strike.

The trial in Karlsruhe is an open attack on the democratic rights of the

people aimed at giving a completely free hand to Nazism and militarism in Western Germany. This explains why the broad working masses in Western Germany are coming out resolutely in defence of the CPG. The bourgeois West German newspaper *Badisches Tagesblatt* reported on November 23 that more than 16,000 resolutions of protest have already been received by the court and they are still pouring in. Delegations from all over Western Germany are coming to Karlsruhe with demands to stop the proceedings against the CPG. Big demonstrations and protest meetings against the attempts to outlaw the CPG have taken place in a number of cities and industrial centres of Western Germany.

The growing prestige of the CPG among the masses was graphically illustrated by the Hessen and Bavarian Landtag election results of November 28. Despite persecution and all the obstacles that were placed in the way, considerably more votes were cast for the Communist Party in both these Landers than at the Bundestag elections of 1953. The election results have proved once again that the broad masses in Western Germany are coming out more and more actively against the anti-people's policy of the Bonn Government, against militarism and fascisation of Western Germany.

The Communist Party of Germany has won the sympathy of the peace-loving peoples in Europe by its consistent struggle against the remilitarisation of Western Germany and for the peaceful reunification of the country on a democratic basis. Mass meetings and rallies of the working people of town and country strongly protesting against the criminal attempts to ban the Communist Party of Germany have been held in Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary and other countries.

MEETING OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

At a recent meeting of the newly elected Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, the following were elected to the Political Bureau: Comrades D. Damba, B. Damdin, Ts. Dugursurun, N. Lkhamsurun, Zh. Sambu, Y. Tsendenbal, B. Shirendyb; Comrades D. Balzhinyam and B. Zhabaldorzi were

elected alternate members of the Political Bureau of the C.C.

Comrades D. Damba, Ts. Dugursurun, N. Lkhamsurun and D. Samdan were elected to the Secretariat.

The meeting endorsed Comrade A. Dugurzhab as Chairman of the Party Control Commission.

the Hitler jaws are only too obvious beneath the grandmother's bonnet.

Increasing numbers of demonstrations of West German workers and youth against remilitarisation, the beating-up suffered by Blank, the head of the so-called Security Department (in fact the Bonn war ministry), at an election meeting, the attitude of ordinary people towards remilitarisation expressed in the words: "I am against war", the significant results of the referendum among the peasants on the outskirts of Frankfurt on Main—all this bears witness to the fact that the German people are more and more realising the nature of these war plans and the immense danger they represent to the peace, security and life of the European peoples, including the German people themselves.

their military plans. They also know that the number of projected West German divisions will easily be increased two or threefold, the more so if this meets with the support of the big American monopolies and the U.S. Government.

The Polish people realise with particular clarity the threat the remilitarisation of Western Germany represents to peace and the security of the peoples, since the plans of the German militarists and revenge-seekers are spearheaded directly against our country, against our borders along the Oder and the Neisse and our Western territories. The reactionary circles in Western Germany have not abandoned their dream of revenge and, with characteristic insolence openly conduct revanchist propaganda.

Unbreakable Unity of Czechoslovak People

The elections to the National Assembly and the Slovak National Council held on November 28 in Czechoslovakia once more explicitly showed what is so characteristic of the internal situation of the People's Democracies—the great and unbreakable unity of the people who are building a new life. 8,711,718 or 99.18% of the electorate voted; of these 8,494,102 or 97.89% cast votes for the candidates of the National Front.

This is definitely good news. It demonstrates the ever-strengthening moral and political unity of our people. The election results are a brilliant victory of our people's-democratic system and the National Front, the victory of the far-seeing policy of our glorious Communist Party.

The elections took place on the basis of a fully democratic electoral system which can be realised only in a country where power is in the people's hands. The elections were held by secret ballot, on the basis of universal, equal and direct suffrage. The right to elect to the National Assembly is enjoyed by every citizen of the Republic (except persons deprived of these rights by court and insane persons) of 18 years and over, regardless of nationality, sex, religious belief, length of residence in the country, social origin, property status and past activities.

In conformity with the electoral law constituencies were set up all over the country, each covering 35,000 people. Each constituency elected a deputy nominated by the electorate. It should be noted that the candidates of the National Front for whom our people voted with such enthusiasm on November 28 are their worthy representatives—the best sons and daughters of the working class, working peasantry and people's intelligentsia.

During the election campaign, before the registration of the candidates of the National Front, meetings in factories and offices as well as general meetings of residents in towns and villages thoroughly discussed the candidates put forward by the working people themselves. If a candidate did not enjoy sufficient prestige among the people and if there were well-founded objections against him the public nominated another candidate.

