

formerly ambassador in Great Britain, whose testimony was confirmed by the others, said:

"Japan, in the event of her taking part in the war, would receive territorial concessions in the Far East, in the Amur region and the Maritime Provinces; as respects Germany, it was contemplated to satisfy the national interests of the Ukraine."

Trotsky's personal complicity in all this was exposed by nearly all the defendants. There is the less reason to doubt it in view of the fact that Trotsky himself had publicly called for the violent overthrow of the Soviet regime.

In his "Bulletin of the Opposition," published abroad, Trotsky discusses in an article headed, "Problems of the Fourth International," ways of getting rid of the Soviet Government. The date is October, 1933.

Trotsky writes:

"It would be childish to think that the Stalin bureaucracy can be removed by means of a Party or Soviet congress. . . . They can be compelled to hand over power to the proletarian vanguard only by FORCE" (Trotsky's emphasis).

His proposed programme for Russia when, with the help of Nazism, he reached power, was also penned by himself in his "Bulletin" in 1930. He called for a general "retreat" from Socialism, the end of collectivisation and of the "hurdle race of industrialisation," and the leasing of State enterprises to private owners.

Such were the conspirators' plans.

The same general scheme was carried out not only by Petain in France but by Quisling in Norway, by Antonescu in Rumania, by King Boris in Bulgaria and dozens of other countries which the Nazis "softened," preliminary to an invasion.

#### U.S. AMBASSADOR UNDERSTOOD IT ALL—LATER.

Joseph Davies, American Ambassador in Moscow at the time of the trials, said that he realised their essential character only in July, 1941, after the Soviet Union had been invaded.

"The Soviet Government, it now appears, was even then acutely aware of the plans of the German high military and political commands and of the inside work being done in Russia, preparatory to a German attack on Russia.

"As I ruminated over this situation I suddenly saw the picture as I should have seen it at the time.

"The story had been told in the so-called treason or purge trials of 1937 and 1938, which I had attended and listened to.

"In re-examining the record of these cases . . . from this new angle I found that practically every device of German Fifth Columnist activity as we know it was disclosed . . . by the confessions and testimony elicited at these trials of self-confessed Quislings in Russia." ("Mission to Moscow.")

The parallel with the Quisling conspirators in other countries can be worked out to the smallest details. In the same year that

the Gestapo murdered Serge Kirov, Communist leader in Leningrad, they or forces allied to them murdered the King of Yugoslavia, the French Foreign Minister and the Austrian Premier with others of lesser standing. Quisling Tukachevsky, whom the Czechs detected in sending to Germany information gained through the Russo-Czech alliance, had his counterparts in Generals Franco and Goded of Spain, Major Quisling and Colonel Sundlo of Norway, General Nedich of Yugoslavia, not to mention Petain and many others.

Why was this not realised at the time? Why did not other Powers accept with gratitude this exposure of the Nazi methods and act as decisively as Russia did against the Fifth Column?

The main reason is that the foreign press and the foreign embassies were not for the most part interested in fighting Nazism. They were looking for material to discredit Communism.

"All of us there in Moscow at the time . . . were centering our attention on the dramatic struggle for power between the ins and the outs—between Stalin and Trotsky—and the clash of personalities and policies within the Soviet Government, rather than on any possible German Fifth Column activities which we were all disposed to discount at the time."

So writes the frank Mr. Davies. As for the general public, it had to rely for the most part on the capitalist press, which in those days descended to the lowest depths of calculated mendacity. Of the Labor newspapers some had been bought or bribed by the Nazis. Chernov said that he had stories to sell to the "Socialist" press as well as the capitalist—and the rest did their dirty work gratis or for the pleasure of venting their spite against Communism.

#### TROTSKYISM—"THE LEFT CLAW OF THE FASCIST PINCER."

Trotskyism cannot be defined as a doctrine any more than fascism. In whatever quack-philosophies it seeks to disguise itself, fascism is basically nothing more than an instrument for smashing democracy—including Socialist democracy—and enslaving the world to monopoly capitalism.

Trotskyism is a department of fascism.

The object of both is the same precisely. It is merely in method that they differ. They are not opposed, but complementary to each other.

Since the Socialist Movement first grew to a force large and powerful enough to threaten the capitalist system, the capitalists have sought to crush it by means of a pincers movement. The Right claw of the pincers is fascism, the Left is Trotskyism.

