

**POISONED
WEAPON
AGAINST PEACE
AND
SOCIALISM**

327.174
N 754 P

ert Norden

N754



***INDIAN INSTITUTE OF
ADVANCED STUDY
LIBRARY SIMLA***

**POISONED
WEAPON
AGAINST PEACE
AND
SOCIALISM**

Albert Norden

**Novosti Press Agency Publishing House
Moscow, 1978**

DATA ENTERED

 **Library** IAS, Shimla



00062159

62159
7-5-79

© Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1978
Editing completed on May 10, 1978

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	5
WHAT ONE IS ALLOWED TO KNOW AND WHAT IS KEPT IN THE DARK	7
I Frame-up of Communists in Cologne	16
What Was Behind the Law Against Socialists?	20
Court-Sanctioned Murder in Chicago	22
II The Sisson Forgery	26
The Broken Box	26
Brainwashing of Witnesses	28
In Search of the "Zinoviev Letter"	30
Forgers Versus US Senators	33
III Why Fire Was Set to the Reichstag	36
The Gleiwitz Provocation	39
A Man Responsible for the Extermination of Slavs and Jews	42
IV "Protocol M"	46
Adenauer's "Prisoners of War"	48
The Killing of the Rosenbergs	51
The Penkovsky Papers	54
Operation Plan 34A	56
An 18 Point Programme	59
Manipulations of a Secret Service	64
False Witnesses Against the Wilmington Ten	66
And Again the "Soviet Threat"...	69
Revelations of Falsifiers	77
Invention of "The Manifesto"	80
TO DISARM THE FALSIFIERS	85

FOREWORD

The overwhelming majority of mankind is fed up with the two World Wars. They are eager for peaceful coexistence and normal relations between all countries regardless of their social systems.

Much has already been achieved. Since the second decade of the twentieth century a peaceable socialist system has been gaining an ever firmer footing on our planet. But the old world does not wish to give in and resistance is put up first and foremost by those who profit from the arms race and war.

According to a Greek myth the fair Pandora, bringer of evil, despite a strict prohibition secretly opened the box in her charge and the evils that were locked in it scattered throughout the world.

In our time Pandora's box has fallen into the hands of sinister forces of the twentieth century. They secretly forge documents to prove to the public the need for aggressive wars. White Guard émigrés, police agents and professional liars of imperialism assiduously draw up "theoretical and tactical plans" for subversive activities abroad, they issue orders for acts of counter-revolution, they prepare documents that look genuine only to the unexperienced eye. They are financed by government departments, General Staff officers and arms manufacturers who spread the fabrications throughout the world. They are quite unscrupulous in their attempts to prove that with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries there can be no peaceful coexistence but only permanent enmity.

Of the multitude of forgeries and lies spread in all the five continents we shall dwell up on a few of the grossest.

All who stand for peace will find weighty arguments here in support of their just cause.

WHAT ONE IS ALLOWED TO KNOW AND WHAT IS KEPT IN THE DARK

The year of 1898. Hearst, the US newspaper baron, received a cable from Frederick Remington representing *The New York Journal* in Havana. The newsman reported that the situation in the country was normal and that since there would be no war he was anxious to come home. Hearst cabled back that he was to remain where he was and admonished him that it was his business to supply photographs and he, Hearst, would supply the war.

And war soon broke out. Spanish colonial rule gave way to that of the United States. How could it have been otherwise with 50 million US dollars invested in Cuba's sugar plantations, to say nothing of the island's inestimable strategic significance?

How do billionaires "supply" wars?

They begin by inventing a lie.

... An explosion takes place on the US battleship *Maine* anchored in Havana. Leave it to Hearst and his press agents to attribute the explosion to a Spanish mine. Actually the boiler that blew up most likely bore a "Made in USA" tag. But the truth leaked out much later. Meanwhile the outcome of the incident was war.

In this provocation imperialism showed its true face. The 80 years that have gone by since the *Maine* explosion have shown that falsifications and war always go together with imperialism. Moreover, they have become an integral feature of it.

With the birth of Soviet power, which showed the peoples a way out of the First World War and

the road to a world without wars, the falsifiers redoubled their activities. There was hardly a crime that they did not attribute to the new social system and its leaders. Hardly a single provocation was instigated against the working class movement on a national and international scale without casting aspersions on the Soviet Union.