There is no need to stress that under such a system of nominating candidates the electors' sense of responsibility grew tremendously. They realised the significance of the elections as an important testimony of genuine people's power. This emphasised the significance of the active electoral right. The difference between now and before the war, when many people considered it a matter of dignity "not to bother about politics" or "be interested in elections", was distinctly manifest. In those days they went

to the polls only under the force of law. Such indifference to elections is displayed now even more glaringly in the capitalist countries. The recent Congress elections in the U.S.A., where out

of some 100 million electors only 42 million voted, bear witness to this.

How different is this from the situation in the people's-democratic countries! The whole of our new life educates citizens in the spirit of the complete exercise of their political rights. This corresponds both to their interests and to that of the state. Indeed if we want to further strengthen and develop our people's democracy, if we want to eliminate the existing shortcomings it is essential that everybody shows a keen interest in public matters and through his ballot paper contributes to the strengthening of the people's-democratic state.

Extensive political work among the masses therefore developed at the first stage of the election campaign. The people gathered at thousands of election stations for talks with leading workers of the national committees, public figures and foremost workers. They had lively discussions on various problems of our home and foreign policy. The candidates met their electorate at numerous meetings. Thanks to this the electors were able to get to know their candidate better and discuss questions they were interested in.

The preparations and the elections themselves were marked by a mighty upsurge which freely displayed the real will of the people and expressed the powerful unity of the broad masses, who selflessly support our people's-democratic system.

On the eve of the elections hostile propaganda made a special attempt to discredit our unity, endeavoured to undermine the confidence of the people in our electoral system. But this evil and hateful propaganda could influence very few people—maybe a handful of former capitalists and rich people who harbour malice and who were deprived of all their privileges at the time of the revolutionary overthrow. But it is highly doubtful whether in many cases even their own children, who have found a place in our new life and have every opportunity of making a good showing at their work, would agree to the restoration of the capitalist system, about which the arms kings, who style themselves the defenders of the so-called superior Western civilisation, dream.

The old capitalist system which has been liquidated once and for all in our country

is somewhat unnatural and meaningless for the younger generation. The elections vividly showed once more that our people do not want the return of terrible economic crises, unemployment and increasing impoverishment of millions of the working people, moral decay and corruption. Our people do not want the return of those grim and tragic times when we lived in fear for the destinies of the Spanish people who were heroically fighting against the fascist gangs and when we sensed what awaited our country unless our people were united and rallied, unless we firmly relied on friendship with the Soviet Union. Our people do not want to hear wild barking on the air again and the threat of fire and death for our towns unless we kowtowed and betrayed everything most dear and sacred to us, unless we turned traitor to the proud awareness of true patriots. Our people do not wish to experience again the tragedy of the shameful Munich capitulation, another occupation and Nazi protectorate.

We pride ourselves today on having such powerful allies as the Soviet Union and People's China, that our immediate neighbours are the fraternal people's-democratic Republics—Poland and Hungary. We are proud that we have a common frontier with the German Democratic Republic in which all the democratic and progressive forces have united and set up for the first time in the history of the German people, a German democratic state living with other peoples in concord and peace, a state in which the former Nazi generals, big industrialists and junkers have vanished from the scene for all time and in which the young people are being inspired by the creative aims of the new democratic and peace-loving Germany. This is a state in which the humanist traditions of the German culture of Herder, Goethe, Lessing, Humbolt, Heine, Beethoven, Bach, Brahms and other great representatives of the German nation, that has given the world Marx and Engels, are once more revered.

We belong to the great and mighty camp of peace which covers an area stretching from Sumava and the Krusne Mountains to the Pacific. There are more than 900,000,000 of us united by the great concept of Socialism which places all the achievements of mankind, science and technique at the service of man and progress and not at the service of devastation and war.

Statesmen in the Western countries talk loudly about so-called "democracy" and "freedom" which allow all-powerful mo-

opolopoly capital to smash the trade unions of the working people, to suppress the strikes of discontented workers by armed force, to tighten up colonial and semi-colonial fetters, to preach and uphold fascism and advocate war. That's what they call democracy and freedom!

We are proud that we have no such "freedom". Our Constitution prohibits the misuse of private property to the detriment of society, the preaching of Nazism and fascism, racial hatred and religious intolerance and national chauvinism. The law on the defence of peace, adopted on December 20, 1950, by the National Assembly of Czechoslovakia, prohibits war propaganda in any form whatsoever. But today we have everything to enable us to live freely, to work and rejoice in the fruits of our labour, which no one can take away from us.

It is natural that the Soviet Note on the necessity of establishing a system of collective security in Europe met with a very warm reception in our country during the election campaign. There is nothing more valued and dear to the Czechoslovakian people than the desire to prevent the division of Europe into two hostile camps, the desire to create an effective guarantee of lasting peace in Europe. The Soviet Union has made another appeal to the whole world to reduce armaments, to prohibit the use of new kinds of lethal weapons and to solve controversial problems between East and West by negotiation. This time too, unfortunately, the governments of capitalist countries have turned a deaf ear to these proposals. But the question of peace and war is now not solely the affair of statesmen and politicians who do not wish to listen to the voice of their own peoples. The consistent peaceful policy of the Soviet Union has awakened the consciousness of hundreds of millions of people in the capitalist countries too, the world over. The idea of peace is becoming irresistible.