It may seem strange to some that it should be possible to help reaction by putting forward super-revolutionary plans—by seeming to be more progressive than Socialists—but if the net result is increased opposition to Socialism or the Socialists' policy, that suits fascism just as well.

Every proposed measure of social reform can be opposed not only from a Rightist but also from a Leftist standpoint. Let us suppose that a village council is asked to repaint the village pump. The Rightist Conservative opposition will oppose it because the village pump is a communal and therefore "Socialist" institution. The Leftist, Trotskyist, opposition will say that the village pump is a device of the capitalists for deceiving workers into a reconciliation with capitalism. Their joint policy, Left and Right, will be: "Down with the village pump!"

Fascism fights Socialism and progress in general from outside by means of a frontal attack and reactionary slogans and terror. Trotskyism fights it from inside, and by means of Fifth-Column intrigue and progressive-sounding slogans. But they both hate it and fight it like Hell.

For the most part the Trotskyist is more dangerous than the fascist. All the world hates fascism, and no self-proclaimed fascist is safe in a gathering of workers unless he is at the business end of a machine-gun.

But politically-inexperienced people with a general instinct towards progress (and this includes most of the world to-day) can often be deceived by Leftist slogans into following a reactionary policy.

That is the whole truth about Trotskyism. From the beginning the Trotskyists have had no other policy than to find out what the Leninists were doing and advocate the opposite from a Leftist angle.

For the whole of his life Lenin had to devote a large part of his time to fighting these pests. Recognising their danger, he devoted at least as many of his speeches and articles to exposing them and other corrupt elements in the Labor Movement as to exposing the Czar or the capitalists.

The story of his fight can be tabulated in the same dismal sequence as in the imaginary case of the village pump outlined above.

#### I. 1890's.

Lenin: Let us remove Czarism as the first step to Socialism.

Right Opposition: Long live the Czar!

Left Opposition ("Economists") Workers! Czarism concerns your enemies the bourgeoisie! Stick to industrial struggles. No politics in Unionism!

Combined Opposition policy: Lay off the Czar!

#### II. 1903.

Lenin: We want a united, disciplined party to lead the workers.

Right Opposition (The Czar): We won't have a workers' party at all.

Left Opposition (Trotsky): Discipline means bureaucracy. We want a nice, loose, amorphous party.

Combined policy: No Bolshevism!

#### III. 1912.

Lenin: Build the illegal proletarian party for the next fight with Czarism.

Right Opposition (the Czar): Jail the illegal proletarian party.

Left Opposition (Trotsky's "August bloc"): Liquidate the illegal party; be constitutional.

Combined Opposition: Wreck the Bolshevik organisation.

#### IV. 1925-28.

Stalin: Let's build Socialism in Russia.

Right Opposition (world capitalism): Socialism won't work! Back to capitalism in Russia!

Left Opposition (Trotsky): You can't build Socialism in one country; therefore, back to capitalism!

Combined Opposition: No Socialism in Russia! Back to capitalism!

#### V. TO-DAY.

Stalin: Open the Second Front for an early Allied victory!

Right Opposition (Munichers): No second front; wait till the Germans kill a few more thousands of Reds.

Left Opposition (Trotskyists): No second front to boost the imperialist war!

Duet: No second front! Let the war drag on for years!

From these instances and others that could be cited it must appear that there is no theory of Trotskyism. It has no connection with Labor principles. It is an agency of fascism.

One of the oddest mistakes made about Trotsky is to suppose that he was an Old Bolshevik—one of the foundation members of the Party. On this was built the further myth that he was a high-souled idealist. Stalin, on the contrary, is pictured a mere upstart; the furtive, crafty Napoleon who tarnished the pure gospel of Leninism and reduced it to the limits of a narrow nationalism.

In fact, Trotsky's unlovely figure first appears on the stage in 1903 at the London Conference of the Social Democratic Labor Party. But he did not join the Bolshevik Party until 1917, on the eve of the revolution. So far from being Lenin's ideological twin he fought Lenin consistently and savagely both at the 1903 Congress and throughout the following 14 years. He fought him first of all on the vital question of the Party rules, on the question as to what sort of a party it was to be.

Lenin said it would have to be united, democratic and disciplined if it was to lead the workers in the difficult and dangerous task of achieving a new social order. Trotsky denied this. And when Lenin built such a party Trotsky fought it over a long period of years. In 1912 he formed the "August bloc" to fight it the better. Of his object there was never the slightest doubt.