The fascists brought the traditional methods of the imperialist falsifiers to a high degree of perfection. The flames of the Reichstag spread far beyond the German borders.

Through the efforts of socialist countries a possibility of excluding wars from people's lives has emerged. Were imperialism to provoke a new world war it would sign its own death warrant. This is well understood by sober-minded Western politicians. Nevertheless, lies, slander and falsifications against the socialist countries and the peace movement, far from being discontinued, are employed with unabating vigour. The aim is obvious: to justify aggressive imperialist policy and the arms race.

Eighty years ago the absence of radio and television did not prevent Hearst's press from deceiving public opinion with regard to the *Maine* incident and the ensuing war.

Radio and television with their round-the-clock broadcasts have turned the mass media into a mighty force. They have spread to every single part of the world and their possibilities have increased beyond measure. Radical changes have also taken place in methods of indoctrination.

The mass media can have a good effect on society. By giving truthful accounts of social changes and world events, revealing their causes and connections, they can meet the vital interests of all peoples and further their wish to develop cooperation on the basis of peaceful coexistence and mutual trust. But

the media can also be used for psychological warfare, poisoning the atmosphere at home and abroad, spreading lies and slander and fabricating incidents to escalate tension between states and justify the arms race.

What can readers and radio or television audiences in capitalist countries learn about the Soviet Union or the socialist world?

And what will be kept from them?

Capitalist sources of information will not tell them that social justice and confidence in the morrow—the age-old dream of the working man—have become a reality in the socialist countries. Or that a socialist economy is noted for its progress, stability and dynamics. Or that there has been no unemployment in the Soviet Union since 1930 and that full employment has long ago been assured in the socialist countries. Nor will the public learn that three out of every four gainfully employed Soviet citizens have a higher or secondary education while three out of every four people in pre-revolutionary Russia were illiterate.

Instead, the capitalist mass media persist in allegations that socialist countries are “gripped by a crisis”, that a “general crisis of the socialist system” is near and that freedom is suppressed in schools and universities where doctrinaire and anti-scientific attitudes allegedly prevail.

What can readers and radio or television audiences in capitalist countries learn of the implementation of socialist democracy as a people’s government?

Will they be introduced to even one of the more than 65 million Soviet people taking part in state management and public affairs, including deputies to the Soviets (councils), members of commissions and activists of different elective bodies, leading trade unionists, or members of permanent production

conferences at industrial and agricultural enterprises? This exciting historical process in the course of which "the mass of the population will rise to taking an *independent* part, not only in voting and elections, *but also in the everyday administration of the state*"¹ emerging as masters of their own destiny, is kept from the public.

Instead they are shown a miserable handful of individuals calling themselves "dissidents" who can be regarded as anything but representatives of socialism. They are inveterate snobs with mercenary interests pursuing anti-socialist, anti-social aims and obsessed with a missionary mania. They would have remained in the shade were they not supported and financed by the capitalist owners of mass media. "Dissidents" are a convenient means of circulating endless fabrications charging socialism with the suppression of democracy and freedom and accusing it of being a system of dictatorship and totalitarianism flouting human rights. Furthermore, while socialism's tangible achievements are ignored, the various difficulties that crop up in the process of building the new system are presented as typical, as constituting the essence of the new society.

The average man in the capitalist world cannot learn much about life in the socialist countries.

Threadbare Lies

The receiver of capitalist mass information is deluged with distorted reports about the military potential of socialist armies. He is drowned in a torrent of lies charging the socialist countries with

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 492-493.

“aggressive ambitions”, “plans of intervention” and a “blitzkrieg”.

The historical fact that the Soviet state has since its inception been paving for all people the road to a world without wars is shrouded in a web of lies and crude falsification. This is done to prevent readers, and radio or television audiences from learning that in the last 60 years not a single war has been unleashed by socialism and in the last 30 years the Soviet Union has made 104 peaceful proposals, including proposals on reducing armaments, while imperialism has triggered off more than 30 wars in the same period and instigated hundreds of armed attacks and other acts of aggression against the socialist states and national liberation movements.