When our citizens went to the polling stations on November 28 they were profoundly conscious of all these important world events. Each one of them understood that casting their vote for the National Front candidate meant voting for peace and the freedom of Czechoslovakia, meant voting against new wars and against the attempts to enslave our people once again. That is why the elections went through so well and so joyfully. They became a great and mighty demonstration of the ardent patriotism of all honest citizens of our Republic. They were a contribution to the strengthening of world peace.

The Polish people do not lose hope that the peoples of Western Europe will prevent the implementation of the London and Paris agreements.

Statesmen in the Western countries talk loudly about so-called "democracy" and "freedom" which allow all-powerful mo-

National Holiday of Yugoslav Peoples

On November 29 the peoples of Yugoslavia celebrated their national holiday, the day of the Republic.

Eleven years ago, at the height of furious battle against the German and Italian fascists, representatives of all the peoples of Yugoslavia gathered at a meeting of the Anti-Fascist Assembly of the People's Liberation of Yugoslavia in liberated Jajce, a small town in Bosnia. On November 29, 1943, the Assembly announced the establishment of the Yugoslav Democratic Federative State on the principle of national equality. The National People's Liberation Council was elected at the same time.

Two years later, on the night of November 29, 1945, the Constituent Assembly adopted a declaration deposing the king and proclaiming Yugoslavia a Federative People's Republic.

The establishment of the Federative People's Republic was the result of the Yugoslav peoples' heroic liberation fight against fascist enslavement. The Yugoslav patriots were not alone in this struggle which developed at the call of the Communist Party. With them was their loyal ally, the fraternal Soviet people, who played a decisive role in liberating the European countries from the fascist barbarians.

The harder the blows dealt at the enemy by the Soviet Army, the stronger grew the patriotic forces of Yugoslavia. Partisan detachments and units of the Yugoslav People's Liberation Army fought selflessly and courageously against the superior forces of the enemy and pinned down many fascist divisions.

In the autumn of 1944 the Soviet Army, pursuing the routed Hitler hordes, reached the Yugoslav frontiers and, with the permission of the National People's Liberation Council, entered Yugoslav territory and helped the patriots of Yugoslavia to liberate vital regions of the country. The combined efforts of the People's Liberation Army and the Soviet troops culminated, on October 20, 1944, in the liberation of Belgrade, the capital.

And on this day, Marshal Tito, the Supreme Commander-in-Chief of the People's Liberation Army, sent a message to Marshal Stalin, Supreme Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the USSR, expressing gratitude to the Soviet Army for its selfless help to the Yugoslav peoples. This message read in part: "The liberation of Belgrade is of historic significance for our peoples. This is so because Yugoslavia, our land of long-suffering peoples, is the arena on which the sons of the great Soviet Union and Yugoslavia spilt their blood shoulder to shoulder. The fraternity of the peoples of Yugoslavia and the peoples of the Soviet Union, has, once again, been firmly sealed."

In the common fight against Hitler's brigand armies a durable alliance was forged between the fraternal Soviet and Yugoslav peoples, the beneficial influence of which was felt not only in the war years but in the postwar period too. The entire march of events shows clearly that the consolidation of this alliance conforms to the vital interests of both the Yugoslav and the Soviet peoples.

The strained relations which obtained between Yugoslavia and the USSR during the past few years were only to the advantage of the enemies of both countries. The adversaries of peace and democracy sought to utilise these strained relations not only in pursuance of their "positions of strength" policy against the USSR and the People's Democracies, but also to weaken and isolate Yugoslavia. Events have shown that the continuation of strained relations between the USSR and Yugoslavia is harmful to both countries and leads to a heightening of world tension.

Consistently pursuing a peace-loving policy, the Soviet Government has put forward a proposal to the Yugoslav Government to normalise relations between the two countries and came out for strengthening the old friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the fraternal Yugoslav peoples. The Government of Yugoslavia has expressed its readiness to cooperate in improving relations with the USSR and the first steps have been taken for the normalisation of relations. Both Governments proceed from the premise that relations between countries must be founded on the principles of equality and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

Now, when as a result of the activities of the Western powers the threat of reviving German militarism has become graver, each step that is aimed at improving relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia corresponds to the vital interests of the peoples of the USSR and Yugoslavia, as well as of all peace-loving peoples, who made incalculable sacrifices in the fight against fascism.

Production Successes of Polish Working People

The Polish working people are working to fulfil production plans ahead of schedule and cut production costs.

In the coal industry miners of the "Gottwald" pit have fulfilled their year's programme 39 days ahead of plan. They have increased their coal output by 4% over last year.