Lenin said of the "bloc" that it was "built up on lack of principle, on hypocrisy and empty phrases." "Such types," he wrote, "are characteristic as the wreckage of yesterday's historical formations or systems." (See Appendix.)

Trotsky replied by attacking Lenin and the Bolsheviks as "barbarous," "sectarian Asiatics," etc.

In July, 1917, this "Old Bolshevik" joined the Bolsheviks who had been in existence since 1903. His motives for seeking membership are clear enough now. At that time the Party had attained a membership of 240,000, having multiplied itself by six within the previous four months. It was obvious to any ambitious man that this Party was rallying the whole people to its standards and that to oppose it was to be left out in the cold.

How is it that the Party accepted a known enemy into the ranks? And is it not a fact that Trotsky and his companions showed real ability, performed real service to the revolution and rose to positions of trust?

The Party accepted Trotsky because of his apparently sincere conversion to its policy. He was not then actually known to have murdered anyone, and there was no way of disproving his story that he had been persuaded by the obvious success of Lenin's policy that Lenin's line was sound. He had already given the Party some help in its fight with the Mensheviks (Rightwing Laborites) and it seemed probable that he could be turned into a genuine and useful Bolshevik.

It is undoubted that Trotsky and his friends were able men. They had to be. Under Socialism it is impossible to rise to high positions of State without giving evidence of some capacity for the job. By the very nature of their work successful police spies have to be pretty clever men. The task of wrecking the Communist parties from within can't be done by half-wits, and nobody suggests that Trotsky was one.

He rendered some services, as wreckers have to do to be able to gain the confidence of their future victims. In "Left Wing Communism" Lenin describes how a police agent named Zubatov rendered the Party similar involuntary assistance by starting a bogus trades union. The Party "helped" him build it and then took it off him.

Actually Trotsky's services to the revolution have been greatly exaggerated since they were marred all the way through by mistakes which now appear to have been sabotage. Such were his opposition to the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, his breach of faith with the Czecho-Slovak legion (which turned it into one of the most dangerous enemies of the Republic), his bungling of the Polish campaign and the mess he made of the Tsarytsin (Stalingrad) defence. But even if his record at this period were spotless it would in no way clear him of the charge of harboring criminal designs. (On Trotsky's plotting against Lenin in 1918, and his connection with the German General Staff in 1921, see Appendices.)

## LENIN ON SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY.

The Trotskyists alleged that the building of Socialism in one country was contrary to the teachings of Lenin; that Stalin had "abandoned the principle of world revolution" and had become a "Russian nationalist"!

But years before the Revolution, Lenin wrote:

"The Socialist revolution cannot be victorious in all countries simultaneously.

"The victory of Socialism is possible in one country alone.

"If one country is victorious, the bourgeoisie of other countries will strive to crush it.

"In such cases a war on our part would be a legitimate and just war . . . for Socialism, for the liberation of other nations from the bourgeoisie."

The controversy about Socialism in one country has been grotesquely misunderstood. According to the common belief, Trotsky, the high-souled evangelist of revolution, was in favor of sending the Red Army immediately across all the frontiers in order to conquer the world for Socialism as a preliminary to establishing it in Russia. Stalin, it is said, gratuitously rejected this noble idea for reasons of his own advancement and confined the grand gospel of Socialism within the bounds of a narrow nationalism. The classic bloomer is summed up by the reactionary theologian Reinhold Niebuhr, who contrasts "Trotsky's fierce enthusiasm for a world revolution and Stalin's prudent contraction of the revolutionary ideal so that it may be compounded with Russian patriotism and harnessed to specifically Russian political and economic tasks."

What actually happened was that about 1925 the Bolshevik Government, which had come to power with the intention of making Russia Socialist, was getting ready to put the job through. The Whiteguards had been routed. Yudenitch, Kolchak, Denikin, Wrangel and others had been killed, captured or expelled. The interventionist troops of the Allies had likewise been hurled out of the country. The French had left Odessa because of the spread of Bolshevism among their troops. Westward the Poles had been sent packing, eastward half-frozen, half-starved Japanese were stumbling out of Siberia. In the north the future Lord Ironside of Archangel had performed the first of the many evacuations for which he was later to be famous. Lenin's N.E.P. (New Economic Policy) had restored the country's economy roughly to the point it had reached before 1914. Now was the time for the advance to Socialism for which the whole country had been eagerly waiting since 1917.