One lie—about the “hegemonic” aims of socialism—is bolstered by another stock lie about a “Soviet threat”. Moreover, as soon as the Soviet Union advances a new proposal for disarmament the myth of a new “threat” from the Soviet Union immediately re-appears.

In his report *The Great October Revolution and Mankind's Progress* Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, proposed that agreement be reached on the simultaneous halting of the production of nuclear weapons by all states and that the nuclear powers pledge themselves to start gradually to reduce and later to abolish the existing stockpiles of such weapons.

The West reacted immediately by launching a campaign of slander, accusing the Soviet Union of “continuing to arm itself” and having at its disposal a “wonder-weapon”. The December 1977 session of the NATO Council came out with the absurd

announcement that "the threat issuing from the Warsaw Treaty" was a "basic factor" in the course of international affairs.

On the eve of 1978 Leonid Brezhnev proposed that agreement be reached on a mutual renunciation of the manufacture of the neutron bomb in order to save the world from this new weapon of mass destruction. He explained the essence of this proposal in messages to the heads of Western states in early 1978.

Now Western politicians and brass hats opposing detente are shouting even louder about a mythical "Soviet threat".

A characteristic feature is that whenever the parliaments of imperialist states are discussing and voting on military budgets the press and radio draw a dismal picture of "imbalance in armament levels" and the "overwhelming superiority" of socialist armies in particular services. At such times the Western press usually publishes alarming reports about a Soviet "wonder-weapon".

Who can refute all these concoctions in the Western press, radio and television?

Communists, Socialists, democrats and peace champions have virtually no access to radio or television.

Typical of the capitalist mass media is a contradiction that is rooted in capitalist property relations. On the one hand, man's ingenuity with the latest technology makes it possible to transmit information with incredible speed and, on the other hand, this information in its content, tendencies and aims, often amounts to misinformation which, by hindering social progress, is counter to the vital interests of mankind.

Barrage of Slander Against Human Reason

Despite all this peace-loving forces in the West are becoming ever more aware of the natural laws governing the historical process and are getting to know the socialist world better. They are beginning to see for themselves that counterposed to the capitalist system with its aggressive inclinations there stands the peaceable socialist system. This growing awareness gives new strength to the world peace movement.

The constant headway made by the forces of peace and socialism compels the imperialists to refine their use of slanders and lies. The *Congressional Record* published by the US Congress wrote that ideas that penetrate the human mind are like bullets which inflict mortal wounds. Distortion and deception can achieve much more than violence. Indeed, a barrage of lies and slander is kept up in the imperialist world against human reason.

Year after year, from morning till night, the press, radio and television indoctrinate minds in the hope that something at least will sink in. Lies and slanders have become the chief weapon of a historically doomed system in its struggle for survival.

I There were only a few hundred Communists in the world in the middle of the last century. But the Communist League had already drawn public attention to itself. *The Manifesto of the Communist Party* was read and studied not only in Germany. The communist slogan "Working men of all countries, unite!" fired the hearts of the young, vigorous and growing working class.

Frame-up of Communists in Cologne

The communist movement was not yet five years old when the ruling classes tried to bar the young Marxist movement from the political scene. Such attempts were made in 1850 and again in 1851 when the powers-that-be forged evidence against the working class, and in 1852 when they actually rigged a trial using these forgeries as evidence.

In May, 1851, a group of Communists was arrested in Germany. However, no evidence that they had in any way been involved in illegal or treasonable activities could be found to support the charges that were brought against them.

Then a Prussian police official, Wilhelm Stieber, who had won a number of government decorations for dealing harshly with the starving Silesian weavers, was dispatched to London with an express assignment to uncover "the major conspiracy hatched by the Central Committee of the German Communists" with its headquarters in the British capital, although the Committee had long before moved its quarters to Cologne. One of the participants in this operation, an agent named Hirsch, ostensibly a clerk in a trading company, infiltrated the community of German Communist émigrés. Soon after Hirsch's suspect liaison with the police came to light and he took cover in the London borough of Kensington.

And although Hirsch could no longer collect information for which he was paid by his superiors, this setback did not deter him from writing "reports" of non-existent meetings of a non-existent central committee, a conspiratorial organization which the Prussian police vainly tried to uncover. In his "work" Hirsch was aided by a certain Fleury (his real name was Karl Friedrich August Krause), a Prussian sleuth who posed as a merchant.

