

JANUARY--MARCH 1941

T H E **BULLETIN**

"MYSTERIES" OF THE "SECOND WORLD WAR"

GEORGE MARLEN

The S.W.P. and the Food Workers Union

(How the Trotskyites Saved the Stalinist Gang)

ARTHUR BURKE

The Trotsky School of Falsification

Enshrining Radek in the Heart of the Working Class

Stalin's Aide---A Fortune for the Workers

THE RED STAR PRESS

P O. BOX 67

STATION D

NEW YORK



CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
"Mysteries" of the "Second World War" George Marlen	1
The S.W.P. and the Food Workers Union (How the Trotskyites Saved the Stalinist Gang) Arthur Burke	26
THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION	
Enshrining Radek in the Heart of the Working Class	32
Stalin's Aide - A Fortune for the Workers G.M.	34

Address Communications to:-

THE RED STAR PRESS
P.O.Box 67, Station D.
- New York -

"MYSTERIES" OF THE "SECOND WORLD WAR"

I.

The Background of the Present Moment

IN the "Second World War," on the surface, the major powers involved seem to be engaged in a struggle very much like that of 1914-1918, i.e., a struggle to defeat each other and to garnish the imperialist fruits of victory. In our view, on the contrary, the basic aim of the imperialist powers is to decimate the world proletarian vanguard as a preliminary to an assault on the Stalinized Soviet Union to destroy and partition it. Our contention is that in mutual agreement, they have been deliberately turning Europe over to Hitler's policing. Not actual war of the 1914-1918 pattern marks the present policy of the ruling class, but an international imperialist conspiracy against the workers and the remains of the October Revolution, a conspiracy camouflaged with a sham war. A careful study leads us to believe that this alone accounts for the amazing way in which the Nazi forces have spread their tentacles over Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium and France without meeting real resistance from the ostensibly "enemy" powers, in the first place, from the French and British imperialists.

History teaches us that a sham war is no novelty. Capitalist society has given rise to a number of mock wars in which the supposed antagonists, while officially doing their utmost to create the impression that they were bent upon defeating one another, in

reality were in secret collaboration, pursuing a common goal. It goes without saying that in a "war" which is really a screen concealing an organized conspiracy there are artificial victories and artificial defeats to fool chiefly those against whom the conspiracies are directed. Needless to say, these "victories" and "defeats" as well as the entire military situation run contrary to the rules of logic and sound reasoning. The explanations offered for the illogical events by those who serve the imperialist plotters are of necessity the reverse of logic.

Virtually the only source of information available to the workers today is the bourgeois source. It is only necessary to peruse with care the pages of the bourgeois newspapers in order to see the network of illogicality, contradictions, discrepancies and various phenomena defying anything like a plausible explanation. Let us mention a few of the "enigmas," "mysteries," and "miraculous" feats in the present so-called "Second World War."

When the German army struck against Poland, the Polish army surprisingly enough withdrew from the outer fortifications. Why did the Polish army make such a suicidal move? The answer was revealed a while later when it was reported that the Polish army had abandoned its fortified bord-

er positions on the advice of the British and French military leaders. Why these "Allies" gave such "advice" which facilitated Hitler's destructive and bloody work in Poland was never explained. The behavior of the "Allied" armed forces during the period of Hitler's march into Poland was perplexing to many. While the German forces were transforming the Polish towns into so many blazing infernos, there was not a single serious attempt to relieve the N a z i pressure on Poland.

After the destruction of Poland there came the period when bourgeois reporters and commentators themselves nick-named the situation the "phoney war," "the Second Bore War," and so forth. That there was something unreal about the "war of the democracies against the totalitarian aggressors" was obvious even to superficial observers.

Meanwhile, behind the scenes, some very secret things were happening. Roosevelt's emissary, Sumner Welles, was touring Europe visiting the leading statesmen of both the Fascist and the "democratic" states. The conversations which Welles held with Hitler and Mussolini as well as with Chamberlain and Daladier were never made public. Having made another round of seeing these leaders, Welles returned to America and reported to Roosevelt in strict privacy. That report remains one of the great "mysteries" of the present situation. From whom were all those secrets withheld? Certainly not from Hitler and Mussolini, because they naturally know what they discussed with Welles. Thus, Roosevelt knows; Hitler knows; Mussolini knows; the leading statesmen of England and France know; but the masses are kept in the dark.

A short while after Welles' visit to the leading statesmen of the "belligerent" countries, amazing things began to happen. "Defying" the might of the British navy, Hitler sent across the Skagerrak, which is over a hundred miles wide, a fleet of ships and planes to invade Norway. From the angle of logic the venture seemed to be

an act of a maniac, and many people regarded it as such. The British warships reportedly went into action to frustrate the Nazi invasion of Norway. Headlines blared of "the greatest naval battle since Jutland." One third of the German navy was reported to have been sunk. Churchill promised that all German warships would be destroyed. It was only sometime later that it became known that the much-vaunted "Battle of the Skagerrak" never took place (See "More About Norway," The Bulletin, Volume III, #5). Meanwhile the Nazis ferried troops, tanks, artillery into Norway and, meeting only feeble resistance from the Norwegians, proceeded to occupy the country. Hitler continued sending heavy reinforcements virtually under the very noses of the British warships. An American correspondent, Leland Stowe, in a sensational dispatch disclosed that the British command threw into Norway about fifteen hundred raw recruits without adequate equipment to meet the highly mechanized Nazi forces. Finally, as one of the bourgeois military experts put it:-

"The Norwegian campaign, in fact, has been ended by what may be called mutual consent because of its unimportance. This is the apparent explanation of the curious Paris announcement that the Germans agreed not to interfere with the evacuation of the Allies from Norway." (J.W.T. Mason, New York World Telegram, June 10, 1940.)

Thus, by "mutual consent" borne out by the "curious" announcement, Norway was left to be policed by the Nazi gendarme of Europe.

As the events unfolded, it became clearer that Hitler was being transformed into a universal policeman for international imperialism with a view to decimating the proletarian ranks, to terrorizing and intensifying the exploitation of the masses and to the eventual destroying of the Stalin-controlled socialized property. That the imperialists would go to the extent of turning also Belgium and France over to the policing of Hitler is something which seemed so incre-

dible that it was difficult even to conceive. In fact, in our view of the situation prior to May 1940, we definitely ruled out such a development, an incorrect conception soon set aright by the startling course of history. The rulers of the imperialist circles, however, were very well informed as to what was going to take place. On June 19, 1940, Senator Downey revealed a very significant piece of information:

"Senator Downey told the Senate today that he had heard Ambassadors Kennedy and Bullitt and President Roosevelt as well forecast sweeping German successes in Europe.

"Mr. Downey said that the Ambassadors to Great Britain and France 'Prophesied to us what has happened in the last sixty days' at a joint session of the Senate and House Military Committees last year." (The New York Times, June 19, 1940. My emphasis - G.M.)

In other words, according to Downey, the American ambassadors to Great Britain and France foretold sometime in 1939, long before the invasion of Belgium and France, what actually took place in those countries in May-June 1940.

The Nazi occupation of Holland, Belgium and the most important section of France is unparalleled in history for its utter illogicality. It was a repetition of what had happened in Norway but on a truly gigantic scale. Once again "defying" the British navy, Nazi transports landed troops on the Dutch coast under the very noses of the British warships. Meanwhile Nazi troops entered Holland and Belgium. For some "mysterious" reason the "Allied" armies hastily abandoned the Belgian fortifications which were regarded among the strongest in the world. Important bridges were left intact and in a few days the Dutch and Belgian campaigns were over. Another of the "miracles" was the corridor of about twenty miles wide separating Belgium from France through which about sixty thousand Nazi troops penetrated to the Channel ports while driving a million "Allied" troops before

them. Another was the unresisted capture of the mightiest fortresses of the world such as Verdun. In the World War after a bloody struggle lasting over four months and costing a million lives, the German army abandoned the attempt to capture Verdun. In this so-called "Second World War," Verdun was captured and passed in twenty-four hours, with the Nazis marching unhindered as if on parade.

The inconsistencies and "mysteries" of the so-called "Second World War" did not end there. France seemingly suffered a complete collapse, and at this moment Mussolini "had thought to gain an empire on the cheap by stabbing fallen France in the back" (Churchill). The Italian army was fully mobilized, apparently straining at the leash to pounce on France and seize the long-coveted juicy morsels: Savoy, Nice, Corsica, Tunisia. But by one of the "incomprehensible" mechanics of this remarkable "war" Mussolini's "stabbing fallen France in the back" was expressed in action by turning his back to France, without grabbing or assaulting the eagerly desired possessions of French imperialism.

Meanwhile the illogicalities and contradictions continued piling up, making it ever clearer that the proletariat is faced not with a war among the imperialist powers but something altogether different. Be it remembered that in the "explanations" of Chamberlain and Churchill the main reason for the "Allied" "failure" to prevent the occupation of Norway was that the Nazis possessed a superior air force. The "inferiority" of the "Allied" air force was played up tremendously after Norway and immediately prior to the "fall" of France. But the spectacular removal of the "shattered" armies of the "Allies" from the Channel ports was ascribed precisely to British air power. Here is this explanation which is in direct opposition to what had been said only a few weeks previously:

"There are indications, too, that Allied air power is being increased and it must not be forgotten that it was British air power as well as that of surface ships

that brought about the successful evacuation to Britain of the Allied armies that lost the Battle of Flanders." (Yates Sterling Jr., The New York Times, June 10, 1940.)

And so, six weeks before, according to the explanations of Chamberlain and other imperialists, neither the British navy nor the Royal Air Force was able, even in alliance with the French navy and air force, to hinder the invasion of Norway although the Nazis had to send their relatively weak fleet across a considerable stretch of sea. Now, in a supposedly complete collapse of the campaign on the continent, the British and French air and naval forces performed an amazing feat in holding off the Nazis and removing tremendous numbers of "defeated" "Allied" troops:

"The British Air Force, particularly, did wonders in protecting a giant fleet of small ships which took Allied soldiers off the beaches around Dunkerque." (Ibid.)

Apart from the question of the relative strength of the air forces, the British are indisputably in full control of the English Channel. This was true when Germany possessed a powerful navy in the World War, and it is true today. In Secretary Hull's statement one reads:

"The twenty miles of water between Continental Europe and Britain are under British, not German, control." (The New York Times, January 15, 1941.)

According to facts and realities the Nazis would be unable to maneuver at will in the Channel. But facts and realities do not count in the "Second World War."

About three weeks after the "Allied" troops successfully left the Continent, presumably due primarily to the British air force and the might of the British navy, the Nazis performed a much more "miraculous" exploit which would have been absolutely ruled out in a real struggle between British and German imperialism. The Nazis occu-

pled two British islands in the Channel! How this utterly unaccountable deed was accomplished is beyond all understanding — if one does not grasp the key to the present situation. But what is most fantastic in the occupation of those British islands, Guernsey and Jersey, is that the Nazis are still there, and not even an attempt has been made to "wrest" them from Hitler. The waters around those islands are under British control. The Nazi force holding those British islands is so insignificant that a few companies of marines landed from British warships could eliminate the Nazi rule there in a few hours. Yet for some unexplained and really unexplainable reason in so far as the imperialist excuses and explanations go, the Nazi bandits are allowed to police those islands.

II.

THE "MYSTERIES" OF THE AERIAL "WARFARE"

Here are numerous "puzzling" and inconsistent aspects of this "war," aspects which are absolutely incompatible with the established laws of thinking, and are accepted by the wide masses because the agents and propagandists of imperialism are skilled in making black look white and vice versa. The aerial "warfare" between the British and the Germans is one of these aspects. Logically, one would expect, antagonists aiming to defeat each other would pursue a policy of concentrating the weapons of war upon military objectives, upon industrial plants which feed and sustain the enemy armies and fleets, and only incidentally strike at targets the destruction of which would not materially injure the enemy. The direct opposite has been the rule in this "war." For many months after the Nazi air raids on Britain began, there wasn't even a word in the dispatches indicative of any Nazi concentration of fire upon British industry.

The really surprising thing is

that after some allegedly intensive bombardment of British industries the damage has been found to be less than five per cent:

"While German night bombers in four months of raids on England have laid waste some cities and blasted and burned huge hunks out of others, British officials assert that damage to the island's essential war industry so far has been surprisingly small." (Taylor Henry, "British Factory Damage Put at Less Than 5%," New York Herald Tribune, January 8, 1941.)

It must be borne in mind that, as a whole, British industry has been expanding all along. Unemployment is being steadily absorbed. Exploitation not only of men but also of women is undergoing a tremendous intensification, with the British imperialists squeezing huge surplus value out of the toil of the proletariat. Churchill remarked in the House of Commons on January 22nd of this year:

"I have kept myself constantly informed of the great tide of new factories rising to productive level. I say that in the next six months we shall have for the first time an intense demand on man power and woman power."