The Bolsheviks were, of course, in favor of making the world Socialist. Socialism, however, had to begin somewhere and it seemed the most sensible plan to start it in a country which was actually under their own control rather than in foreign territory. This

naturally was the policy of Lenin and indeed of everyone who was not a fool. Trotsky, however, replied to it with a proposal which had two important parts.

1. Russia could not go Socialist until the rest of the world was ready to go Socialist too.

2. It was, therefore, wrong to advocate Socialism for Russia at the present time.

### LOUD LEFTIST TALK.

Curiously enough it is with the first proposition that Trotsky is generally associated. But the truth is that he had no more concrete plan than anyone else for carrying it into effect. He knew as well as most that Russia had not the strength, let alone the desire, to undertake a Napoleonic conquest of the world. What he had to say about this was the purest balderdash. But it was more. It was provocation designed to undermine Russia's very existence as an independent State.

But when it came to implementing the second part of the proposition, opposition to immediate Socialism in Russia, Trotsky was very definite and concrete. He did not merely oppose Socialism—he put forward precise proposals for implementing the only possible alternative, the reintroduction of capitalism. The world-revolution talk was merely a cloud of verbiage put up to deceive and delude. The actual, concrete, immediate policy for which the wretched man fought night and day was to prevent any further advance of the Socialist revolution in Russia.

He proposed that large sections of the country's economy should be leased out to private owners. He declared for the surrender of a number of mills and factories to foreigners in the form of concessions. He jeered at the collective farms and was bound, as was admitted at the trials, to rely on the most reactionary of the peasants in opposing them, the Kulaks. The super-revolutionary who could not wait to plant the Red Flag in Timbuctoo and Tumbumba wanted to hand his own country over to foreign exploitation. The sea-green incorruptible evangel for the world-socialist revolution teamed up with the wealthiest Russian peasants against their poorer brothers.

It was this reactionary reality of his policy which made Trotsky so popular a writer with the American press when he began his sojourn abroad. No yearnings for a world revolution caused William Randolph Hearst to open the columns of his chain of newspapers to Trotsky, nor was it the white heat of Socialist sincerity which gained for him the universal acclaim of the capitalist world. It was simply that whereas Stalin stood for Socialism in all countries, beginning in Russia, Trotsky opposed Socialism in any country and opposed it most of all in Russia.

After many years the opinion of the Communist Party on the rival proposals of Stalin and Trotsky was tested by a vote in October, 1927. The result:—

For the Central Committee and Stalin .. 724,000  
For Trotsky and Zinoviev ..... 4,000

Were the Trotskyists sincere? That question was very soon to be settled. The Russian workers proceeded to give a practical proof that Socialism could be built in a single country by doing the job in four to five years. How well they did it has only now penetrated to the capitalist press, but to everyone in Russia their success was obvious ten years ago.

If the Trotskyists had been sincere they would have been the first to rejoice at the disproof of their own theories. To those who want Socialism the whole world over, what could be more delightful than to find one-sixth of it converted within a brief lustrum? Undoubtedly a large proportion of Trotsky's 4000 followers did react in this way.

To the leaders, however, the success of socialism was the death-knell of all their hopes. It was the end of everything. They could no longer expect to gain their ends by argument. They either had to give up the struggle for power or resort to terrorism, aided by the German and Japanese, by calling in the German and Japanese fascism to carry them through. "There remained two roads," said Kamenev, as already quoted. "Either honestly to end the struggle against the Government or to continue it by means of individual terror. We chose the second road."

The Trotskyists ceased to be a dissident fraction of the Communist Party of Russia. They signed on as the advance guard of the Hitlerite army of invasion. The subsequent murders and wreckings were not simply bursts of spite due to frustration, as was sometimes suggested. They were the necessary prelude to June 22, 1941.

At this point, then, Trotskyism, properly speaking, passes out of the philosopher's field of study and enters that of the criminologist. The conflict which began in 1903 with Trotsky's opposition to the proposed Party rules ended with murder, arson and sabotage. And treason. Lenin had warned the conspirators that it would be so. At an early stage he had told the Trotskyists that their course was taking them straight into the camp of the counter-revolution. In 1937 Stalin remarked that Trotskyism had long ceased to be merely a "political trend in the Labor movement . . . The Trotskyites have been transformed into a gang of professional wreckers, spies and assassins without principles and without ideals."