The working people of Poland rejoiced at the news that the second coke-chemical battery at the V. I. Lenin Metallurgical Combinat in Nowa Huta had been put into commission. This battery, the biggest in Poland, has been built in accordance with the most up-to-date technical methods. The blue prints were prepared by Soviet drafting offices. The equipment and other machinery for the construction of the battery was supplied by the Soviet Union.

Recently the many thousands of textile workers at the Marchlewski Mill in Lodz won a great victory: a weaving shop at this mill produced a million metres of material above plan. Thousands of metres of fabrics have been manufactured by economising on raw materials.

As a result of good work by the Party branch, which succeeded in mobilising the workers to take up Zhandarova's method, the workers at the Poznan Phosphate Fertiliser Plant had fulfilled the year's plan by the beginning of November. By the end of this year the plant will have produced nearly 18,000 tons of superphosphates in excess of plan.

FIGURES TALK

Growing Unemployment in Capitalist Countries

★ In capitalist countries unemployment, dread scourge of the working class, is rising.

According to obviously underestimated official data, in one year alone (from September 1953 to October 1954) the number of unemployed in the U.S.A. showed an increase of 1.7 million. The number of workers employed in the textile industry has dropped to less than half the 1949 figure.

★ During the past three years the number of unemployed in Italy has gone up, according to the Ministry of Labour, by approximately 400,000, reaching in February this year the record figure of 2,419,000. To conceal the real state of affairs the Government decided to include unemployed from 15 years of age in unemployment statistics whereas formerly 14-year olds were counted.

★ Official reports show that in July the number of unemployed in Japan was 640,000. Mass sackings are taking place in the shipbuilding, coal, metallurgical, engineering, textile and other industries. By the end of July the Kosyuha Steel Company, one of Japan's big iron and steel companies, had dismissed 40% of its workers.

★ According to official data unemployment in Canada at the beginning of this year had reached 438,000 as against 130,000 jobless in 1952.

American "Gifts" to Egypt

During the past few weeks there has been tremendous bally-hoo put out by U.S. propagandists about a consignment of American poultry and livestock to Egypt—declaring this to be a "gift", "an example of U.S. generosity".

Great indeed was the bewilderment, surprise and indignation of the Egyptians when this "aid", to which so much publicity had

Churchill's statement that even before the war had ended he gave an order to collect the German arms so that they could be issued again to the Hitler soldiers and directed against the USSR has the aim of encouraging the forces advocating the policy of aggression and hatred among the peoples.

(Press Item)



HIS ALLY

Drawing by J. Novak

For High Ideological Level of Literary Criticism in Bulgaria

Literary criticism has been attracting close attention from the broad public in Bulgaria for some three years now, and its present state, its errors and tasks are the subject of discussion at meetings of writers and in the press, and are dealt with in Party documents. Wide sections of the people show a lively interest in it. The explanation is that literary criticism has proved to be the weakest spot in the development of Bulgarian literature. Comrade Vylko Tchervenkov pointed out in the C.C. report to the Congress of the Communist Party of Bulgaria that "we still lack an adequate and militant criticism capable of correctly directing the development of artistic creation and leading it".

The weakness of our literary criticism was most perceptibly revealed early in 1952 in the evaluation of Dimitr Dimov's novel, "Tobacco", which became the subject of heated discussion immediately after its publication. Discussion of this work, the evaluation of this novel and the level of criticism by the Party were all factors which constituted a turning point in the development of literary criticism.

"Tobacco" is a big success of the post-liberation Bulgarian literature. As in no other work in our literature, Dimov shows with particular force, on the basis of vivid and exposing facts, the decadence and complete moral collapse and predatory nature of the bourgeoisie. The many sketches and episodes are a clear and convincing portrayal of the ruthless exploitation of the workers, they show how the labouring people were robbed on a mass scale. The novel realistically depicts the corruption and anti-popular policy of the Bulgarian rulers who were in the service of German imperialism.

★
Georgi Tsanev
Professor, Sofia University

★ ★

dogmatism, abstract theorisation, isolation from life and talmudism—which screened the lack of a creative assimilation of Marxist-Leninist aesthetics. The wealth and diversity of the events of daily life, the inner complicated nature of the characters and the ideological and emotional content of the novel did not come within the framework of the vulgarised schemes evolved by certain critics and therefore they rejected it.

The oversimplified approach of these critics in analysing the negative characters made it impossible for them to realise the satirical and exposing import of such characters as Irene, Costov and von Geier. They accused the writer of endowing these heroes with a "wealth" of spiritual qualities, a "high degree of culture" and ascribed an incorrect understanding of the typical to him.

Not only contemporary literature but also our literary heritage have fallen victim to the dogmatic, talmudist approach towards the theoretical study of artistic works divorced from the concrete historical conditions. Our criticism regarded the writers of the past in a sectarian way, over-emphasised their reactionary or erroneous views and individual unrealistic works and on this basis altogether rejected their creative work.