The leaders of imperialism are aware of course of the fact that this gigantic fraud, the so-called war between the "democracies" and the Fascist powers, represents a tangle of contradictory and "inexplicable" phenomena. There are many things which the imperialist spokesmen do not even attempt to explain. One of the phenomenal features of this "war" is the obvious avoidance on the part of the Nazis to wipe out British industry:

"There are many phenomena in this war which defy explanation, even by the most expert. If the German air force can practically destroy a city in a one-night raid, as in Coventry, why is it that it has failed to wipe out industrial England in a series of these raids? If, as we know, England can live

only if her ports remain open, why has not the German air force concentrated its efforts on closing these ports by aerial bombardments? It has made but few raids on Liverpool and Bristol, and those only recently. What is the answer? I don't know. Apparently no one does." (Joseph P. Kennedy, New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 19, 1941.)

Incidentally, Kennedy's remark regarding the "destruction" of Coventry is a considerable exaggeration. A few days later Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner in a dispatch from Washington to The New York Herald Tribune reported that they had learned something regarding the "destruction" of Coventry from an important British authority visiting the United States, Air Chief Marshal Sir Hugh Dowding:

"His information has also done much to dispel the notion that the big night-bombing raids are totally destructive. In the famous Coventry raid, for instance, he reports that a rifle factory and a plant making the small Siddeley engines for training planes were the only ones seriously damaged, while the city's machine-tool shops and the vital Rolls-Royce engine factory near by escaped virtually unscathed. Interruption of production by damage to electric power lines and other public utilities rarely lasts more than three or four days, he says. And he insists that although the rate of increase has naturally been slowed by bombing, British aircraft production is still gaining perceptibly every month." (January 23, 1941.)

These reporters also stated:

"Two influences have startlingly altered expert opinion on Britain's chances in the coming all-out air battle with observers stationed in Britain, who continue unanimous that German bombing has done SURPRISINGLY LITTLE DAMAGE TO PRODUCTIVE FACILITIES." (New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 23, 1941. My capitals - G.M.)

That's how the Nazis have been "wiping"

out airplane and other British industries! And that's how the German air force practically "destroyed" Coventry! Of course, when Coventry had been bombed there were blood-curdling headlines on the front pages of the newspapers creating the feeling of a genuine war having burst over Europe. Nor is Dowding alone in his observation:

"Most of Dowding's story is confirmed by our own observers. For instance, their dispatch showing that the great raid on Southampton did not prevent Spitfire from turning out four or five extra planes that week exactly checks with Dowding's data on Coventry and what he says of the value of decentralization." (Ibid.)

Statements like those of Dowding are tucked away and therefore very often escape the attention even of those who sift carefully the information supplied by the capitalist press.

One repeatedly sees news items stating that the British aviators are bombing the so-called "invasion ports," that is, the Nazi-held Channel ports. It would seem that those objectives were the very spearheads of Nazi attack on Britain. Yet the behavior of the British aviators, as described by an eye-witness, is extremely "queer," to say the least. It is well known that no effective air attack can be carried out if the powerful enemy is warned of the coming raid and is therefore given time to take necessary measures. In the matter of the British bombing the "invasion ports" the Nazis receive advance warning, and the informers are not the "Fifth Column" but the British themselves. At the end of January the American Export liner, Siboney, brought to the United States many notables, among them one Dr. Maes:

"Dr. Maes was in occupied France until Jan. 8, and he said that the British were being very "humane" and cautious in their bomb attacks on channel ports. Frequently, he declared, on the day before a raid the British would send a plane over to drop leaflets warning that the

raid was coming. Then an hour before the actual attack a lone plane would pass overhead with a warning siren to send the people to safety." (The N.Y. Times, Jan. 30, 1941. My emphasis - G.M.)

III.

THE "RIDDLE" OF MUSSOLINI'S NAVY

With the entrance of Italy into this so-called "Second World War," the contradictions and the illogicalities were extended into the Mediterranean.

Although on the whole the British navy is far more powerful than the Italian navy, the British Mediterranean ships were apparently outnumbered by Italian forces:

"On both land and sea the British in the Mediterranean regions were apparently outnumbered by Italian forces." (New York Times, Nov. 10, 1941. Section 4.)

Since this "war" represents an endless chain of "mysteries" the remarkable inactivity of the Italian navy has been an impenetrable "enigma." This naturally has been observed by not a few people. A sample report states:

"For several days I have been at sea with a portion of Britain's Mediterranean fleet. The Admiral had an assignment in the Central Mediterranean. With battleships, aircraft carriers, cruisers and destroyers, he carried it out without notable interference from the Italians, although on the second day out, THE ITALIAN NAVAL FORCES, SUPERIOR IN NUMBERS AND ENDOWED WITH GREATER SPEED, COULD HAVE ENGAGED HIS SQUADRON. BUT THEY DID NOT CHOOSE TO DO SO." (Richard Mowrer, New York Post, Oct. 4, 1940. My capitals - G.M.)

The only "explanation" the bourgeois editors could offer was to propound the "riddle." On the editorial page of the New York Times of October 24 1940 the "riddle" of that inactivity was presented to the readers:

"The Mystery of Italy's Navy

"How is one to explain the inactive role of Italy's Navy in the war? Here is a navy with some of the fastest ships in the world, with the largest fleet of submarines in Europe, with no far-flung ocean routes to be defended, with seamen whose traditions of bravery on the water go back to the heroic days of Venice and Genoa. Yet this great fleet has not dared to challenge Britain's naval grip on the Eastern Mediterranean."

Of course to those who understand that the imperialist powers are carrying on a sham war, all the "strange" actions on the part of the German, British, French and Italian imperialists are no mysteries at all. But of course the imperialist editors, hiding the truth, picture the inactivity of the Italian Navy as an insoluble mystery. They feel they must advance some explanation, and they speak of "perhaps" this, that or the other as the cause for the "mystery." The difficult points which they are compelled to cover are the facts that, in the first place history provides numerous examples of a fleet engaging a more powerful adversary; in the second, that the Italian Navy is a mighty war machine, the second largest in Europe if we are to discount for the moment the French Navy, and is regarded as superior to the British Mediterranean fleet. The editors of the New York Times finally gave the impression that they themselves were puzzled by the "inexplicable" and seemingly cowardly behavior of Mussolini's Navy:

"Whatever the reason, the behavior of the Italian Navy until now must be accounted one of the mysteries of this war." (Ibid.)

IV.

THE "MIRACLE" OF GREECE

In its military aspect, the whole Italian participation in this "war" is incredible. The most conspicuous

freaks have been the preposterously anomalous and utterly unreal campaigns in Greece and Africa.

On the 28th of October the Italian army invaded Greece. There was hardly a person who, having a certain amount of knowledge of the purely military side of the situation, harbored any doubt of the immediate outcome of the Italian attack upon Greece — according to the logical way of thinking. The military expert of the New York Post, Fletcher Pratt, wrote on the day following the invasion:

"The odds are gigantically with Italy. The Greek army is not too well trained, is badly equipped and ill served by roads. It is outnumbered by the Italians, who have worked like mad to build up a system of motor routes through Albania.

"The Italian air force is so overwhelmingly superior that it ought to finish off the Greek airplanes and landing fields by midnight tonight. After that the Fascist bombers can go to work on communication and concentration points, striking for the same collapse in the back areas that brought about the fall of Poland, Norway and France.

"It is hard to see how England can spare enough airplanes to do any good. It is still harder to see how they can get there soon enough if spared. The landing fields are apt to go out too soon." (Fletcher Pratt, New York Post, October 29, 1940. My emphasis — G.M.)

In the air, Fletcher Pratt indicated, Italy had a decisive advantage; he implicitly ruled out the possibility of Greek-British victory. To him the question involved merely how good a resistance they could put up:

"In the air the enemy can operate from secure nearby bases, while British planes must first come from a long distance and then work out of bases in the country under attack. The Italian effort will undoubtedly be to make the air arm decisive, as the Germans did in

Norway.

"The question of the campaign is not whether the Greeks and their British helpers can win, but how good a fight they can put up and what they can save." (Ibid. My emphasis - G.M.)

From the military angle much of this analysis is perfectly logical and correct. If Hitler, without the participation of Italy, was able to "conquer" literally within several weeks, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium and France, how long would it require Mussolini, possessing a gigantic military machine and backed by a "victorious ally" whose military might exceeds all previous records in its history, to pulverize the relatively insignificant Greek army and crush the small and feeble little country under his bloody heel! Nothing in the light of common military sense could save Greece. Its neighbors in the Balkans were under the shadow of Hitler's guns. In Africa the Italian forces were reported to be superior to the British who, therefore, in a natural situation, would have been compelled not only to keep all their equipment and men there, but to do their utmost to increase their strength. In the Mediterranean the Italian navy was free to intercept transports to Greece, and in the Adriatic Sea, virtually a lake separated from the Mediterranean by a fifty-mile strait between Albania and the Italian mainland, Mussolini was in complete control. Hanson W. Baldwin, military expert of the New York Times, two days after the Italian-Greek "war" began, wrote something on this theme:

"London denied earlier reports that British forces had landed at Crete or Corfu or other Greek islands, but said that the Mediterranean fleet under Admiral Sir Andrew B. Cunningham, had already taken measures to aid the Greeks. By many, Britain's help was expected to be limited chiefly to naval aid, unless Turkey should come into the war. For the British forces in Egypt and the Near East are thought to be considerably inferior in man power and in planes to Italian-African forces, and it

is not believed likely that General Sir Archibald Wavell, British commander in the Middle East, would feel that he had strength enough to weaken his defenses in Egypt by sending any considerable forces to Greece." (The New York Times, October 30, 1940. My emphasis - G.M.)

In terms of military science, Baldwin in all probability evaluated the picture as any professional investigator would. From the point of view of a real war, Egypt and the Suez Canal as well as Gibraltar would have been exposed to danger of seizure by the Italian and German imperialists had the British forces been diverted from these pillars of the British Empire:

"Moreover, the threat is not to Greece alone. The Grecian campaign is probably but the beginning of the Axis Winter campaign, which may well include a blow against Gibraltar and the Western Mediterranean basin. Hundreds of thousands of men are locked up in Britain — and the bulk of them must stay there — against the threat of German invasion of the British Isles, a threat which the German General Staff will take care to see is never lifted as long as the war lasts.

"Britain's riposte, therefore, against the latest Axis drive, may be strictly limited by the lack of adequate man power, material and planes and by the necessity of keeping in reserve sufficient forces to meet other, perhaps more deadly, thrusts." (Ibid.)

From every conceivable angle, except two, that of a deliberate understanding among England, Italy, Germany and other imperialist powers, or revolutionary overturn of imperialism, the fate of Greece was apparently sealed: The advantage for a successful military campaign in Greece, including the geographic position of Italy and Germany, was completely on the side of Mussolini and Hitler. Baldwin wrote in the same article:

"Interior Position Aids Axis:

"The interior position of the

Axis is again serving them well; any aid that comes to Greece from Britain must come from overwater by long, circuitous communication routes; the Axis working from the centre of Europe outward, can quickly shift men and equipment from point to point, whereas Britain must work around the perimeter with consequent disadvantages."

Then commenced the "miracles" of Albania and of the Adriatic — "miracles" which negated all the laws of military science and of specific analyses of the situation from the military angle. The inadequately-equipped and poorly-trained Greek soldiers "defeated" Mussolini's mechanized army, "drove" it into Albania and have continued the uninterrupted, triumphant "pursuit" ever since. How did such a "miracle" come to pass? In order to give an explanation to phenomena which orderly thinking would allot to the category of impossibilities, the capitalist newspapers were compelled to stand logic and reason on their head. Everybody knows that one of the main reasons given for Hitler's spectacular occupation of Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium and Northern France was the blitzkrieg tactic. This suddenly was "forgotten" by the newspapers. Since the Greek mechanized equipment was nothing to speak of, and the Greek soldiers had no alternative but to employ obsolete methods of warfare, the capitalist journalists with the most serious mien gave the ridiculous explanation for Greek "victories," namely, old methods of war! In a dispatch headed "Greeks' Gains Laid to Old-style War," the New York Times correspondent, A.C. Sedgwick, said:

"The Greeks have for the most part conducted their amazingly successful exploits on a primitive scouting pattern. They have not hesitated to discard all impediments for swift action. Case after case is reported here of small Greek squads capturing enemy concrete strongholds by stealth with equipment reduced to rifle, bayonet and perhaps a few grenades." (The New York Times, November 24, 1940.)

Thus, in Albania, in the very country which Mussolini had occupied in three days precisely through the blitzkrieg, or near-blitzkrieg, method he now meets with "defeat" after "defeat" at the hands of a technically backward Greek army! For a number of years Mussolini had been building roads and strongholds in Albania. Now, participating in the "mystery war" he had to play an absurd game and pretend "defeat" at the hands of Greek soldiers who literally used primitive methods of fighting in "capturing" the Italian strongholds. In his dispatch Sedgwick states that the Greeks were saving munitions by rolling stones upon Mussolini's troops:

"There are even some cases in which they are reported to have saved ammunition by rolling boulders down upon the enemy, exactly as their forefathers did in the 1821 war of independence." (Ibid.)