When the trials in 1938 disclosed that Trotsky and his gangsters had been plotting against the Soviet Power as far back as 1918, Stalin correctly declared that Trotskyism never had been a section of or a trend within the Labor movement.

Just as Mussolini is reported to have ordered one of his fake-intellectuals to "provide him with a philosophy within 48 hours," so the Trotskyists vamped up some pseudo-Marxist mumbo-jumbo to make it plausible that they were sincere followers of a respectable, albeit a mistaken, doctrine. The trials exposed this pretence.

They showed that Bukharin and Radek were not learned philosophers who failed to see eye to eye with Stalin on some of the subtler points of Marxism. They were in fact atrocious scoundrels on the same level, morally and intellectually, as the fascist storm-troopers with whom they associated.

The only difference was that fascism began with simply thuggery and later acquired a "theory," whereas Trotskyism began with anti-Labor theory and degenerated into thuggery.

Nor could the murders of the political leaders, Kirov, Kuibyshev and Mezhinsky, be represented as political in motive. The assassination of Gorky and his son and the attempt on Yezhov could have only been undertaken by dehumanised beings—fascists—through and through. The astounded court heard of how Gorky's doctors had been suborned by Yagoda, chief of the G.P.U., to give Gorky, who suffered from heart trouble, an overdose of stropanthin, how his son Peshkov was induced to rest in the open air on the river bank so that he might take cold; and how Kuibyshev, afflicted with angina pectoris, was encouraged to continue his work at full pressure and deprived of medical help in his last seizure. Yezhov was to be murdered by inhaling an almost undetectable poison sprayed on his office furniture. As Vyshinsky pointed out, similar murders had been committed before, but few with such diabolical skill in the planning. (See Murder of Maxim Gorky in Appendices.)

Never have the frightful effects of fascism on its human devotees been so starkly exposed. "One feels the naked play of those dark forces which shatter and rot human souls," a foreign observer remarked to Anna Louise Strong after attending the trials.

The human refuse was destroyed. Most of the conspirators were executed; some years later Trotsky fell in Mexico at the hand of his private secretary and fellow-conspirator. But his evil spirit still hovers over the German armies for whom he tried to open the gates. The "Daily Telegraph" reported in July, 1942: "A trick of the Germans is to broadcast from travelling vans speeches made years ago in opposition to Stalin by Trotsky and other members of the Fourth International. This creates the impression that there is no longer unity in the Soviet Union."

The Soviet Union dealt with Trotsky in the flesh; it is for the whole world to exorcise his ghost.

## Fifth Column in Other Lands.

In 1936, armed and inspired by Hitler and Mussolini, General Franco's fascist-monarchist rebels advanced on the Spanish Republican capital, Madrid. "In four columns we are advancing, north, south, east, west," said a fascist general, proudly surveying his Nazi, Moorish, Italian and Portuguese troops, "and, in Madrid itself, we have a Fifth Column to help us."

The fascists had a Fifth Column working in other capitals also. Madrid held out for two or three years after its siege began with the coining of that phrase, "Fifth Column." Despite the overwhelming odds, Madrid was never conquered by direct frontal assault. Democratic Spain fell because of "non-intervention"—the manifestation in the Spanish war of the criminal and fatal appeasement policy adopted by the ruling circles of Britain, France and U.S.A.; the line of the Munichers, aided and abetted by Right-wing Labor, who sacrificed the interests of their own peoples to gratify their hatred of Soviet Russia and of the militant democratic movement everywhere. Madrid fell because butcher Franco was able to find a group of traitors in high places, inside the city, who in a military sense opened the city's gates to the invaders.

The Spanish struggle provided many a clear demonstration of the judgment that Trotskyism is fascism. In Spain itself Trotskyist provocation was conducted by an organisation using the high-sounding title of "Party of Marxist Unification"—the notorious "P.O.U.M." It was financed directly by the fascist dictators. Without any mass following, the "P.O.U.M." controlled four radio stations and 29 publications. Under the pretext of advancing the cause of the toilers, these gentry forcibly dispossessed peasants for the purpose of "collectivisation"! At a time when the Spanish Republic was fighting desperately for its life, the "P.O.U.M." organised strikes and demonstrations, and in May, 1937, started an armed insurrection in Barcelona.