In the report at the VIIth Congress of the Comintern in 1935 Georgi Dimitrov pointed out that "we are concerned with every important question, not only of the present and the future, but also of the past of our own peoples" that the Communists must

show the correct path of development for our literature and particularly for literary criticism. The newspaper *Rabotnichesko Delo* carried an editorial entitled "Concerning the novel 'Tobacco' and its ill-starred critics". On the shortcomings of criticism the article said:

"Instead of analysing and clearly seeing the conditions under which a given work is born they evolve their abstract and dry-as-dust schemes and try to fit into them the literary works they are reviewing. There is not an ounce of correct Party policy in this method of criticism, it is directly opposed to the method of Socialist realism." The newspaper showed, in a concrete way, how to remedy matters and assimilate Bulgaria's literary heritage. At the same time the article not only stressed the immense artistic, social and educational significance of the novel but also pointed to some of its shortcomings.

In the second edition of the novel published this year, Dimov, having taken into consideration the critical remarks, rectified certain shortcomings to which the newspaper *Rabotnichesko Delo* and readers had drawn attention.

In our cultural life there was another event. Whereas such an outstanding work as "Tobacco" was rejected by the critics, another work, which has no merits and distorts in a hostile manner our new reality in the countryside, was staged by the State Musical Theatre. I refer to the operetta "Delyana". *Rabotnichesko Delo* did not disregard this fact either. It published an article, "A harmful work", exposing the entire lack of ideological and artistic content of the operetta.

These articles testify to the immense help given by the Party to our literary and

POLITICAL NOTES

Why is a Bumper Harvest in the U.S.A. Considered a "Calamity"?

Labor, organ of the U.S. railwaymen's trade union, recently published a drawing of a cow symbolizing U.S. agriculture. Farmers are shown strenuously fattening it up and the Wall Street profiteers are even harder at it milking the cow dry of dollars.

This same journal asked on September 18: Who wins when the farmer is the loser? It went on to say that since January, 1953, when the present Administration came to power and Ezra T. Benson became Secretary of Agriculture the farmers' incomes have fallen considerably. And all that the farmers have lost—and more—the companies processing and selling agricultural produce have put in their pockets. Benson, the journal wrote, was not fighting for the interests of the consumer and the farmer but for the food corporations whose profits were swelling rapidly.

There's no gainsaying that this is the absolute truth. And in circumstances when the U.S. ruling circles are concerned about one thing only—to maintain the already fabulous profits of the food corporations—the contradictions of capitalism, which have been driven to absurd extremes, stand out a mile.

And, indeed, the prospects of a good harvest this year gave rise to consternation among speculators on the stock exchange and other businessmen who are stuffing their pockets full by robbing the farmers. Day by day the bourgeois papers drone on about surplus agricultural produce and

and result in a further reduction in consumption of farm produce. According to the *Agricultural Situation Bulletin*, in 1953 the amount of butter consumed per capita was less than half that consumed during the agricultural crisis in the 'thirties; the per capita consumption of cheese fell 11.3% in 1953 alone and so on.

What is the reason for this peculiar situation of increased "surpluses" on the one hand and increased retail prices for farm produce on the other?

The reason is quite obvious—it is because the capitalist monopolies are scrambling for maximum profits. That is why increased "surplus" of any farm produce in the U.S.A. is accompanied by a rise in retail price.

What is giving rise to higher prices in the country, to the increased burden of direct and indirect taxation is the policy pursued by the U.S. ruling circles, the policy of militarising the economy and the arms drive, the policy of knocking up aggressive military blocs. And this cannot but lead to new difficulties in disposing of agricultural produce.

U.S. ruling circles are applying compulsion in reducing the areas under crops, are destroying farm produce and, under the guise of so-called "aid", are dumping it on foreign markets. The areas sown to wheat have already been reduced 30% and cotton 19.3%. Last year about

tion and leading it".
The weakness of our literary criticism was most perceptibly revealed early in 1952 in the evaluation of Dimitr Dimov's novel, "Tobacco", which became the subject of heated discussion immediately after its publication. Discussion of this work, the evaluation of this novel and the level of criticism by the Party were all factors which constituted a turning point in the development of literary criticism.

"Tobacco" is a big success of the post-liberation Bulgarian literature. As in no other work in our literature, Dimov shows with particular force, on the basis of vivid and exposing facts, the decadence and complete moral collapse and predatory nature of the bourgeoisie. The many sketches and episodes are a clear and convincing portrayal of the ruthless exploitation of the workers, they show how the labouring people were robbed on a mass scale. The novel realistically depicts the corruption and anti-popular policy of the Bulgarian rulers who were in the service of German imperialism.