One is made to forget that this is a period of tanks and aeroplanes, of long-range rapid-firing artillery, of steel and concrete forts, of barbed wire and steel helmets. The Greek army has won a whole series of incredible "victories" through the most ancient methods of offense:

"The Greek soldiers have been forced to rely on the most ancient methods of attack, and at this they were fully successful." (Ibid.)

That, of course, is one of the many "mysteries" of this topsy-turvy "war." In fact Sedgwick said that the modern mechanized equipment of the Italian army actually contributed to the Italian defeat:

"It is interesting to observe that the Italians frequently hampered their own movements and contributed to their own defeat by bringing with them cumbersome anti-tank guns when it would appear that their own General Staff must have known that there was no need for such weapons." (Ibid.)

Thus everything is turned upside down. It is common knowledge that

what counts in modern warfare among the capitalist powers is industrial structure. Now all this becomes "useless." Speedy tanks capable of climbing hills, even the planes which could fly from Italy to South America, are now "obsolete" in so far as the campaign in Albania is concerned. Now, "it is warfare in which the human spirit again has its part. The human element counts. Red blood is more important than gasoline" (Ibid.).

In Ethiopia, where the fierce tribesmen fought with an infinity of spirit and daring, where the terrain made operations unusually difficult for an invader, Mussolini's modern mechanization overcame the tribesmen with a minimum loss of Italian soldiers in actual battle. "Spirit" and the "human element" crumbled before tanks, artillery, airplanes, poison gas. But in the Greek "war" an ounce of "spirit" is apparently more powerful than a ton of high explosives, if we believe the bourgeois press.

Such are the cock and bull stories which are being poured out by the newspapermen to explain the "mystery" of the Albanian situation.

Naturally the Greek morale has been strengthening daily in the face of the "miracles" of "capturing" Italian strongholds with bayonets and boulders.

"With an air force of 130 obsolete planes, a navy of which the former United States battleship Idaho and some French destroyers form the core and 150,000 dubiously equipped men in the field, Greece will fight Italy 'into the sea,' if the Fascisti are not aided by Germany, the two representatives told reporters." (The New York Times, November 23, 1940.)

The contradiction in the last portion of the statement is obvious. What sort of aid could Hitler give Mussolini? Obviously not boulders or bayonets, but modern equipment. But modern equipment Mussolini possesses in abundance, as well as men.

We remember that the New York Post military expert, Fletcher Pratt, said that the Italian air force would finish off the Greek air force, planes and airfields in a few hours. Nothing of the sort has happened. It must be borne in mind that Italy has almost 3,500 planes in active service (The New York Times, Nov. 10, 1940). Mussolini with relative ease and swiftness could have transformed the virtually unprotected Greek cities into smoldering ruins. Since counterfeit is made with a view to deceive by passing the false for the true, it must resemble the true in some outward appearances. To dispel a few of the "mysteries" Mussolini sent some planes to bomb Greek cities. But the bombing itself has become one of the "enigmas" in the situation. The planes did very little damage. Here is a sample of the reports with respect to the raid on the large city of Salonika:

"Salonika Raid Fruitless"

"According to a communique issued by the Ministry of Home Security, there was a raid on Salonika, but no damage or casualties. It appears that of the many bombs dropped on this second most important town of Greece all fell into the blue waters of the bay." (A.C. Sedgwick, The New York Times, January 22, 1941.)

Here is another example, dealing with air bombardment of the islands of Zante and Crete:

"Italian planes bombed points on the island of Zante and one person was wounded. In Crete, the Greeks said, bombs fell on open fields." (New York Times, February 16, 1941.)

V.

THE "MYSTERY" OF THE ADRIATIC

It is interesting, that the greatest advance the Greek army made was in the coastal region, that is, in the area most easily accessible to the

Italian war vessels and airplanes. Here is a brief record of the mileage registered in the advance of the Greek army:

"A Greek spokesman reviewing the counter-invasion of Albanian territory, said that since Nov. 28 the Greek forces had:

1. Advanced seventeen miles in the north, from a point five miles south of Pogradec to the vicinity of Lin, which is vital for the protection of Italy's main mid-Albanian base at Elbasin.

2. Extended the central sector from Georgevitsa, ten miles southeast of Moskopolis, by about fifteen miles to bring them to within fifteen miles of Berat, north of Kllisura.

3. Gained eighteen miles in the southeast, from Senitsa, three miles southeast of Argyrokastron, to the heights north of Tepeleni.

4. Made a thirty-five-mile sweep of the Southern Adriatic coast of Albania, seizing Porto Edda, Palermo and Khimara and advancing from there to within about fifteen miles of Velona." (New York Times, December 29, 1940. My emphasis - G.M.)

The Italians, holding the coastal region, could have used a powerful combination of the mechanized army, air force and the navy to prevent the Greeks from seizing fortified ports like Porto Edda and Khimara. Yet, nothing, it seems, could stop the sweep of the poorly-equipped Greek troops!

But this is only a minor "miracle" of the Adriatic. The great "miracle" of the Adriatic was performed by the Greeks on the sea itself.

It is commonly known that the Italian Navy, composed in the main of modern ships, some of them the fastest in the world, and having the largest submarine fleet in Europe, has been undisputed master of the Adriatic. The Strait of Otranto, a heavily fortified area, is guarded by naval and air patrols as well as by land batteries on the Albanian and the Italian shores.

Not even a log can float through the Strait of Otranto without being sighted by the Italian patrols. But in the present so-called "Second World War" any "miracle" is possible. So there occurred a "miracle" that would make any departed Admiral gasp in his grave with astonishment. The puny Greek Navy, composed of obsolete American and French boats, steamed through the well-guarded Strait of Otranto into the Adriatic, an area which under ordinary war circumstances would have been a death trap for the Greek fleet. It approached the Albanian shore and shelled the Italian-held Albanian towns. In these days of radio communication the Admirals of the Italian Adriatic fleet were instantly informed of the appearance of Greek warships in the Italian waters. How the slow-moving Greek ships could have escaped the fast and powerful Italian cruisers has been a "mystery." But the "mysterious" and the "miraculous" adventures of the Greek Navy did not end there. They only began. It appears that the tiny Greek Navy repeated the impossible feat, entered the Adriatic for the second time, did some shelling and, eluding the Italian planes, submarines and surface ships, escaped. That, however, does not exhaust the great "miracle" of the Adriatic. The Greek fleet repeated the exploit for the THIRD time!

"The audacious Greek fleet, for the third time, has penetrated into the Adriatic Sea through the fifty-mile-wide Strait of Otranto despite the heavy Italian air and naval patrol of this channel and not only shelled the Albanian base of Velona, but also cannonaded the coast at several more southerly points.....

"The accomplishment of the Greek fleet, which is microscopic in comparison with the fleet of the enemy, was related in a communique of the Marine Ministry published tonight. It says that Sunday night a flotilla of destroyers, commanded by Rear Admiral Cavvadias, carried out an operation of the Adriatic, traversing the Otranto Strait for the third time and advancing into the Gulf of Velona." (C. L. Sulzberger, The New York Times, Jan. 8, 1941.)

Anyone glancing at the map can find the island of Saseno lying right in the mouth of the Gulf of Velona about three miles from one shore and six miles from the other. The island is a powerful Italian fortress. Immediately south is the fortified Cape Glossa, also guarding the entrance to the Gulf of Velona. Concerning the town of Velona and the island of Saseno we find the following in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, Volume 3, p. 65:

"The port is the best of the Albanian coast, and the nearest to Italy. It is protected by the island of Saseno, the ancient Saso, and by Cape Glossa, the northernmost headland of the Acroceraunian Mountains."

In circumstances of actual warfare it is absolutely impossible for a hostile warship to squeeze through into the Gulf of Velona without being challenged by the batteries of the island of Saseno. The "miracle" performed by the old ships of the Greek Navy becomes, therefore, doubly "miraculous" when the Greek Marine Ministry officially stated that the Greek fleet not only penetrated the heavily guarded Strait of Otranto and entered the Adriatic, but also advanced into the Gulf of Velona and actually shelled the port of Velona itself, and returned to Greek waters. Where were the Italian patrols of the island of Saseno and the Cape Glossa? Where were the Italian vessels plowing the Adriatic? Where were the fast Italian warships patrolling the Strait of Otranto? Supposedly, nobody knows. Sulzberger's report in the New York Times stated that after the Greek flotilla had advanced into the Gulf of Velona—

"There the squadron hove to and let loose a salvo of some sixty shells against the port and the island base of Saseno, which has been transformed from a goat pasture into a potent naval fortress by the Italians. The warships began their bombardment suddenly and turned on their searchlights in force. Then, almost before the Italians had become aware of the attack, the Greek flotilla turned

and sailed into the Adriatic, retreating to its base at reduced speed. AT NO TIME DURING THE OPERATION WERE ANY ITALIAN WAR VESSELS ENCOUNTERED." (C. L. Sulzberger, New York Times, January 8, 1941. My capitals - G.M.)

To show that the Italians were in control of the Strait of Otranto we shall cite another dispatch of the same correspondent dated only five days earlier, in which he stated that the Italians were quite busy in the area of the Strait of Otranto, transporting troops by plane and fast motorboats:

"At the same time, the Italians have adopted another German method of warfare and are NOW TRANSPORTING TROOPS ACROSS THE OTRANTO STRAIT by plane in quantities, thus evading the constant British and Greek sea patrols. Air pilots who have been flying over the Otranto area also say that the Italians ARE INCREASINGLY USING FAST MOTORBOATS to transport officers and small groups of men ACROSS THE STRAIT." (New York Times, Jan. 5, 1941. My capitals - G.M.)

Yet the Greek fleet entered the Adriatic and then the Gulf of Velona, cannonaded Velona and other points, and returned at reduced speed to Greek waters without having been challenged, without encountering a single Italian war vessel!

Such is the "Second World War"!

The capitalist newspapermen realize, of course, that as a war the entire affair is the acme of absurdity, that there is no rhyme or reason in the whole picture. And, realizing this, they must teach their readers to accept the unreasonable and the illogical, otherwise the terrible criminal game may become obvious. Hence the remarks by such eminent bourgeois figures as Kennedy. Hence, too, the instruction to its readers by such an influential capitalist newspaper as the New York Times:

"LOGIC IS NOT THE GUIDE TO THIS

WAR. Some completely irrational and implausible incident — an intervention of nature, an accident, an unexpected human reaction — may upset the sequences of reason and change the course of events. Logic does not rule, and we shall continue to be plagued and baffled by the unreasonable and irrelevant behavior of premises and conclusions." (Editorial, The New York Times, Jan. 9, 1941. My capitals - G.M.)

There is logic to this "war." It is concealed beneath a mountain of deceptions about Churchill fighting Hitler and Mussolini, and about Mussolini and Hitler fighting Churchill. All the imperialists have combined in one of the most gigantic frauds ever perpetrated upon the toiling masses. Under the screen of "war" the imperialists are Fascisizing the world with a rapidity hitherto impossible. They are destroying the most militant section of the workingclass, and are preparing to attack and partition the Stalinized workers' State. That is the true logic of the present "Second World War."

VI,
THE "SITDOWN STRIKE" OF THE
ITALIAN AIR FORCE

Let us examine a few more of the contradictions and "mysteries" of this terrible swindle perpetrated by the imperialists. We have seen above that the implied reason for the Italian "defeats" in Albania was that Mussolini employs the most modern equipment and methods against the old methods used by the Greek army. Mussolini's successful crushing of Ethiopia was due to the modern methods of warfare used. Now, the Italian "defeats" in Africa, are ascribed among other things, to the antiquated military tactics pursued by the Italian army. United Press war expert, J.W.T.Mason, wrote:

"Italy's defeat in North Africa

has been due to inadequate leadership, lack of equipment and inability to discard old methods of combat for the new blitzkrieg tactics." (New York World Telegram, February 8, 1941. My emphasis - G.M.)

The Italian forces in Africa were of considerable size and as we have cited before were regarded to be of greater numerical weight than the British.

"On both land and sea the British in the Mediterranean regions were apparently outnumbered by Italian forces. Italy's army in Egypt has been estimated at between 250,000 and 350,000 men. An additional Italian force — possibly 100,000 men — is held in East Africa. To carry on a Mediterranean air war Italy has between 2,200 and 3,500 planes in active operating squadrons." (New York Times, November 10, 1940.)