The Trotskyists outside Spain did their stuff, too. Thus in Britain, Fenner Brockway, of the "Independent" Labor Party, and his fellow-Trotskyists opposed aid for Republican Spain on the grounds that the "Stalinists" were obstructing the establishment of a "workers' republic"! In short, the usual provocation and betrayal under the cloak of Leftist talk. To the British and French imperialists bent on throwing Spain to the fascist wolves, nothing pleased them more than to be able to use the ammunition provided by the Trotskyist traitors posing as super-revolutionaries.

When the Spanish government finally became strong enough to suppress the "P.O.U.M.," the Trotskyists became busy and noisy with "demands" for a "fair, full open trial"—and actually took advantage of the Barcelona putsch to launch fresh slanders against the Spanish government.

of the German Bund in America, together with Father Coughlin and Pelley's Silver Shirts; the vast network of agents which nearly captured the entire continent of South America for Hitler.

Australians need no reminder of the activities of the egregious Dr. Asmis, Consul-General for Germany in Sydney, and the big Nazi organisation which used to hold meetings in the bush near Sydney and Melbourne, where they would listen in to Berlin. The people who met and welcomed Count von Luekner and the journalist, von Bork, and those to whom they gave money, are known to the police if not to the public.

Suffice it to say that no one who in the past has called for stringent action against Nazi agents, open or concealed, "Leftist" or "Rightist," has ever been proved wrong. On the contrary, it is perfectly plain that the misguided "Liberals" who pleaded so fervently that von Luekner, Quisling and their like should not be deprived of "democratic liberties" have had it brought home to them that their actions set the seal of doom on their countries and their liberties.

#### AMERICA—FIFTH COLUMNIST EXTRAORDINARY.

While on a world scale Trotsky must be given "pride of place" in the catalogue of organisers of the Fifth Column, in America "honors" go to Martin Dies. The study of his technique is important for Australians.

Like other lands, the United States is plagued with a great variety of Axis organisations masquerading under many labels. There is the "Christian Front" of Father Coughlin; there is, or was, the German-American Bund; the Silver Shirts; the Ku Klux Klan; and, of course, a number of Trotskyists groups, not least being the "Socialist" Party headed by Norman Thomas.

But the greatest of all is Martin Dies. This Texas Congressman is not only able to pursue his pro-Hitler activities; he is actually the guardian and sponsor of every anti-democratic force in America. More than that, he has secured official recognition! He leads the Congressional Committee for "investigating un-American activities"! Fascism has thus been able to garb itself in anti-fascist clothing.

"Red-baiting" is his chief occupation. Trial after trial against Communists and other legal democratic bodies have been instituted by the Dies Committee. And every trial, without one exception, brought out its record of Dies' provocation and perjury. Notorious police characters, professional informers, Gestapo agents and other human debris have been his chief "witnesses." At least two-score of those who testified for Dies were gaoled or interned as gangsters and spies in the period following the trials or investigations concerned. In short, under the cloak of "purging" the country of "subversive elements" Dies has strengthened his own and other organisations whose one and only objective is destruction of Labor and democracy.

The fact that Dies is paid out of Government funds is an index to the degree of danger threatening the country from within. But other voices are making themselves heard. Following a demand for a fresh "purge"—this time Dies was after those expressing support for the Atlantic Charter!—Vice-President Wallace said:

"As a matter of fact the effect on our morale would be less damaging if Mr. Dies were on the Hitler payroll . . . In calmer times this would make him the laughing stock of the country. In these days of crisis and tension, however, we cannot tolerate deliberate and dishonest efforts to confuse the public . . . It is the solemn duty of all patriotic citizens to fight the enemy within our gates who hides under many cloaks, the most insidious of which is a false patriotism."

Among enemy agents protected by Dies were "General" Krivitsky (alias Ginsberg) and Jan Valtin (alias Krebs). The former committed suicide some 18 months ago; the latter has been interned recently. Ginsberg gained notoriety with his book, "I Was Stalin's Agent"; Valtin's book, "Out of the Night," became the favorite of every slanderer of the Soviet Union. Where the Dean of Canterbury's "Socialist Sixth of the World" received trifling notice, if any at all, in the book reviews of the leading American journals Valtin's was hailed as a true and authentic account of Soviet life and of Communism, despite its palpable absurdities and falsehoods. W. H. Chamberlain, another notorious "red-baiter," violated literary taste and ethics by writing laudatory reviews for a number of papers and magazines.