Their reports were highly absurd. Marx and Engels who lived in London in those days wrote to this effect: "Not a Christian name was correct, not a name correctly spelt, not a single individual made to speak as he would be likely to speak."¹

So what if these forgeries were made up of base lies! As they say, "the end justifies the means" and the Prussian government finally received "evidence" to the effect that the Communist League was planning to let loose unrest, uprisings and revolution. In October, 1852, a monster trial began in Cologne following eighteen months of "legal investigation" and preliminary detention of eleven Communists.

The star witness for the prosecution was the police official Stieber. He declared conceitedly that one of his secret agents had been on intimate terms with the men in London who should be regarded as the "organizers of the Communist conspiracy". It looked as though Stieber had completed one of his pet projects. To back up the fabrications provided by Hirsch and Fleury he went so far as to adduce in evidence a master forgery disguised as "the original minutes" of secret sessions of "Marx's party".

As he praised his own performance as a spy he added that this book tallied with the reports of his agent. Stieber declared under oath that he had no doubts as to the authenticity of the book and that his conviction was based on a thorough investigation.

What leaps to the eye is the blatancy of this falsification. Engels wrote: "Some who were baptized William were here christened Louis or Charles;

¹ Marx and Engels, *Selected Works in Three Volumes*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, Vol. I, p. 391.

others, at the time they were at the other end of England, were made to have pronounced speeches in London; others were reported to have read letters they never had received; they were made to have met regularly on a Thursday, when they used to have a convivial reunion, once a week, on Wednesdays; a working man, who could hardly write, figured as one of the takers of minutes and signed as such; and they all of them were made to speak in a language which, if it may be that of Prussian police stations, was certainly not that of a reunion in which literary men, favourably known in their country, formed the majority.”¹

A handwriting test showed that the “minutes” were written in the same hand as the reports of the police agent Hirsch, a fact which he later admitted in an interview with a police magistrate in Bow Street, London.

From that day on the minutes were listed in the court proceedings as “the notebook” containing “many true facts”. With the jury largely made up of aristocracy, the eleven Communists in the dock were found guilty in spite of the fact that their verdict clearly rested on rank falsehoods. Seven of them were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment—up to six years. Thus the dilettantist concoction of Mr. Stieber took effect.

Fifty years later, in 1901, Heinrich von Poschinger, member of the Imperial Privy Council, published a letter written by Kaiser Friedrich Wilhelm IV on November 11, 1850, to Prime Minister von Mantuffel, a document which had until then been kept in the state secret archives of Prussia. In that letter the Prussian king set forth a brilliant anti-communist idea which he himself qualified as “neither pure

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 391-392.

nor fair. Namely, would not Stieber be the right man to unravel the mystery of the conspiracy and rig up the kind of trial the Prussian public has been so anxious to see? Also (and that's more important still) to mete out punishment to the conspirators? So make haste to appoint St-r and put him to some sort of test. I think the idea might have a far-reaching effect and that's why I want to see it carried through without delay.

Time is precious.

Vale!

Friedrich Wilhelm." ¹

That "right man" Stieber (whom Marx described as one of the most contemptible sleuths of the last century) was appointed chief of the Berlin police department a mere four days after the Kaiser had sent that letter to Manteuffel. In 1870 the Prussian government put him at the head of its espionage service.

There was a time when his career faced a severe crisis, when he himself was arrested "for illegal and malevolent deprivation of liberty and for unlawful attempts to extort money from the arrested." But the criminal was soon released, for he knew too much and threatened exposure. Stieber made a fortune from speculative dealings involving the sale of land and from the money that the Kaiser and the Prussian government paid him. Bismarck did not want to lose his star spy and finally appointed him state privy councillor.

Also in that period Stieber rendered services to the Czarist government of Russia by organizing a manhunt for Russian émigrés in Prussia. In return

¹ Denkwürdigkeiten des Ministers Otto Freiherrn von Manteuffel, hrsg. v.H.v. Poschinger, Berlin 1901, Bd. 1, S. 328.

the Czar awarded the master spy the St. Anna Order with diamonds and the Cross of St. Stanislaus. In 1874 Stieber retired from active public life and until his death lived off the sizeable incomes from his two landed estates in Brandenburg and the money he made on a number of tenement houses in Berlin.