In August 1940 the Italian army, despite "old methods of combat," achieved a sensational "victory" over the British and occupied British Somaliland. Then, in September, continuing to use the same methods, it scored another remarkable "success" and occupied a portion of Egyptian territory. On December 9th the British staged in Egypt a "reconnaissance in force" and since then a whole series of amazing occurrences passed before the dazed world. One of the totally "inexplicable" phenomena during those occurrences was the "strange" conduct of the tremendous Italian air fleet of which over a thousand planes were stationed in Africa. The inactivity of the vast air fleet was puzzling to those who watched the aviation operations closely. Major Alexander P. de Seversky, for twenty years a leader of American aviation, got the impression that the Italian air force was on a sitdown strike:

"The number one puzzle of the war is the strange behavior of the Italian air force. Neither the Greek nor the Libyan-Egyptian campaigns gave evidence of Fascist

aviation in the numbers which might logically be expected from Italian air power." (New York World Telegram, December 19, 1940.)

In this "war" it is perfectly logical that everything of importance must of necessity be illogical. It is quite possible that de Seversky did not realize that. He continued to show wonder:

"At the outbreak of the war Italy was generally credited with possessing 3500 war planes, and it is estimated that her total now is 5,000. While the quality leaves much to be desired, the relatively small number of aircraft at the disposal of Britain and her allies in the Mediterranean led all observers to expect spirited Italian aviation enterprise.

"There have been magnificent opportunities for Il Duce's aircraft to do its stuff. The Taranto episode offered such an opportunity. A properly organized air force would never have permitted a British airplane carrier, stationed so close to the coast to get away with impunity. All indications are that Italian aviation did not even attempt to pursue the carrier." (Ibid)

Viewing the picture with the eyes of a professional airman, de Seversky observes in it only the elements relating to his field, evidently fully swallowing the noisy headlines that blare about naval battles. So he wrote:

"The Italian navy at least has fought several running battles. But Mussolini's aviation behaves as though it were on a stubborn sit-down strike.

"Expert observers are unable to solve the puzzle. There must be a consistent solution, but it certainly is not visible at this distance." (Ibid.)

It certainly is visible. The solution of the "puzzle" and all the other "mysteries" and "riddles" of the so-called "Second World War" is possible only through an analysis which

completely excludes all the fanciful yarns that the imperialists and their lackeys feed to the masses.

De Seversky's statement about the numerical inferiority of British aircraft in Africa is confirmed from other sources:

"Finally General Wavell's air helpers had what they considered was a one to four inferiority." (New York Times, January 30, 1941.)

Corroboration of his assertion that Italian aviation is on a "sitdown strike" has been forthcoming all along. The New York Times (February 4, 1941) wrote:

"Agordat fell in two days under a British air bombardment to which the Italians offered no reply."

This was true throughout the Albanian and the African campaigns. Since the British air force in Africa was approximately only one fourth the strength of the Italian air force, it would have looked absolutely ridiculous for a huge fleet of planes to be annihilated in an air battle. It was far simpler to create the impression that the Italian air force was busy elsewhere and to let the British bring their planes into the game:

"British fire into Tobruk has been aided materially by British planes flying as spotters for the artillery. No Italian planes have appeared to challenge them and R.A.F. pilots report that all Italian planes in eastern Libya have been withdrawn to the Berka and Benina airdromes outside Benghazi." (Richard D. McMillan, New York World Telegram, Jan. 21, 1941.)

Other correspondents let slip the information that the Italians in the Agordat-Barentu section had bombing planes, yet they remained inactive during the British "capture" of Agordat:

"A correspondent with the British forces in the Agordat-Barentu

zone sent this report on the operations there:

"The surprising feature thus far has been the comparative inactivity of the Italian Air Force, although it is believed that the Italians have about 300 bombers and fighters in East Africa." (The New York Times, February 3, 1941.)

We showed elsewhere (see The Case of Holland, Belgium and France) that the method resorted to by the Italian air force in the game of furnishing a "victory" to the British was not at all original with them. The British command employed this tactic to bring Hitler's soldiers and the Gestapo into the Lowlands and into the most important industrial section of France. At that time British aviation was on a sort of sitdown strike while Hitler's planes were sowing hellfire among the millions of refugees on the highways of France and other countries. Now in Africa the British air force reversed the tactic and participated actively in the occupation of towns, while the Italian air force adopted the former British tactic of being "elsewhere."

Of course the plan of the "magic" acts in Africa producing startling effects would have been more difficult to put over if the Italian air fleet were constantly in view, opposing the weaker British air forces and interfering with General Wavell's land movements. Churchill admitted that the Italian air fleet was far more numerous than the British, but gave the impression, without telling when, where or how, that the British had "wrested the control of the air" from the superior Italian air fleet:

"Of course, none of our plans would have succeeded had not our pilots, under Air Chief Marshal Longmore, wrested the control of the air from a FAR MORE NUMEROUS ENEMY." (The New York Times, Feb. 10, 1941. My capitals - G.M.)

* * * * *

To the numerous remarkable and truly fantastic occurrences, impossible "feats," and various phenomena which, as Kennedy asserted, "defy explanation"; to the "mysteries" of the

Adriatic, of the Skagerrak, of the two British islands in the Channel, of the Italian Navy, the Italian air force, of the "corridor" with 60,000 Nazis "chasing" a first-rate army of a million men, and to the many other situations, totally illogical in a real war, was added the "mystery" of the Italian conduct in Africa:

"Italians' Conduct in Egypt
Fuzzling

"Although the Italians are conceded to have been outgeneraled and outfought in the recent battle in the Western Desert, several of their apparent mistakes remain FIRST-CLASS MYSTERIES today. Even expert military observers cannot tell why the Italians built rock fortresses to stop modern tank and artillery fire, and why they did not observe British armored cars approaching before the attack in the Sidi Barrani area. Most mysterious of all is why Italian planes did not bomb the British in the areas to the rear during the battle." (New York Times, December 30, 1940. My capitals - G.M.)

This is really so incredible as to give the whole game away. Even in the days of Feudalism no horseman could approach a fort without being spied from a considerable distance with a naked eye. And here the world is regaled with a first-class "mystery" eclipsing even the most fantastic wonders of the romantic fiction. A modern army fails to observe armored cars approaching for an attack! Wasn't there a single officer or man equipped at least with common opera glasses? The Italians had outposts in the desert, obviously observation posts for the special purpose of frustrating any surprise attack and at the first sign of any irregularity in the desert to report to headquarters. A modern observation post is well-provided with spyglasses, powerful searchlights and other instruments. Unbelievable as it may sound, The New York Times states that "Outposts in Desert Apparently Failed to Detect Approach of British Tank Units." The "puzzle" is so "baffling" that not only ordinary mortals but accord-

ing to the bourgeois press itself, even expert military observers cannot explain the conduct of the Italians, "why they did not observe British armored cars approaching before the attack in the Sidi Barrani area." As to the reason why the Italians did not take advantage of their numerical superiority in the air, it remains one of the "unsolved mysteries" of the "Second World War."

The bourgeois press admits that the explanations offered for the "strange" behavior of the Italian air force are inadequate:

"Both air force and army men are UNABLE TO EXPLAIN why, during the battle, Italian planes were used chiefly to strafe advancing British troops and to make none too effective efforts to protect Italian airdromes — this despite SUPERIORITY OF NUMBERS. British planes, meanwhile, were bombing and strafing every Italian airdrome, port and supply station in Libya, causing the Italians much difficulty. Had the Italian planes retaliated in kind, the British attack undoubtedly would have been hampered, but they made only the MOST FEEBLE EFFORTS.

"A neutral observer who was far forward during the entire operation saw not one Italian plane and heard only a few at night. Several explanations have been offered, but NONE SEEMS WHOLLY ADEQUATE." (New York Times, December 30, 1940. My capitals - G.M.)

In fine, the conduct of the Italian General Staff was made to look very much like that of the man balancing himself on a limb which he is sawing off at the base.

The reversed interpretations of the topsy-turvy elements in the imperialist game become only too obvious after checking the reports, editorials and other comment of the capitalist ideologists. In Albania the Italian army was reported to have over-equipment of modern weapons of war; in Africa, lack of such equipment.

The Italians were pictured as having imagined that they were fighting not the modern British mechanized army, but some backward colonials:

"Italy had had months to study the German campaign in France, in which German armored units were so successful, but Italian Marshal Rodolfo Graziani apparently thought he was fighting a colonial war." (Ibid.)

Graziani, of course, thought nothing of the kind. He had his secret instructions from Rome, and not only from Rome but very probably from Berlin, London and Washington. When the secret archives of the imperialists finally fall into the hands of the revolutionary workers, the whole world will know what occurred in Munich, the essence of the talks Sumner Welles had with Hitler and Mussolini, and the precise account he rendered to Roosevelt.

In so far as the equipment of Graziani's army is concerned, the correspondents in their dispatches plainly indicated that the Italian army was well armed and prepared for modern warfare:

"British occupation of Kassala was described in these circles as the 'successful climax of the war of manoeuvre carried out by numerically inferior forces against an enemy VERY WELL ARMED AND EQUIPPED.'" (New York Times, January 21, 1941. My capitals - G.M.)

The pattern designed as a guide for manufacturing "victories" and "defeats" and employed successfully in Norway, Holland, Belgium and France was now introduced in Africa. This pattern consists of a rapid withdrawal of an army from fortified positions in order to allow the "enemy" to occupy those positions without a fight or with as little contact between the two "opposing" armies as possible. In the Lowlands and in France the program called for British and French withdrawal; in Albania and Africa, for Italian withdrawal:

"In an advance of more than seventy miles up to January 24 British imperial forces have encountered the Italians only three times." (The New York Times, Jan. 29, 1941.)

It is very possible that no contact at all had been contemplated and the onrush of the British was a bit ahead of schedule. In any event, the basic policy of non-resistance or of a mere show of resistance was pursued throughout:

"Otherwise the British forces, despite the speed of their advance, found that the Italians had retreated ahead of them, abandoning villages and fortified positions before they could be attacked." (Ibid.)

Indeed, there is nothing that approximates the curious and even embarrassing ridiculous condition in which the imperialists find themselves in order to carry on their fake war. Most unrealistic of all is their attempt to invest it with the mantle of realism. Why should an army well armed and trained, having superiority of numbers, flee one fortified position after another even before those positions are attacked. Some towns were turned over to the British - by proxy!

"The Sheik of Kassala informed the British that they had left, The British then occupied the town." (New York Times, January 21, 1941.)

"At Tesenei, one of the first towns taken in Eritrea, the British found that Italian troops had fled, leaving behind only the Governor's chauffeur with a letter requesting good treatment for the inhabitants of the town." (The New York Times, January 29, 1941.)

Good bye, and take care of the slaves of imperialism, said the bloody Fascists to their "democratic" "enemy." One might harbor the erroneous idea that in Eritrea or in the Italian Somaliland the terrain is difficult of defense. As a matter of fact the advantage in this respect is wholly on

the side of those who would try to stop an invading army:

"On the southern fronts in Eritrea, Western Ethiopia, the Kenya border and Italian Somaliland, the terrain varies enormously, and whether it is rocky mountain country or wide stretches of desert sands it is equally difficult for the advance of forces of all arms. From the viewpoint of defense, the nature of the country offers EVERY FACILITY but so far the Italians appear to have made little use of this advantage." (Major Claude S. Jarvis, New York Times, February 3, 1941. My capitals - G.M.)

For some hidden reason fortified positions were being abandoned by the Italians without waiting for the British attack.

Italian soldiers obviously had received orders to surrender to the British without offering any resistance, and they surrendered by the tens of thousands. They were ready to surrender to any uniformed man who they knew was not an Italian. Thus, Edward Kennedy, a reporter of the Associated Press in Libya, related that some Italian soldiers surrendered to him, and he turned them over to a British correspondent or directed them where to go to be officially "captured":

"Dozens of Italian soldiers have surrendered to me personally, mistaking me in my correspondent's uniform for a British officer. So many prisoners have been taken in the capture of Tobruk that handling them is an annoyance.

"Faced with the problem of whether under the neutrality act an American is allowed to capture prisoners, I have usually found a way out by turning those surrendering to me over to a British correspondent, or directing them to where they may be officially captured." (Daily News, January 24, 1941.)

To the confused masses the picture of the "Second World War" is enveloped in a mist. The military experts express their doubts and bewil-

derment and do much "explaining" but of course do not offer the correct explanation, and would not offer it even if they were tipped off by the men in higher places.

Hanson W. Baldwin of the New York Times has sufficient information to realize that the Italian imperialist commander, Graziani, is an able general. Baldwin cannot evidently ignore the fact that there is something extremely "fishy" about the whole African somersault. The peculiar "defeat" of the Italian armies he regards as a very curious business:

"The strange defeat in detail of the Italian armies in Libya, with the fall of Tobruk, which the British Imperial Army of the Nile "mopped up" last week, presents in retrospect one of the most curious campaigns in military history." (The New York Times, Jan.27, 1941.)

Graziani's seemingly unsound and suicidal strategy, the strategy of cutting up his army into segments, each segment naturally facing a superior British force, Baldwin regards as a major mystery:

"Why Marshal Rodolfo Graziani, still considered by the British one of the ablest colonial and desert commanders in the world, should have permitted large segments of his forces to be overwhelmed by superior forces; why, in effect, he should have opposed the British in successive encounters with only parts of his army, each of those parts doomed to disaster, appears on the face of it to be one of the major mysteries of the war." (Ibid.)