The sharp eye of the author pierced into the very entrails of the political and social systems of bourgeois society. The novel allots a prominent place to many a representative of this society—from the gendarme and the sleuth to the Minister of Internal Affairs himself, from the insignificant agent buying tobacco to the managing director of one of the biggest tobacco exporting companies. Spiridonov, Morev, Barutshiski and others—representatives of this parasitical, rapacious and rotting class—are vividly and brilliantly portrayed. In these figures the author has succeeded in bringing out the multifarious features which make up the old world, doomed by history to destruction.

And we see how a sound, virile and optimistic working class rises to struggle against the parasitical, decadent class of the bourgeoisie. The working class is exploited and persecuted but it is full of vitality because the future belongs to it. Dimov, with knowledge of historical reality, describes the struggle of the working class of Bulgaria under the leadership of the Communist Party at the different stages, he discloses the concrete forms this struggle took—from strikes to the partisan movement and the national uprising. The novel reflects the tremendous influence exerted by the Soviet Union on world affairs, the help it rendered to freedom-loving peoples and its services in liberating mankind from fascism.

"Tobacco" is a work of great effective force. Describing the sufferings of the people, the exploitation of the working class, the sadism of the police state and the devastation and disasters that war brought in its train, the author vividly shows what a terrible social system our people have rid themselves of. Showing the selflessness with which our people fought against the forces of war, oppression and fascism, the novel inspires its readers to real action in defence of peace, democracy and Socialism. The pictures of the grim past are drawn with such force that they have the effect of a summons to vigilantly safeguard our present bright life won at the cost of blood and countless sacrifices.

Whereas the bulk of our literary critics failed to appreciate the merits of the novel and its immense social significance the rank-and-file reader, guided by a feeling for the living truth, a knowledge of life and a love for everything that is really fine and heroic, received Dimov's novel with warmth and judged it to be a splendid success of our socialist literature.

The negative attitude of some critics towards this novel graphically mirrored all the major vices of our criticism—schematism,

The oversimplified approach of these critics in analysing the negative characters made it impossible for them to realise the satirical and exposing import of such characters as Irene, Costov and von Geier. They accused the writer of endowing these heroes with a "wealth" of spiritual qualities, a "high degree of culture" and ascribed an incorrect understanding of the typical to him.

Not only contemporary literature but also our literary heritage have fallen victim to the dogmatic, talmudist approach towards the theoretical study of artistic works divorced from the concrete historical conditions. Our criticism regarded the writers of the past in a sectarian way, over-emphasised their reactionary or erroneous views and individual unrealistic works and on this basis altogether rejected their creative work.

In the report at the VIII Congress of the Comintern in 1935 Georgi Dimitrov pointed out that "we are concerned with every important question, not only of the present and the future, but also of the past of our own peoples", that the Communists must "enlighten the working masses on the past of their people, in an historically correct fashion, in a genuinely Marxist, a Marxist-Leninist, a Lenin-Stalin spirit, in order to link up their present struggle with the people's revolutionary traditions in the past". From this it follows that literary criticism must examine the creative work of writers of the past from a Marxist-Leninist standpoint and place at the service of the people everything that is revolutionary, realistic, democratic and progressive in their creative work.

The necessity for cherishing the literary heritage was likewise emphasised by Comrade Vylko Tchervenkov. Referring to such writers as P. Slaveikov, Ch. Botev, I. Vazov and so on, he said at the conference of Communist writers in 1949: "Everything that is positive in Bulgarian literature before September 9, 1944, is part of our national wealth, which we must safeguard, multiply, value and develop in future."

To a certain degree literary criticism deviated from this Party line. It could not understand the contradictions in the creative work of such writers as P. Slaveikov, S. Mikhailovski and A. Strashimirov. It belittled the significance of realistic and democratic literature, thus narrowing the rich source of progressive traditions.

Our critics did not understand the concrete truth of life or how and when it becomes the truth of art, and proceeded from general and abstract formulas on the positive hero, on the typical and on Socialist realism. An insufficient assimilation of the Marxist-Leninist method of approach to the study of life and literature, an inadequate theoretical, methodological and specialist literary training was partly responsible for this. It was also the result of the fact that though our literary critics closely followed the development of Soviet literature they did not learn from it as they should. The blunders of literary criticism are also explained by the fact that the Secretariat of the Writers' Union behaved more like an observer than an active leader of literary life in the country. Until recently the Presidium of the Writers' Union hardly dealt with questions of creative work, and when it dealt with them it did not give them sufficiently serious consideration. The leaders of the Writers' Union failed to see the incorrect and non-party line of criticism and to rectify the mistakes in time.

It became necessary for the Party to intervene and put an end to this incorrect line, to disclose the shortcomings and

concrete way, how to remedy matters and assimilate Bulgaria's literary heritage. At the same time the article not only stressed the immense artistic, social and educational significance of the novel but also pointed to some of its shortcomings.

In the second edition of the novel published this year, Dimov, having taken into consideration the critical remarks, rectified certain shortcomings to which the newspaper *Rabotnichesko Delo* and readers had drawn attention.