What Was Behind the Law Against Socialists?

In the 1870's the working class movement in Germany was on the upswing, with the revolutionary centre in Europe having moved from France to her eastern neighbour. Strikes and political meetings swept the country. The influence and prestige of social democratic ideas grew markedly after the two main factions in the German working class movement—the Eisenachites and Lassalians—had sunk their differences. Social democracy in Germany gained in strength both politically and organizationally. Marxist ideology exerted its growing influence not only on industrial but also on agricultural workers. The leaders of the German Social Democrats were the outstanding men of the international working class movement: Marx, Engels, Bebel and Liebknecht.

The growing prestige of the Social Democratic Party in the country can be judged from the results of the election to the Reichstag in January 1877. The Social Democrats received more than 493,000 votes, which was 40 per cent higher than in the elections in 1874.

Kaiser Wilhelm I and Chancellor Bismarck sought to deal a crushing blow at the growing political opposition, but their attempts to misuse penal laws against the revolutionary working class movement

and to mount anti-communist campaigns proved utterly futile.

And then on May 11, 1878, an attempt was made on the life of Kaiser Wilhelm I. The man who made it was a certain Hoedel, a former Social Democrat who had long before been expelled from the party for currency machinations. Bismarck needed neither investigation nor evidence. The day after the incident he produced the draft of an emergency law against the Socialists and submitted it to the Reichstag for approval. However, at that point he failed to secure passage of this document.

Soon after another incident occurred that Bismarck had been waiting for so long. On June 2 a certain Nobiling made a second attempt on the Kaiser's life. This specimen had never been in the Social Democratic Party. But the truth seemed to be the least of Bismarck's concerns. He circulated a fabrication to the effect that those who had plotted against the sovereign's life were all Social Democrats. Thus, on the strength of this piece of falsehood he dissolved the Reichstag and launched a campaign against the Socialists. It was in this politically charged, undemocratic atmosphere that new elections were held on October 19, 1878. Bismarck finally succeeded in securing the passage of his anti-socialist legislation.

The emergency law banned the activity of all Social Democratic organizations and trade unions with socialist-oriented programmes. The socialist press was subjected to stringent control and all other socialist publications were prohibited. Workers who were members of the Social Democratic Party lost their jobs. In some German cities martial law was imposed and hundreds of Social Democrats were deported. The Socialists were deprived of such basic rights as freedom of speech, freedom of the press,

freedom of assembly and freedom of forming societies and organizations.

And all that was the product of falsification of facts.

But Bismarck's triumph was short-lived. Defying the ban, the Social Democratic Party gained strength with every new election. In 1890 Bismarck was powerless to do anything to prevent the situation slipping out of his control. The anti-socialist legislation was abrogated over Bismarck's protests, which in effect meant his political downfall.

Court-Sanctioned Murder in Chicago

The international working class movement continued to gain strength.

The struggle of the American workers for an eight-hour day reached its crucial phase in the 1880's. The working class of the United States no longer agreed to slave 14-16 hours a day in factories and mines and demanded decent human conditions of life.

The situation was particularly tense in Chicago. The capitalist press mounted an hysterical campaign against the workers and their leaders, including Albert Parsons and August Spies, who enjoyed great popularity with the masses. On May 1, 1886, when 80,000 working men and women turned out in the streets of Chicago for a peaceful demonstration the *Chicago Mail* wrote in the style of "wanted" circulars about Parsons and Spies: "Mark them for today. Keep them in view. Hold them personally responsible for any trouble that occurs. Make an example of them if trouble occurs."¹

¹ Philip S. Foner, *History of the Labour Movement in the United States*, International Publishers, New York, 1955, Vol. II, p. 105.

The demonstration passed off peacefully. But two days later the police opened fire at striking workers who demanded an 8-hour working day, killing six of them. And the next day, on May 4, a protest meeting was held in Haymarket Square in Chicago. The crowd was addressed by Parsons, Spies and Fielden. This time, too, everything seemed to be passing off without violence. Carter Harrison, Mayor of Chicago, who was present at the meeting, decided not to commit the police force which had been posted nearby in case of trouble.