Thus in this "war," which is a gigantic fraud camouflaged with some destruction of life and property in order to give it a semblance of genuineness, the principles of logic and strategical science do not and cannot hold. Baldwin says further:

"But the Graziani tactics seem to be the very negation of a basic strategical principle, the principle that the enemy must be met with

full strength, that he cannot be permitted to strike at separated or isolated forces and thus to defeat them in detail."

Graziani, naturally, does not have to be instructed in the elementary principles of military science. It is precisely because he knows them that he was able to accomplish successfully what he did. Similarly, it required good military brains of the "Allies" and the Germans to work out the scheme of the "corridor" between Belgium and France to achieve the rapid Nazi occupation of Paris and the most important section of France. Feeling that he must give something of an explanation, Baldwin resorts to the old method of disregarding facts established previously by numerous reports:

"Most important was the factor of British air power. The British EARLY established clear-cut air superiority, and, having it, they blinded the Italians and worked their own will, harassing Italian troop movements and concealing and protecting their own." (My capitals - G.M.)

In the files of the New York Times and of other capitalist newspapers one can find references to the numerically superior strength of the Italian air fleet in Africa. Only three days after Baldwin wrote the above statement one could read in The New York Times that the air helpers of the British commander, Wavell, estimated that the Italians had four planes to one British.

While the Graziani tactic negated a basic principle of military action, the tactic of the British commander, General Wavell, was no less a negation of war strategy. In a real war, rushing headlong with small forces speedily across an enormous stretch of desert territory with lines of communication so drawn out, his situation would have been hopeless. This, of course, did not escape notice. Robert P. Post cabling to the N.Y. Times, said:

"There arises the question of

how far General Wavell is going to pursue them. It would appear that his lines of communication are long enough at the moment." (The New York Times, Jan. 23, 1941.)

Post even expressed the supposition that Wavell might decide "it is time to halt an advance that has been made with incredibly small forces."

But Wavell went right ahead "conquering," as if by magic, one Italian stronghold after another, marching unimpeded toward Benghazi. Two weeks after Post had made his remarks, the editorial of the New York Times asked in pretended wonderment:

"Is there any stopping place in the Italian retreat in Africa? Until now it might have been suspected that the strange passivity of Marshal Graziani was a trick to draw the British far from their bases to some point where the remnants of his armies could make a successful stand. But where is this point? Reports that the garrison has begun to withdraw even from Benghazi, capital of Cyrenaica and one of the proudest and most imposing of Fascism's "new cities," confirm a growing impression that the rout in Libya is not simply an evacuation of one untenable position after another." (February 7, 1941.)

And on the next day one read the editorial in the New York Times half-admitting the illogicality of the farcical spectacle in Africa by the mere mention of the fantastically few casualties the British army suffered in "conquering" one of the precious jewels of the Italian empire. Many people believe that an army on the offensive suffers heavier casualties than the one that is being attacked. This was the common explanation for the terrific losses Stalin's army suffered in Finland. Yet in the Libyan affair the incredibly small forces under General Wavell, on the offensive "against" a well-equipped army of a quarter of a million men, "captured" one fortified place after another, "netted" over a hundred thousand armed

soldiers, and all that at the expense of a FEW HUNDRED CASUALTIES:

"Bengazi has fallen on the sixty first day of a campaign unprecedented in colonial warfare. An invasion of 250,000 well-equipped troops has been turned into a rout and counter-invasion netting some 114,000 prisoners at the cost of only a few hundred casualties." (The New York Times, Feb. 8, 1941.)

About two weeks earlier, in the January 28th issue, the New York Times attempted to hint that the "mystery" in Africa was due to a general discontent in the Italian army:

"Only one thing is clear in the rout of the Italians in Africa. That the armies did not retreat but waited at point after point to be captured by thousands is a mystery that suggests widespread disaffection not only in the troops but in the command."

Unfortunately that was not the case. And on February 7th this suggested explanation had to be discarded by the New York Times itself; also the report of shortage of supplies and arms had to be negated by the admission that great reserves were not used by the Italians:

"This is more like a withdrawal from the war than a military retreat. No doubt supplies are lacking in Africa, as Marshal Graziani charged after the first defeat. Even if they could be safely transported, the home stocks of oil and equipment are so low that they prove that Italy never expected to fight. BUT THE AVAILABLE STORES WERE NOT USED. With every advance the British have gathered in GREAT RESERVES of tanks, trucks, guns and food. The Italians are resourceful and tenacious fighters when they want to fight, as they proved in the wars of liberation, at the Piave and in Ethiopia, but at no point in this battle have they fought as well as they could. In their surrenders and in their retirement

they act like nothing so much as an army laying down its arms.

"There is no hint of revolt in the ranks. There is no proof of rebellion at home." (My capitals and emphasis - G.M.)

That the masses in Italy are gloomily discontented, that the workers in the army are harboring bitterness and hope of liberation from the imperialist tyranny, there is no doubt. And there is little doubt that the same holds true for France, Poland and other oppressed countries, and even for Germany and to a growing extent for the British Empire. But the explanation for the unprecedented "mystery" of the Italian "defeats" lies elsewhere. Mussolini, Churchill, Hitler, Roosevelt, Petain are playing ball. On the masks they wear there is hatred and rage — the Fascists scowl at the "democrats" and the "democrats" at the Fascists. Beneath the masks there are knowing winks. A network of secret communications with emissaries and envoys darting to and fro, across the Atlantic to Europe and back to Washington, is spread around the toiling people and the small countries and millions of colonial slaves. International imperialism has temporarily shelved its war for booty to collaborate under the smoke-screen of a purest stage-play to tighten the noose of exploitation upon the capitalist world and finally to partition Stalinist Russia. The imperialists can be frustrated only if the workers act to overthrow them and establish a Socialist system.

The scattered information in the imperialist press itself, when pieced together, yields a sufficiently clear picture of the deceptive performance acted with telling efficiency by the first class stage-directors of imperialism. One of these experienced directors, the sly Churchill, put it very cleverly and succinctly when he told over the radio of his message to General Wavell on the eve of the "magic" performance in Libya:

"At that time I ventured to draw General Wavell's attention to the seventh chapter of the Gospel of

St. Matthew, at the seventh verse, where, as you all know or ought to know, it is written:

"Ask, and it shall be given; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.

"The Army of the Nile has asked, and it was given; they sought, and they have found; they knocked, and it has been opened unto them." (The N.Y. Times, Feb. 10, 1941.)

Such is the "Second World War"!

VII.

THE "MIRACLE" OF THE LIGURIAN SEA

One more "miracle" of the "Second World War" is worth mentioning. It is the "miracle" of the Ligurian Sea, the bombardment of Genoa by the British warships. In an actual war, an Admiral proposing action against such a strongly fortified city as Genoa which, besides its own batteries has an additional protection of deadly mines, submarines, an efficient air force, and the nearby naval base of Spezia, would have been eyed either as a traitor or an adventurer. But things are different in the "Second World War." It must be understood clearly what the bombardment of Genoa involved before the fleet could be well within range:

"Unofficial observers noted one or two interesting points in connection with the bombardment of Genoa. For one thing the bombardment involved a bold trip to northwest Italy, well inside Italian waters, and back again." (James Mac Donald, The New York Times, February 10, 1941.)

The British fleet went inside the Italian waters. Ostensibly it escaped notice of Italian warships, merchantmen and planes, at least one of which must have been patrolling the Ligurian Sea. Most ships and planes, as everybody knows, are radio-equipped. Yet

the bombardment was recorded by the British Admiralty as a "surprise attack." The British fleet steamed "unobserved" through the Italian waters, which are regarded as impenetrable, approached Genoa and—

"The British men-of-war rained more than 300 tons of shells on all parts of the harbor, ignoring the risks of Italian mines, submarines, airplanes or return fire by shore batteries." (Ibid.)

There was no report of any British ship striking a mine or being hit or attacked by a submarine or damaged by fire, if there was any, from the heavily fortified shores. The only interference, as far as we could ascertain, was by two Italian planes reportedly shot down by the British, and the only British casualty was one plane:

"Navy officials asserted that the only British casualty throughout the entire operation was one Swordfish plane, which is reported missing. Two Italian planes, 'which attempted to interfere' with the British attackers, were shot down, according to the Admiralty communique." (Ibid.)

Having bombarded Italy's chief seaport and one of the important naval fortresses of the country, the British withdrew unscathed and passed through the Italian waters back into the Mediterranean. The entire exploit eludes all logic, is so utterly fantastic as to be absolutely unexplainable from the military and naval point of view. It was, the Kennedys would say, a phenomenon defying explanation. On the next day, February 11th, The New York Times said editorially:

"Under the ORDINARY conditions of modern warfare, such a naval assault on a well-fortified port is THEORETICALLY IMPOSSIBLE. Nothing like it has been attempted in the present conflict, not even in the confused naval actions off Norway. Yet the British carried it through with small loss and in complete disregard of the Italian fleet anchored far away at Spezia." (My caps.—G.M.)

Nothing so obviously illogical was attempted in the "confused" situation off Norway.

The Italian Fascists also felt constrained to say something about the incredible "feat" of the British naval squadron at Genoa. Giovanni Ansaldo exclaimed that "some men cannot see how it was possible that an enemy squadron could arrive in front of Genoa in full daylight" (The New York Times, Feb. 12, 1941). But of course no explanation was given.

Just as the imperialist generals have been violating in this "war" the first principles of military science, so the imperialist admirals have cast overboard established views of naval tactics:

"..... the British Navy was able — as it has been able to do in the Mediterranean — to violate one of its own precepts: that ships cannot take on shore batteries." (Robert P. Post, The New York Times, Feb. 12, 1941. My emphasis — G.M.)

The "miracle" of the Ligurian Sea surpassed the "miracle" of Scapa Flow where a Nazi submarine entered the well-guarded powerful naval base of the British Empire, attacked some warships and departed. It is equalled only by the great "miracle" of the Adriatic. The "inefficiency" of the British Navy in the "miracle" of Scapa Flow had by now been all forgotten, and the only explanation that The New York Times could give for so "miraculous" an event as the bombardment of Genoa was that "To the world at large it was formal notice of the weakness of the Italian sea power." The "strangely" ineffective behavior of the land batteries at Genoa, the "miraculous" passage of British warships through the presumably mined and supposedly impenetrable waters, and the virtual "sitdown strike" of the Italian air force was for the moment left out of sight. It must be stressed that an attack upon Genoa was not something like an attack upon Valona or Tobruk. Genoa may be regarded as the very heart of Italy.

"This blow was aimed straight at the heart of Italy from waters sup-

posed to be impenetrable." (Ibid.)

To show more vividly what a naval absurdity, from the point of view of actual war, the British penetration of the Italian waters to the very city of Genoa is, it is sufficient to bring to the attention of the reader the vast radius of defense a modern naval base provides. For instance:

"The "Gibraltar of Asia," as Singapore has been called, provides an air and naval base for the defense of India, of the Netherlands Indies, of the British possessions that string across the vast Pacific distances to Australia and New Zealand." (The New York Times, Feb. 16 1941.)

It will be remembered that Australia lies 2,450 miles from Singapore. Another illustration is Pearl Harbor. It forms a naval pivot for the entire northeastern Pacific. No fleet can approach San Francisco 2,400 miles away, or the Panama Canal 5,389 miles distant without being intercepted by the naval and air forces which are based on Pearl Harbor. But in the case of the bombardment of Genoa, the Italian air and naval forces stationed at the great naval base and arsenal of Spezia only a few minutes' flight from Genoa, remained "strangely" unconcerned about the British blow aimed straight at "the heart of Italy"! It must have taken the British warships sometime to pour out 300 tons of shells, yet the only reported attempt to interfere came from two Italian planes, and the only British loss was one plane!

VIII
THE CLEAR AND THE OBSCURE
IN THE
GREEK AND AFRICAN EVENTS

We recall that during the "miracle" of Dunkerque, the British left great stores of supplies to the Nazis. Now the British were recom-

pensed in part for that expenditure:

"The number of prisoners captured by the British must now exceed 120,000, not counting large numbers of Italians killed. The booty includes vast quantities of supplies, nearly 300 tanks, thousands of guns, machine-guns and small arms and hundreds of trucks, leaving the Italian divisions remaining outside the British lines with a serious shortage of auxiliary armament." (The New York Times, February 8, 1941.)

The Italian army was well supplied not only with tanks, artillery, planes, munitions and small arms but also with huge amounts of food and clothing:

"The British have found incredible amounts of food and clothing abandoned by the Italians." (World Telegram, February 6, 1941.)

What was this "mystery" in Africa if not a deliberately manufactured "victory" for Churchill!