But here is the real story of Ginsberg and Krebs: These two agents of the Gestapo were despatched to America on agreement between Trotsky and Hess for the express purpose of poisoning the atmosphere between Russia and the rest of the democratic world, to prevent the formation of the United Nations!

Nor should it be long before similar connections between Eugene Lyons and Boris Souvarine and the Axis are brought to light. Ruth Dilling, author of "The Red Network," a red-baiting work as its title indicates, was arrested and charged with treason. So it goes on, one after another. Scratch a "red"-baiter and you'll find a Fifth Columnist! The experiences in Australia have established the truth of this proposition more than once, e.g., the "Australia First" movement, and at least two men who in years past "defended" Australia from the "menace" of Communism in press and radio, and who to-day are broadcasting fascist filth from Radio Tokio.

#### IN AUSTRALIA.

In Australia to-day you can hear alongside the full-throated roar of General Rankin and Major Cameron the shrill yelpings of the Trotskyists as they set out on the hunt together. Trotskyists usually no longer dare openly to attack the Soviet Union or the Communist Party (neither did the Russian Trotskyists). But under

such slogans as "No Second Front," "Down with the Curtin Government" they play their part in the sinister team.

"Socialism Now" is their cry as they seek to foment an insurrection which would lay Australia open to the Japanese invaders.

As in Russia the Trotskyists pretend to have a theory; they claim to be a party with a political programme. As in Russia, however, to-day's polite disagreement with a Trotskyist over a point in Marxism will probably mean for you, to-morrow, a knife between the shoulder-blades.

#### WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

How is the Trotskyist menace to be fought? For the most part, by being vigilant, by exposing it and training the workers to beware of it.

That was the lesson drawn by Stalin from Russia's experience. There the Trotskyists achieved their limited measure of success only because the Communist Party and the workers in general were not watching out for them. In the triumph of the Five Year Plans they forgot that the Reaction inside and outside Russia would intensify its malice and sharpen its weapons.

The Soviet Government was accused of being too harsh with old and trusted Party members. What had happened was exactly the opposite. The authorities had been too lenient with dissidents who had too often shown that they were in fact enemies.

As this survey has shown, the Trotskyists had many times fallen out with the Party and opposed it. Invariably, however, they had made what was apparently a sincere confession of error and sought reinstatement. The Party, having regard for their undoubted ability, and unable to conceive that "old comrades" could be guilty of murderous intentions, had reinstated them, with what were thought to be adequate safeguards.

The Party forgot that Judas had first to be a disciple before he could earn his thirty pieces.

For that misplaced lenience the Soviet authorities paid, to their inexpressible grief, with the death of the beloved Kirov and many other honest citizens, high and low. They will never again be guilty, in Stalin's words, of "such gaping carelessness, complacency and blindness." They appeal to the rest of the democratic world to imitate them.

And so the call to Australians to-day is to buckle on their armor and unsheathe their swords, but also to keep the weedicide and the rat-poison handy. We must fight the enemy who bombs and batters, but also the enemy who creeps and crawls. Major Rankin, who bellows for our blood, is somewhat easily dealt with, but what about X—— in the —— Union who is always attacking the Reds and who whispers that this is a capitalist war—that Curtin

and the Union leaders have sold out? There you have the budding Rykovs and Kamenevs. "They are sincere," you may say; or "anyway, they don't carry any weight." That's what some Russians said—and Kirov fell.

As fascism is beaten to earth the fascist-Trotskyists will not grow less ruthless. On the contrary, they will be more dangerous than ever because of their very desperation. If we complacently assume that the ever-rising popularity of the Soviet Union is making its enemies tamer and less offensive we shall be guilty of the very crime for which Stalin reproached Party members. As he said in an unusually vigorous outburst: "It is a belch of the Right deviation which assured everyone that the enemies would quietly creep into Socialism, that in the long run they would become real Socialists . . . It must be remembered that the more desperate the position of the enemies, the more willing will they be to seize on extreme measures as the only measures of doomed people."

We have been warned. And so, armed to deal with the enemy on our doorsteps as well as the enemy at the gate, ready to meet the arrow that flies by day and the pestilence that walks in darkness, let us go forward together in the spirit of Stalingrad and Tobruk to humanity's final victory over the forces of slavery and death.