In our cultural life there was another event. Whereas such an outstanding work as "Tobacco" was rejected by the critics, another work, which has no merits and distorts in a hostile manner our new reality in the countryside, was staged by the State Musical Theatre. I refer to the operetta "Delyana". *Rabotnichesko Delo* did not disregard this fact either. It published an article, "A harmful work", exposing the entire lack of ideological and artistic content of the operetta.

These articles testify to the immense help given by the Party to our literary and theatrical criticism, to its resolve to rid the ideological front of any bourgeois influence, to the principled Party line in the development of literature and the arts.

In 1953 *Literaturno Front*—organ of the Writers' Union—sponsored a discussion on the state of affairs in our criticism. This discussion, however, suffered from a lack of organisation and had insufficient guidance from either the Union or the editorial board. It lasted for a fairly long time and showed that our criticism had failed to carry out the tasks it had been set by the Party. It managed to solve certain problems only; in particular it changed its attitude towards our literary heritage. It should be admitted, however, that in this matter, too, all was not well. Hitherto there was a nihilist approach towards our literary heritage; some critics now went to the other extreme and displayed an uncritical attitude towards all elements in this heritage, both reactionary and unrealistic. They forgot the major teaching of Lenin on the two cultures in every national culture, on the critical assimilation of the cultural heritage; they forgot that we should take from the national culture only its progressive, democratic and socialist elements.

The Party has done everything possible to encourage and correct the critics, to enliven their work, to create an atmosphere of free exchange of opinion based on the Party line of principle. Whereas, before, a certain group of critics held a monopoly and thought, as the *Rabotnichesko Delo* noted, that "they are the complete and arbitrary masters" of Bulgarian literature, now all the conditions for collective work, for participation of all critics in literary life have been created.

Concrete organisational measures have also been taken to enable the main task of everyday and purposeful leadership of literature to be carried out in the spirit of Party policy. By now the critics' section of the Writers' Union has been reorganised into a commission on criticism, its chairman became a member of the permanent staff of the Secretariat of the Writers' Union. The commission, as an auxiliary body of the Secretariat, organises the work of the critics and keeps an eye on their work; it will systematically discuss the critical columns in the publications of the Union, hold discussions on the key problems of literature etc.

Literary criticism in Bulgaria is now being restored to a healthy state. The basic feature of this process is a desire to overcome weaknesses. And we have all the possibilities to do this. Helped by the Party and paying heed to its stimulating advice, our literary criticism will fulfil its tasks.

Mass sackings are taking place in the shipbuilding, coal, metallurgical, engineering, textile and other industries. By the end of July the Kósyuha Steel Company, one of Japan's big iron and steel companies, had dismissed 40% of its workers.

★ According to official data unemployment in Canada at the beginning of this year had reached 438,000 as against 130,000 jobless in 1952.

American "Gifts" to Egypt

During the past few weeks there has been tremendous bally-hoo put out by U.S. propagandists about a consignment of American poultry and livestock to Egypt—declaring this to be a "gift", "an example of U.S. generosity".

Great indeed was the bewilderment, surprise and indignation of the Egyptians when this "aid", to which so much publicity had been given, eventually arrived from across the ocean. It turned out that the sheep and chickens had arrived from the U.S.A. suffering from epizootic diseases. The sheep had to be killed off there and then so as to prevent the disease spreading to Egyptian animals. As concerns the chickens, as the journal *At-Takhrir* reported, they had nearly all pegged out, and those that did find their way to the Egyptian villages infected the local poultry with T.B.

And here the matter would probably have ended had not other unpleasant circumstances come to light in connection with this "gift". The point was that shortly afterwards, the U.S. authorities sent the Egyptian Ministry of Agriculture a large bill for these chicks. It even included the cost of maintaining the numerous American "specialists" who had accompanied the chickens to Egypt. And although their presence in Egypt in no way helped to save the chickens from almost total extinction the American profiteers demanded such an exorbitant price for their goods that even if these chickens had recovered, grown up and become fully-fledged egg-layers, and even if they had begun to lay golden eggs, the Egyptian peasants would not be able to settle up with their American benefactors for donkey's years.

It is hardly surprising that the Egyptian Government was forced into a polite refusal to take the next lot of puny chicks, and Abdel Razzak Sidki, Minister of Agriculture, in substantiating his decision, declared unequivocally enough that Egypt rejected help that did it harm.

The insatiable appetite of the American monopolists has once again revealed itself through the guise of "philanthropy".

Michael SALTER

NEWS IN BRIEF

★ At the Anshan Iron and Steel Combinat (China) more than 3,000 rationalisation proposals were adopted in the third quarter of this year.

★ In Budapest a new scientific magazine *Politico-Economic Review* has come off the press. It is published by the Academy of Sciences and aims to raise the level of political economy and ensure that it serves the aims of the policy in the new stage in a better way.