Why was this "victory" necessary for the imperialist powers? It is impossible to ascertain the hidden motive behind every detail, every move the imperialists are making in their far-reaching secretly-directed game. It is very likely that by continuing the uninterrupted, unrealistic "successes" of the "Axis" they began to sense the danger of being found out. Perhaps, therefore, that was the reason the bourgeoisie began to spread the hope that the British too would soon achieve "victories." That seems to be the point behind the remarks of Churchill in the Commons on January 22, 1941:

"But my mind goes back to a few weeks ago when our critics were crying out about our inaction against Italy and wondering whose was the hidden hand that was shielding Mussolini from British wrath.

"At the time, I endured these taunts in silence because I knew

the large and daring measures which had already been taken by which is has been since rendered possible to gain the splendid victories in Libya, Sidi Barrani and Bardia."

It may be that the need for British "victory" is only part of the explanation for the "mystery" of Africa as well as the "mystery" of Albania. Without question the imperialists are building up a feeling among the masses that Hitler is invincible. Be it remembered that one of the "mysteries" is that he has not "lost" a single "battle." Perhaps he will be brought into the Albanian and African pictures and made to appear to tip the scale. In any event, it is necessary to keep the elements that are clear apart from those which have not yet become plain. That the "Second World War" is a sham war, of that there is no shadow of a doubt, but it is too early to determine the precise and immediate role the African and Albanian affairs play in the general gigantic plot.

IX.

THE BRITISH "BLOCKADE" THE "AXIS"

Features establishing the fact that the "belligerents" are very amicably conducting their affairs can be found in abundance. Let us take the instance of the Nazi trade with Latin America. Supposedly there is a British blockade. Last June news leaked out that German industrialists made attractive offers of merchandise to traders in Brazil and other Latin-American countries. These offers were declared to be mere propaganda, although the Latin-American traders expressed conviction that some goods would slip the British "blockade."

"According to letters to the exporters, the Latin-American buyers are convinced that at least part of that merchandise on which Germany is soliciting orders was made up in the belief that it could be slipped through the Allied blockade in Italian vessels." (The New York Times, June 3, 1940.)

Ships carrying Nazi merchandise to Brazil were intercepted by the British warships. And it wasn't musical instruments or pencil sharpeners that the Nazi merchandise consisted of, but definitely contraband of war, for it consisted of arms!

"One of three ships recently stopped by the British Navy was the freighter Siquera Campos, bringing to Rio de Janeiro arms purchased from the Krupp works in Germany in 1938. The ship was held at Gibraltar, and Brazil demanded its release, for a precedent had to be established if other shipments were to get through." (Walter Kerr, New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 11, 1941.)

Well, what happened? Was the precedent established for other ships to get through?

"The order from Krupp, which amounted to \$45,000,000, was probably the greatest placed by Brazil in modern times for army equipment....

"The uproar that the detention of the Sequeira Campos caused in Brazil produced the desired result. The ship was RELEASED, and presumably future shipments will get through." (Ibid. My capitals -G.M.)

Thus do the British imperialists "blockade" the Nazis - by permitting passage of huge shipments of war material from German imperialists to their customers.

We can cite another interesting item which appeared in the press seven months after Italian imperialism entered the "war":

"Despite the war and the British blockade, the Italian owned and operated air line, L.A.T.I., has maintained a link between the Rome-Berlin Axis and the Western Hemisphere, completing its first year of operation last December 23rd.

"Land planes making weekly flights between Rome and Rio de Janeiro have enabled Germany and Italy to remain in direct contact with South America and the United States without running the risk of

confiscation or censorship by British authorities.

"Between June 10, 1940, the date of Italy's entry into the war, and Dec. 23, 1940, the line's planes made thirteen westbound flights and fifteen eastbound flights." (The New York Herald Tribune, January 16, 1941.)

Such is the "Second World War"!

C O N C L U S I O N

The present policy of the chief capitalist powers has nothing in common with "super-imperialism" of the Kautskian school. The imperialists have momentarily suspended their gang war for the purpose of combining to put over a gigantic plot which requires the cooperation of all the leading bandits. The classical precedent for such combined action among the imperialist powers is the intervention in Russia in 1918-1921. At that time, all the capitalist powers, though divided by sharp antagonisms, combined in an effort to reestablish capitalism in Russia. Today international capitalism is attempting to save itself through a strenuous effort of temporary collaboration in virtually every field. If it succeeds, which is quite possible although not at all certain, it will establish a slavery on this earth far more cruel and brutal than ever before. The only force that can frustrate the financial vultures and prevent the establishment of a military-industrial serfdom, that can overthrow all oppression and exploitation of man by man is the only progressive class in modern society, the proletariat.

But the proletariat lies prostrate, a helpless slave and victim of the imperialists, because it is paralyzed by the poison of opportunism, as in the actual war in 1914. At that time the chief opportunist poison was Social Democracy which tied the masses to the imperialist "fatherland." To-

day Social Democracy drugs millions of workers with the ensnaring illusion that the "democracies" are fighting Fascism. But far more powerful and deadly than Social Democracy is the potent virus of Stalinism. This opportunist monster, having usurped the traditions of October, is parading before the workers in the disguise of "Bolshevism." The Stalinists have been betraying the toilers since the degeneration of the Soviet Republic set in, during Lenin's illness in 1921-1922. Pretending that they are duplicating the line which Lenin put forth during the actual imperialist war, these infinitely treacherous deceivers of the workers spread the paralyzing lie that Churchill and Hitler are really fighting each other. "The war that has broken out in Europe is the Second Imperialist War." (Declaration of the National Committee, C.P.U.S.A.) That's how the Stalinist poisoners becloud the minds while the imperialists in secret collaboration are rapidly spreading the tentacles of Hitler's Gestapo. But the Stalinist bureaucrats of the "Comintern," the counter-revolutionary machine which bears the same name it bore when it was a Leninist organization, are not only pseudo-Bolsheviks who deceive the workers with the distracting fable of the "Second Imperialist War" or "Second World War." The political aids of the "Comintern," the Trotskyites and Left Trotskyites, echo the Browders and Dimitrovs. In phrases almost identical with those employed by the "Comintern," the Trotskyites state that "... the war in Europe is an imperialist war" (Socialist Appeal, October 17, 1939). And the Socialist Appeal's brother-under-the-skin, the Fighting Worker (Oehler), declares: "Everybody should know that the second imperialist war started last September...."

All the reactionary forces, pseudo-Bolshevism as well as imperialism, are deceiving the workers. Unless these forces are exposed, unless the proletariat eliminates from its body the poison of pseudo-Bolshevism and learns the truth about the imperialist policies, about Stalin and

Trotsky, the world bourgeoisie will successfully carry out its diabolical schemes; and very probably after it wipes out the class-conscious vanguard and the remnants of October it will drench the world in blood in a genuine second imperialist war. The first step in preventing such a horrible

future, the first step in doing away with the black present, is the exposure and destruction of the deadly acid of pseudo-Bolshevism and the building of a new Marxist party.

George Marlen
February 21, 1941

SEND FOR A FREE COPY OF -

THE CASE OF HOLLAND, BELGIUM AND FRANCE

AN EXPOSURE OF THE WAY IN WHICH
THE IMPERIALISTS IN COLLABORATION
BROUGHT THE NAZIS INTO HOLLAND,
BELGIUM AND FRANCE.

For an evaluation of the deceptions of the opportunists on the present international situation, send for:-

THE OPPORTUNISTS
AND THE
"SECOND WORLD WAR"

ADDRESS:
P.O.Box 67
Station D.
New York

THE S.W.P. AND THE FOOD WORKERS UNION
(How the Trotskyites Saved
the Stalinist Gang)

THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY leaders (Cannonites) picture the mass work they conduct in the trade unions as the specific form of what they term their everyday struggle against Stalinism and other forms of opportunism in the working-class ranks. Stalinism in the trade unions constitutes a basic menace to the interests of the workers. Around the time of the Second National Convention of the S.W.P., Cannon wrote:

"No, you cannot ignore the Stalinists. More than that, you cannot gain a single inch of ground and hold it in the trade unions without an intelligent and unrelenting fight against Stalinism." (Socialist Appeal, June 23, 1939.)

Cannon further stated during the above-named period: "Ninety percent of party work must be directed to the trade unions." (Ibid., June 30, 1939.) It is to be observed that the S.W.P.'s mass work in the trade unions constitutes an overwhelming portion of what it calls its struggle against Stalinism. These formulations, as every S.W.P. member and sympathizer knows, have been reaffirmed again and again since the time they were first made, and are the fundamental orientation of the S.W.P. activities.

The New York City food workers are a highly militant section of the proletariat, generally speaking. For many years the deadly influence of the Stalinist bureaucrats amongst large sections of these workers has been particularly marked. Moreover, the Stalinist leaders have been deeply en-

trenched in the food workers' union in New York City. The S.W.P. leaders have always claimed that it is their aim to rout the Stalinist bureaucrats from their positions in the food workers' union.

The career of the Stalinist leaders in the food workers' union has followed the usual criminal course of Stalinism amongst the workers. Gangsterism, pilfering, sell-outs, double-crossing, collusion with the bosses, and the like have constituted the policy of Stalinism in the food workers' union. In an article dealing with Local 302, a major unit of the Cafeteria Workers, Hotel and Restaurant Union (AFL), the Socialist Appeal wrote:-

"In the four-year domination of the union by the Communist Party, it has been completely exposed as an agency of the bosses within the ranks of the workers." (June 29, 1940.)

This particular Local 302 of the food workers' union has been dealt with in the columns of the Socialist Appeal over a considerable period of years. Three consecutive issues of the Socialist Appeal in the recent period (Dec. 21 and 28, 1940 and Jan. 4, 1941) have had front-page articles dealing with Local 302. It is apparent that some very vital activities occurred in this union recently. Let us examine, then, how the S.W.P. "fought Stalinism" in its mass work in this union.

In 1936, the Stalinists captured

the union control by making a typical deal with the gangster elements in it, as has been admitted by the Trotskyites. By 1938, a "Progressive" wing existed in the union which in December of that year polled 1,258 votes, Larry Phillips carrying the "Progressive" standard (Socialist Appeal, December 17, 1938).

In December 1939, the so-called "Progressive" bloc made even greater gains, obtaining 42 per cent of the votes and electing two business agents, Juan Aviles and Joe Diaz, as well as three members of the General Council and five members of the Executive Board. The strangle-hold of the Stalinist bureaucrats over the union machinery appeared to be shaken.

"These revolts of the culinary workers against the Stalinists came as a result of three-years misrule. The Stalinists rode roughshod over the interests of the membership. They signed agreements which are a disgrace to the labor movement. In many locals they have given up union control over hiring and firing. They have signed two and three year contracts which make no provisions for the rising cost of living. They ruthlessly squelched the voice of the rank and file which cried out against this treachery." (Socialist Appeal, December 30, 1939.)

In June 1940, elections were again held in Local 302:-

"There are two candidates in the field, William Kincheloe, representing the 'United Orange Ticket' of the progressive anti-administration bloc, and Costas Dritsas, representing the Stalinist 'Rank-and-File' machine which controls the administration." (Socialist Appeal, June 22, 1940.)

In this election, Kincheloe, the "Progressive," defeated Costas Dritsas, the Stalinist representative:-

"The members of the Cafeteria Workers Union of New York, Local 302, delivered a decisive defeat to

the Communist Party machine dominating the local, when William Kincheloe, Progressive, was elected by a margin of 240 votes over his Stalinist opponent." (Socialist Appeal, June 25, 1940.)

The S.W.P. expressed gratification over this and formulated the next task in Local 302:

"The big task of the Progressives now is to prepare for the elections in December when the Stalinists can be completely swept out." (Ibid.)

The Stalinist machine by June 1940 was decidedly shaken in Local 302 and at the next election, December 1940, could "be completely swept out," according to the S.W.P. While in June the S.W.P. posed the sweeping out of the Stalinists in the December elections as a possibility, in August, this possibility was presented as a certainty:-

"His [Kincheloe's] victory means that the Stalinist administration is now a 'lame duck,' no longer representing the membership, and certain to be ousted at the December regular elections." (Socialist Appeal, August 3, 1940. My emphasis - A.B.)

In the next issue of the Socialist Appeal, this was repeated:

"Having recently lost to the progressives a by-election for the presidency of the union, a forerunner of certain defeat in the regular elections for all offices in December, the Stalinists had made a desperate attempt to rally all their forces for the election of delegates." (Ibid. August 10, 1940. My emphasis - A.B.)

Let us see how the Socialist Workers Party contributed to this task of decisively routing the Stalinist bureaucrats in December 1940:

Not long after his election to the leadership of the local, Kincheloe, the "Progressive," double-crossed his

fraction and entered into a bloc with the "right-wing" gang which was battling for control against both the Stalinists and the "Progressives." The latter, in danger of losing the position they had won, entered into an alliance with the Stalinist clique headed by Costas Dritsas. This, by the way, gives a revealing picture of the thoroughly unprincipled character of the so-called "Progressive" leadership of Local 302. After having been the butt of Stalinist hounding for years and having paraded as unswerving enemies of the Stalinist bureaucrats, the "Progressives" formed an alliance with the Stalinist gangsters! Moreover, the "Progressives," in forming the bloc, yielded the two leading positions, President and Secretary-Treasurer, to the Stalinists.

It is at this point in the picture that we see the S.W.P. openly flinging off its "anti-Stalinist" mask. The Trotskyites were a part of this Stalinist-"Progressive" bloc, within the so-called "Progressive" wing. The Stalinist bureaucrats and their new "allies," the "Progressives," rigged up a program which "promises" the workers everything beautiful in trade unionism. The Stalinists are old hands at this game! Promises cost nothing and can be squirmed out of with the greatest of ease. The December 21, 1940 issue of the Socialist Appeal (page 2) published this programme without a single word of comment or warning. In fact, the Socialist Appeal characterizes the programme as "the militant program." The fact that the Trotskyites were in the horse-deal with the Stalinist bureaucrats is directly indicated by the Socialist Appeal's write-up of the elections in Local 302:-

"The right wingers yell loudest about the Trotskyists and Stalinists uniting against them." (Ibid. p. 1.)

The clique alliance with the Stalinist bureaucrats is palmed off by the Socialist Appeal as a matter of "militant unionism" "against the corrupt right wing officials" (Ibid.). Thus, all of a sudden, the Stalinist gangsters have become, according to the Trotskyite SWP,

advocates of militant unionism and battlers against corruption.

The next issue of the Socialist Appeal carries the news that the Stalinist-"Progressive" bloc made a clean sweep in the elections of Local 302. On what, according to the Trotskyites, was the "united front" led by the treacherous Stalinist gangsters based?

"What is more, the united front was based on a genuine fighting program in the interests of all food workers against the bosses." (Socialist Appeal, Dec.28, 1940.)

There was no end to the wonders of this Stalinist-led "united front":-

"All combined on the one supreme immediate task confronting the union membership: smashing the menace of racketeers and boss-controlled labor fakers." (Ibid.)

No worker would even gather from the Socialist Appeal that the "programme" concocted by the Stalinist gang is the crassest demagogic fakery. Quite the contrary, the whole swindle is foisted by the Socialist Appeal on its trusting readers as a bonafide struggle against corrupt union practices!

The new president of Local 302 is Costas Dritsas, the old Stalinist bureaucrat, one of those who, according to the Socialist Appeal of June 1940, should have been swept out of the union. The Secretary-Treasurer is Kramberg, the leader of the Stalinist fraction in the union, while the two minor general offices, General Organizer and Labor Chief, went to "Progressives," Phillips and Aviles. The Stalinists are thus again in control of the machinery of Local 302. The Socialist Appeal carries not a syllable revealing to the workers that this was an enormous victory for Stalinism in the trade unions. Indeed the Cannonite leaders present a neat cover-up of this fact; the issue of the Socialist Appeal relating the victory of the Stalinist-"Progressive" bloc has on its front page a prominent picture of Larry Phillips, the "Progressive" - not Dritsas, the Stalinist,

you see, because this would be somewhat "embarrassing" to the mighty "anti-Stalinist" Socialist Appeal.

Thus while in August 1940, the Trotskyite S. W. P. set as the prospect of Local 302 for December 1940 the Stalinists' "certain defeat in the regular elections for all offices," when the December 1940 elections came around the Socialist Workers Party took part in a maneuver which put the Stalinist bureaucrats right back in control of the union. Shortly after the elections in Local 302, the utterly confused workers, imagining that they had won a victory over reaction, held a celebration. The leading bureaucrats made eloquent speeches "promising" their victims a joyous future. The Socialist Appeal carried a report of this celebration:-

"The four speakers of the evening were the General Officers just elected: Costas Dritsas, President (United Rank and File Club); Sam Kramberg (same group); Secretary-Treasurer; Larry Phillips, General Organizer (United Progressive Group); and Juan Aviles, Labor Chief (United Spanish Workers Club)." (Socialist Appeal, Jan. 4, 1941.)

The Socialist Appeal wisely kept mum about the fact that Dritsas and Kramberg are Stalinists. Moreover, the Trotskyite paper, falling in line with the demagogy of the Stalinist bureaucrats, reported that:-

"Dritsas struck the keynote when he spoke of the fight for a better contract for the 10,000 members of the union." (Ibid.)

Cannon's paper peddled this without a single word of exposure, due clearly to the fact that Cannon is supporting the Stalinist bureaucrats. The Socialist Appeal even promises the workers that under the Stalinist leadership the union will put up an honest fight in the interests of the workers:-

"It was clear from the speeches and the splendid morale of the audience that the bosses are in for a fight when the new contract nego-

tiations begin." (Ibid. My emphasis - A.B.)

The "agency of the bosses within the ranks of the workers," as the Socialist Appeal described the Stalinist bureaucrats in Local 302 only six months ago, now appears as a genuine fighter against the bosses. At the end of 1938 the Socialist Appeal wrote:-

"The history of the mismanagement of the local by the Stalinists reads like a nightmare — open collaboration with the notorious Bosses Association, the Affiliated Restauranters, Inc., and organized campaign of terror against the rank and file who are fighting for clean unionism and democratic control of the local." (December 31, 1938.)

But now that the Trotskyites entered the bloc with the Stalinist bureaucrats, all this is "discreetly" omitted.

The argument might be raised:- But suppose the workers of Local 302 under the new leadership do get some gains in the forthcoming negotiations with the bosses. Would not this show that the entry of the Trotskyite leaders into the bloc with the Stalinists served the interests of the workers? The reply is: Absolutely not! It is entirely possible for the Stalinist bureaucrats to get some reformist gains for the workers in certain situations. In fact, in the past the Stalinist leaders actually obtained such gains for the workers - in France, for example, during the Popular Front period when certain reforms were introduced — mainly on paper, but some in reality - by the Popular Front Government. But to point to this example is to reveal the nature of the "gains" won by the workers under the treacherous, counter-revolutionary leadership of Stalinism (we may add here Social Democracy, reformism, anarchism, etc.). These "gains" are a trap for the workers, a palliative to quiet them down while the bourgeoisie prepare themselves for a decisive assault. Only gains won under a genuine revolutionary leadership are genuine gains for the workers. All others are illusory and deceptive, a part of the system of

demagoguery with which the opportunists paralyze the masses. The task of Marxists is to warn the workers against such "gains," not to palm them off as genuine.

The Socialist Appeal, it should be recalled, is the chief propagandistic front of the S.W.P. It may be said without an iota of exaggeration that, except for the phrase which mentions the Trotskyites uniting with the Stalinists, the reports of the elections in Local 302 appearing in the three issues of the Socialist Appeal could have appeared word for word in the Daily Worker. In neither paper is Diteas referred to as a Stalinist; in neither paper is the victory of the Stalinist-"Progressive" bloc mentioned as a victory for treacherous Stalinism; in both papers the entire swindle just perpetrated in Local 302 is palmed off as a genuine victory of the food workers over reaction.

In the Trade Union Resolution of the Plenum of the National Committee of the S.W.P. printed in the Socialist Appeal of Nov. 26, 1938, there occurs the sentence:-

"In order to save the unions from destruction, we unite with all serious elements to exclude the agents of Stalinism from control of unions."

This is the paper resolution. The reader of the Socialist Appeal sees only this "anti-Stalinist" front. The behind-the-scenes machinations in support of Stalinism are not seen by the reader. The mass work of the S. W. P. therefore appears in the eyes of its followers as a struggle against Stalinism. The mass work of the Trotskyites is in reality a form of support to Stalinism, directly and indirectly, as we have shown concretely in the case of the recent events in Local 302 of the food workers' union. To what does all the "anti-Stalinist" noise appearing for years in the Socialist Appeal in its articles on Local 302 boil down? To a demagogic front which conceals a fundamentally opportunist, pro-Stalinist line. The Trotskyite worker, as he read this

"anti-Stalinist" outpouring, imagined that the S.W.P. was engaged in a life-and-death struggle against counter-revolutionary Stalinism in the food workers' union. The upshot of the entire affair turned out to be a matter of helping to re-establish the domination of Stalinism in Local 302 and of palming off a gang of opportunist office-seekers as "Progressives."

In the Trotskyite reader's mind there is possibly the idea that in supporting the Stalinist bureaucrats against the "right wingers" the Trotskyites were serving the interests of the workers. Implicit in this idea is the concept that somehow the Stalinist bureaucrats are not as bad as the "right wingers." According to Cannon, however, not even all the bosses themselves are as great a danger to the trade union movement as the Stalinists:

"The Stalinists are a **GREATER DANGER** to the trade union movement **THAN ALL THE BOSSES** precisely because they attack from within." (Socialist Appeal, May 14, 1938. My capitals - A.B.)

This is an undeniable fact. Because the Stalinist leaders mask themselves as Communists, they are able to mislead the workers with an efficiency which the open and undisguised enemies, the bosses, are unable to attain. Yet, a victory for this most dangerous foe within the working class is paraded by the Trotskyites as a victory for the workers! Here there stands clearly revealed the concealed pro-Stalinist core of the Trotskyist "anti-Stalinist" front.

* * * *

The question arises: Why should the Stalinist bureaucrats who rave against the Trotskyites form a bloc with them? The answer is indicated in an article in Cannon's Fourth International (February 1941, p. 39) and in The Militant (February 8, 1941) where the Stalinists are pictured as at present in danger of losing their hold over the unions. It is in order to prop up their unstable control in the

unions that the Stalinist bureaucrats are willing to make use of the Trotskyites' support in so-called "united fronts."

* * * *

A word about the Shachtmanite Workers Party in connection with the elections in Local 302. When Shachtman was still in Cannon's Party, he participated in every opportunist policy and maneuver of that organization. Now that Cannon kicked Shachtman out, the latter puts on a front of being very critical of the S.W.P. Consequently, the Dec. 30, 1940 issue of Shachtman's Labor Action chides the S.W.P., because in the Socialist Appeal's reports of the events in Local 302 "There is no criticism of the Stalinist record in the union, no indication of the limited nature of the bloc, no warning as to the future course of the Stalinists." But Labor Action does not disagree in principle with the policy of the S.W.P. In fact, Labor Action in this issue definitely states that "...a bloc with the Stalinists in a union is permissible under certain conditions....." Under what conditions, it may be asked? When the Stalinists pursue a policy in the interests of the workers? When will this all-essential condition occur? We answer categorically: Never! A bloc with Stalinism can be only against the interests of the masses, for Stalinism has no policy but counter-revolution. Labor Action has no objection to the S.W.P.'s helping to re-establish Stalinist control of Local 302; it objects only to the fact that the S.W.P. did not make enough "anti-Stalinist" noise. Like the Socialist Appeal, Shachtman's Labor Action palms off the victory of the Stalinist gangsters as a defeat of reaction. The headline of the article in Labor Action reporting the elections in Local 302 reads: "Reactionaries Beaten In Cafeteria Union Election." An honest, Marxist headline

would read: Reactionaries Victorious in Cafeteria Union Elections: Stalinist Counter-Revolutionaries Again in Control of Local 302: Trotskyists Assist Stalinism to Victory.

* * * *

The Trotskyite leaders pretend that by their "mass work" in the trade unions they are building a new revolutionary party. In reality, the Trotskyite mass work is a method of building Stalinism, directly and indirectly. The Trotskyite mass work is a system of demagogy with which the Cannons and Shachtmans inveigle anti-Stalinist-minded revolutionary workers and tie them to one opportunist fraud after another. Trotskyite mass work is a method of preventing a struggle against Stalinism. Sometimes it takes the form of more or less open support to Stalinism, as in Local 302; at other times it is a matter of diverting the workers from a struggle against Stalinism by getting them to support such ludicrous bourgeois fakery as the Ham-and-Eggs Plan in California; while at other times it takes the form of deceiving the workers into circulating petitions for the pacifist Ludlow Referendum or supporting the corrupt, opportunist, bourgeois American Labor Party. Whatever the form the Trotskyite mass work assumes, it is a technique to paralyze politically advanced, anti-Stalinist revolution a ry workers and frustrate their desire to combat and defeat the Stalinist counter-revolution. The first task of honest, revolutionary workers who desire to combat the Stalinist counter-revolution and to create a new revolutionary Party is to break with the Cannons and Shachtmans, the disguised agents of Stalinism.

Arthur Burke
January 10, 1941

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION

ENSHRINING RADEK IN THE HEART
OF THE WORKINGCLASS

I N THE STALINIST DEGENERATION of the Bolshevik Party, very few former revolutionists exhibited their opportunist transformation in so pronounced a form as did Karl Radek. In his services to Stalinism there were some outstanding moments of Radek's career.