★ Under people's rule in Albania 12 technical schools and 7 institutes—agricultural, pedagogical, medical and so on—have been set up. A law institute has recently been opened.

power and Ezra T. Benson became Secretary of Agriculture the farmers' incomes have fallen considerably. And all that the farmers have lost—and more—the companies processing and selling agricultural produce have put in their pockets. Benson, the journal wrote, was not fighting for the interests of the consumer and the farmer but for the food corporations whose profits were swelling rapidly.

There's no gainsaying that this is the absolute truth. And in circumstances when the U.S. ruling circles are concerned about one thing only—to maintain the already fabulous profits of the food corporations—the contradictions of capitalism, which have been driven to absurd extremes, stand out a mile.

And, indeed, the prospects of a good harvest this year gave rise to consternation among speculators on the stock exchange and other businessmen who are stuffing their pockets full by robbing the farmers. Day by day the bourgeois papers drone on about surplus agricultural produce and from the expressions they use one would think they were talking about a national calamity. Again, on the other hand, they were as pleased as Punch in reporting that the wheat harvest this year has fallen by 208 million bushels against last year, because such "improved statistical indices" had an immediate salutary effect on wheat prices on the American markets. On the Chicago market, for instance, at the beginning of November the price of a bushel of wheat was 17 cents (about 8%) higher than in July.

It is common knowledge that a profound agricultural crisis has been raging in the U.S.A. for some years now and that there is no market for a great deal of the produce. The "surplus" grain, cotton, dairy produce and so forth are, even on official data, calculated to be worth billions of dollars. It is not because the needs of the Americans in farm produce have been fully met that the "surpluses" have arisen. No—far from it, the surplus obtains at a time when tens of millions of working people are unable to make ends meet, when they are in dire need and are eking out a half-starved existence, and when, at the same time, retail prices for consumer goods are rocketing without restraint. Suffice it to say that these prices have risen 13.9% since 1949 alone.

The rising cost of living, increasing unemployment, declining wages and other factors bear witness to the steadily growing impoverishment of the working masses

the one hand and increased retail prices for farm produce on the other?

The reason is quite obvious—it is because the capitalist monopolies are scrambling for maximum profits. That is why increased "surplus" of any farm produce in the U.S.A. is accompanied by a rise in retail price.

What is giving rise to higher prices in the country, to the increased burden of direct and indirect taxation is the policy pursued by the U.S. ruling circles, the policy of militarising the economy and the arms drive, the policy of knocking up aggressive military blocs. And this cannot but lead to new difficulties in disposing of agricultural produce.

U.S. ruling circles are applying compulsion in reducing the areas under crops, are destroying farm produce and, under the guise of so-called "aid", are dumping it on foreign markets. The areas sown to wheat have already been reduced 30% and cotton 19.3%. Last year about 20% of the potato harvest remained on the fields and part of it was dumped in the sea. And all this was done in the interests of maintaining high retail prices. Obviously, such a policy makes the already difficult situation in which the American farmers find themselves even worse.

Farmers' incomes are steadily falling, whereas the running costs of their farms are continually rising. Between 1951 and 1953 alone, for instance, their incomes dropped 25% and this year they went down another 6%. The *Journal of Commerce* recently reported that according to estimates by Agricultural Department economists farmers' incomes in 1955 would again fall by not less than 5%. Hundreds of thousands of farmers are being ruined, abandoning their land and fleeing to the cities. It is calculated that between 1945 and 1950 about 500,000 farms had been abandoned and according to the estimate of the Agricultural Department another million farmers and their families will soon leave the land.

As for an evaluation of the situation caused by the agricultural crisis, one cannot but agree with the opinion expressed by an ordinary American farmer whose letter was published in the *Capitol Times* on September 6. He wrote that there was no over-production, the reason was that not enough was being consumed. Millions of people, he said, were going to bed hungry while the millionaires were waxing fat.

That's the crux of the matter.

Jan MAREK

Facts Expose...

The "Luftwaffe" Again! A school for training cadres for the West German Air Force that is being resurrected is to be opened near the Mulheim airfield (Ruhr).

For this purpose an old people's home is being hastily vacated. Paratroop training schools are being opened at the Essen-Mulheim airfield and near Frankfurt on Main. For these, too, dwelling houses are being vacated. Hundreds of families are being deprived of the roofs over their head as a result of the remilitarisation of Western Germany.

Starvation Diet Thousands of the working people in Uruguay are living on a starvation diet.

An investigation made in the outskirts of Rivera by a Uruguayan food commission showed that 40-50% of the people in this region never have milk, 30-90% of them cannot buy butter, and fruit and vegetables are out of the reach of 75-87%. The working people of Uruguay are starving while hundreds of tons of food are being exported to the U.S.A. at rock bottom prices.

EDITORIAL BOARD