In 1923 he aided the opportunist leaders of the German Communist Party, Brandler and Thalheimer, to carry out the treacherous policy of coalition with Social Democrats through which Stalin, Zinoviev and other Russian renegades betrayed the German October. Later, during the period of the rise of the Chinese revolution, Radek skillfully concealed Stalin's policy of betrayal in China and pictured a rosy future for the Chinese workers and peasants. When the Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev bloc exploded in the open, Radek, at that time a member of the "Left Opposition," proposed that Trotsky make a factional bloc with Stalin against the Zinoviev-Kamenev clique. After Radek was expelled and exiled he completely capitulated to Stalin, and, no longer in the guise of an "Oppositionist," Radek continued his work of peddling Stalinist poison to the Russian masses and the world proletariat. Every day in the week and every week in the year, and year in and year out, Radek betrayed the workers in the interests of the Stalinist bureaucracy. One of the most able of the Stalinist journalists, Radek made strenuous efforts to corrupt the workers with Stalinist vices. A particularly vile and fulsome piece of work in which Radek, with Byzantine flattery and hypocrisy, depicted his master Stalin as building

socialism was his masterpiece: "The Architect of Socialist Society."

To cover up the demagogy of the bureaucrats who were pretending they had completed the construction of socialism at a time when the masses of the Soviet Union lacked even such elementary food as milk, Radek with brutal cynicism "explained" that milk is a product of cows, not of socialism. Trotsky testifies:-

"Is it not monstrous?' we wrote in March 1932. 'The country can not get out of a famine of goods. There is a stoppage of supplies at every step. Children lack milk. But the official oracles announce: "The country has entered into the period of socialism!" Would it be possible more viciously to compromise the name of socialism?' Karl Radek, now a prominent publicist of the ruling Soviet circles, parried these remarks in the German liberal paper, Berliner Tageblatt, in a special issue devoted to the Soviet Union (May 1932), in the following words which deserve to be immortal: 'Milk is a product of cows and not of socialism, and you would have actually to confuse socialism with the image of a country where rivers flow milk, in order not to understand that a country can rise for a time to a higher level of development without any considerable rise in the material situation of the popular masses.' These lines were written when a horrible famine was raging in the country." (L. Trotsky, The Revolution Betrayed, p. 61, 1937.)

Like all turncoats, but more so than many others, Radek played the Judas role toward his friends of yesterday among the "Oppositionists." Many years later, testifying before the Dewey Commission, Trotsky said the following about Radek:

"From the middle of 1929 Radek's name became, in the ranks of the Opposition, the symbol of the most degrading forms of capitulation and the knifing of yesterday's friends. The aforementioned Dingelstadt, in order to outline Stalin's difficulties more clearly, asks ironically, 'Will he receive any aid from the renegade Radek?' To emphasize his contempt for the document of a recent capitulator, Dinglestadt adds, 'You have cleared for yourself a road to Radek!' (The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 529.)

Radek's revolutionary past had long since receded into a dim memory. Masking his true self with well-studied Bolshevik-sounding phrases, Radek became the lowest type of lackey of the Stalin clique. To give an instance of the blackness of heart of this putrid renegade, it is sufficient to recall his part in the Blumkin affair. We shall cite Trotsky's testimony once again. In order to make the picture definite in the reader's mind we quote a passage of considerable length:

"Trotsky: Blumkin, a member of the Bolshevik Party and a former member of my military secretariat, was in Constantinople on an official mission.

Goldman: When?

Trotsky: In Constantinople, he visited me and also met my son in the street.

Goldman: In Constantinople?

Trotsky: In Constantinople. He took him to his room, to his hotel.

My son saw Blumkin. Blumkin said: 'I will see the old man.' My son came to me and said: He will see you.' I said, 'Absolutely impossible. It is too risky.' He insisted so that I had to accept, but very secretly. He went to Russia, to Moscow. Radek came from Siberia as a capitulator. He had absolute confidence in Radek — an old confidence.

Goldman: You mean Blumkin had?

Trotsky: Yes, Blumkin. He was younger than Radek. He visited him, and RADEK DENOUNCED BLUMKIN IMMEDIATELY TO THE G.P.U.

Goldman: Blumkin visited Radek, and, according to your information, what did Blumkin say to Radek?

Trotsky: He informed him about his visit to me, on his own initiative. Because, if he had asked me about telling of this visit, it would have been absolutely impossible for him to do such a stupid thing.

Goldman: What did Radek do after Blumkin informed him of his visit to you?

Trotsky: He denounced him for his visit to me.

Goldman: What happened to Blumkin?

Trotsky: HE WAS SHOT." (The Case of Leon Trotsky, pp.105-6. My capitals - G.M.)

Radek kept up his work of loyally turning over his former friends into the clutches of Stalin's chief of the G.P.U., Yagoda. Suddenly, in the process of centralization of Stalin's power, during which a clearing of posts for new flunkys occurred, Stalin captured Radek and also Yagoda into his steel net. Radek figured in the frame-up Moscow Trial as a defendant.

It goes without saying that very

few people had a better knowledge and clearer understanding of Radek's counter-revolutionary Stalinist activity, than had Trotsky. Most of the revolutionary workers did not know of Radek's black deeds, but that cannot be said for Trotsky who, intimately connected with the Russian situation, familiarized himself throughout the years with Radek's pernicious activities. Yet, fully conscious of the fact that for a long stretch of time Radek served the cause of reaction, dancing in attendance to a bloody tyrant and aiding a wolfish bureaucracy to strangle the Russian masses, Trotsky, after Radek's trial, taught the workers to regard their long standing betrayer in the following light:

"No matter what one's attitude towards the defendants at the Moscow trials, no matter how one judges their conduct in the clutches of the G.P.U., all of them - Zinoviev, Kamenev, Smirnov, Piatakov, R A N E K, Rykov, Bukharin, and many others — have by THE WHOLE COURSE OF THEIR LIVES proved their disinterested devotion to the Rus-

sian people and their struggle for liberation." (L. Trotsky, Socialist Appeal, March 26, 1938. My emphasis and capitals - G.M.)

Such is the "Leninist education" that Trotsky was handing down to the uninformed, trusting revolutionary workers. The reason for such "education" is buried deep within Trotsky's true role in the Stalinist degeneration of the October Revolution. Some of the material throwing light upon his role we have given elsewhere. Trotsky himself gives a correct estimation of the nature of his "Bolshevik" methods. Trotsky knew quite well wherein lies the proof of the degeneration of a revolutionist. We read in his autobiography (p. 528) these appropriate words:

"There can be no greater proof of the intellectual downfall of a revolutionary politician than deception of the masses."

G. M.

January 5, 1941

STALIN'S AIDE — A "FORTUNE"
FOR THE WORKERS

WHEN one studies the characters clustered around Stalin at the time when he was well advanced on his domineering career, one's attention is involuntarily arrested by an exceedingly striking passionate figure — Dzerzhinsky. From the very early stages of the Stalinization of the Soviet Union, Dzerzhinsky aided Stalin in burying Lenin's program of worker's democracy and in entrenching the top bureaucrats in solid control. The machi-

nations in Georgia against the anti-Stalinist Mdivani group were carried out in part by Dzerzhinsky as an ally of Stalin. In Lenin's letter to the National Question addressed to the Twelfth Congress there was a definite line proposed to the delegates to hold Stalin and Dzerzhinsky responsible for their opportunist policy:

"It is, of course, necessary to hold Stalin and Dzerzhinsky respon-

sible for all this out-and-out Great Russian nationalistic campaign." (Quoted by L. Trotsky from Lenin's letter of December 31, 1923, in The Stalin School of Falsification, p. 68.)

Lenin's campaign against Stalin included a fight also against Stalin's close assistants, one of the most outstanding of whom was Dzerzhinsky. Trotsky testified in his autobiography:

"Lenin's offensive was directed not only against Stalin personally, but against his entire staff, and, first of all, his assistants, Dzerzhinsky and Ordzhonikidze." (L. Trotsky, My Life, p. 437. My emphasis - G.M.)

The Georgian scandal aroused Lenin against Stalin and Dzerzhinsky. In a letter to Trotsky, Lenin stated that he could not trust Stalin's and Dzerzhinsky's impartiality in the Georgian case.

"At present, the case is under "persecution" of Stalin and Dzerzhinsky, and I cannot trust their impartiality. Quite the opposite." (Quoted by L. Trotsky in My Life, p. 483.)

Indeed, Lenin was filled with indignation at the bureaucratic machinations of Stalin, Dzerzhinsky and other Stalinist bureaucrats, and so expressed himself in writing to the opponents of Stalin's policy in Georgia. Lenin's secretary brought a note to Trotsky which makes that clear.

"Fotiyeva came to me again with a note from Lenin addressed to an old revolutionary, Mdivani, and to other opponents of Stalin's policy in Georgia. Lenin wrote to them: 'I am watching your case with all my heart and soul. Ordzhonikidze's rough methods and Stalin's and Dzerzhinsky's encouragement fill me with indignation. I am preparing notes and a speech for you.'" (Ibid. p. 484.)

Dzerzhinsky was one of those renegades who, as builders of the Stalinist bureaucracy, were among the foremost betrayers of Leninism. He climbed high to the upper stories of Stalin's tower of bureaucratism, and was placed at the head of the Supreme Economic Council of the Soviet Union, as a reward for his services to Stalin:

"Lenin's note promising the Georgian Bolsheviks his full support against Stalin, Dzerzhinsky, and Ordzhonikidze was addressed to Mdivani. The fates of the four reveal most vividly the sweeping change in the party engineered by the Stalin faction. After Lenin's death, Dzerzhinsky was put at the head of the Supreme Economic Council, that is, in charge of all state industries. Ordzhonikidze, who had been slated for expulsion, has been made the head of the Central Control Commission. Stalin not only has remained the general secretary, contrary to Lenin's wish, but has been given unheard-of powers by the apparatus. Finally, Budu Mdivani, whom Lenin supported against Stalin, is now in the Tobolsk Prison." (Ibid. p. 506.)

Dzerzhinsky was particularly vicious against the opposition workers. In 1923-24 Dzerzhinsky was in the forefront removing anti-Stalin revolutionary workers from jobs, driving them to destitution and suicide. He supported Stalin in every major crime this renegade committed. He aided in suppressing Lenin's anti-Stalin documents, he lied without stint that the Stalin gang was building Socialism in Russia. The last speech which Dzerzhinsky delivered contained a fiery denunciation of the "Opposition."

"He died practically on his feet, just after he had left the platform from which he had so passionately been denouncing the opposition." (Ibid. p. 487.)

Dzerzhinsky had said that the Opposition would be dealt with in a

bloody fashion. Dzerzhinsky died at his Stalinist post, fighting for Stalin and the bureaucracy.

Every Stalinist bureaucrat expressed his deep grief over the loss of so valuable a fighter for the bureaucracy's interests. They lied to the masses that Dzerzhinsky died in service to the interests of the workers. Here is how Stalin deceived the workers:

"Knowing no rest, dodging no hard labor of any kind, contributing all his strength, all his energy to the cause, which the party entrusted to him - he burned out in tempestuous work in the interests of the proletariat.

"Farewell, hero of October! Farewell, true son of the party! Farewell, builder of unity and might of our party!" (Stalin, Pravda, July 22, 1926.)

There were numerous messages written in the same vein, some of them exalting the dead Stalinist bureaucrat in almost poetic language. Here is another outstanding example of the bureaucratic eulogy for the Stalinist renegade Dzerzhinsky:

"Of his services, of his indestructible faith in the proletariat and equally indestructible loyalty to the proletariat, of all his deeds there will be written books and books. There was almost no field in which he would not work, however he always worked in the very same field: in the front ranks of his party and his class, breaking the path to the future, first demolishing the old society and then laying the foundation for the new."

Who wrote these deceptive words? Kalinin? Molotov? Voroshilov? This commendation of the character and services of the deceased, loyal lieu-

tenant of Stalin was written by — Leon Trotsky!

The illusion is widespread that Trotsky fought for Leninism against the destroyers of Leninism, i.e., against Stalin and his Dzerzhinskys. In his obituary for Dzerzhinsky, which was printed in the Pravda for the workers to read, Trotsky whitewashed this destroyer of Leninism and of the opposition workers. Moreover, Trotsky in strong commendation of Dzerzhinsky told the workers that the bureaucrat who died in the service of the Stalinist reaction was a fortune for them:

"The word death does not tie itself with this exceptional end — in the struggle, on the move, after a fiery speech. Dzerzhinsky did not die, he became transformed. And accompanied with envious hatred of enemies, but a still greater fiery love of millions he, descending from his post, entered forever into history.

"His name was Felix, and Felix in Latin means fortunate one. And indeed his life was a fortune — a fortune for the class which he served, for the party to which he belonged, and a fortune for himself." (L. Trotsky, Pravda, July 24, 1926.)

The only good fortune for the proletariat would have been if Lenin had lived to crush Stalin, Dzerzhinsky and all other allies of the usurper of power. Unfortunately for the workers, and fortunately for Stalin and the international bourgeoisie, Lenin did not live to see the full flowering of Dzerzhinsky's opportunism and to read Trotsky's hypocritical obituary of that Stalinist bureaucrat.

G. M.

January 5, 1941