But just as he left shortly before the end of the meeting, 180 policemen were moved in to disperse the participants in the meeting. A bomb was set off and the police opened fire. That was the signal that the American reactionaries had been waiting for so eagerly.

A wave of intense persecution spread throughout the whole country. Socialists, trade union leaders, workers' newspaper editors—all came under the provisions of emergency legislation following the incidents in Chicago. On June 21 a trial began which was to result in the death of four working class leaders: Parsons, Spies, Engel and Fischer. They were charged with setting off the bomb. Significantly, the jury pronounced the accused men guilty before the end of the trial. The witnesses were either bribed or intimidated into giving false evidence.

One businessman from Chicago summed up his opinion by saying: "No, I don't consider these people to have been found guilty of any offense, *but they must be hanged*. . . I do consider that the *labor movement must be crushed!* The Knights of Labor will never dare to create discontent again if these men are hanged." ¹

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 111.

Violence, police bullets and the legalized injustice of capitalist courts were all called into action to suppress the growing working class movement.

The new investigation conducted by the Governor of Illinois six years after the execution of the four innocent working class leaders showed that in the entire process that had led to their death the law had been violated: the judge and jury had not been selected according to law, the police had forced the chief witnesses to commit perjury, the convicted men had not thrown that bomb and the true criminals were among the police. All that means that the death sentence passed by the court was spuriously based on lies and fabrications.

Since 1889 the First of May has been celebrated throughout the world in commemoration of Parsons, Spies, Engel and Fischer, as the day of solidarity of the working class.

II In 1917 Russia's workers, peasants and soldiers carried out the Great October Socialist Revolution. A new chapter began in the history of mankind. The ideas of the revolution spread, giving a powerful impetus to the world working class and national liberation movement. The forces of world reaction retaliated by unleashing armed intervention against the young Soviet state. Campaigns of slander had become the main weapon in the struggle against the Soviet Union, against Communists and Socialists, and against democrats and peace supporters in other countries. The "world Bolshevik conspiracy" had become the main theme of imperialist propaganda.

The Sisson Forgery

Edgar Sisson of the US Committee of Public Information in Russia stayed behind after the Revolution of 1917. He was in charge of propaganda, censorship and intelligence and, being a frank counter-revolutionary and experienced secret service agent, he set out to look for any form of subversive activity against the revolutionary government. He managed to persuade US Ambassador Francis to pay 17,000 roubles for forged "documents" "exposing" Lenin and the Bolsheviki as "German agents". That was a crude fabrication which had been in circulation as far back as July 1917. The US Committee of Public Information published Sisson's papers as official material. The purpose was to show the October Revolution in a false light, to sow confusion in the minds of Americans and to justify military intervention. Sisson's clandestine manipulations were wholly approved of by the State Department and President Wilson, and he was given every support.

The Broken Box

It was the end of October 1918. Kaiser Germany, crushed in the war and threatened by revolution, was living through hard times. The craft of fabrication was more valuable than ever.

Reactionary quarters were looking for a pretext to break off relations with the young Soviet Republic and to accuse German revolutionary workers and soldiers of communist heresy. They wanted to prove that the "hand of Moscow" was responsible for the tense situation then existing, that "the Russian Embassy" had been constantly "working for revolution" and interfering in Germany's domestic affairs.

Prince Max von Baden, the Imperial Chancellor, instructed Social Democrat Scheidemann, a state secretary, to create the pretext. At a meeting of state secretaries on October 28, 1918, Scheidemann came up with an idea which he later described in his *Memoirs of a Social Democrat* in this way:

"It is necessary to train several members of the service personnel to do the following: when carrying the box down the stone stairway they should be able to drop it from their shoulders in such a way that it should fall on a corner and definitely be broken. Leaflets proving that the Embassy is abusing its extraterritoriality in a most inadmissible way will pour out and it will then be possible to draw the appropriate conclusions."¹

Six days later, on the evening of November 4, the box belonging to the Soviet Embassy which was to be dispatched by express was indeed dropped and broken at the Berlin railway station in Friedrichstrasse "according to plan", to quote Max von Baden. This is what he wrote in his reminiscences later: "... and here texts of a most compromising and provocative nature were revealed: appeals calling for revolutionary struggle and for acts of terrorism. Now we had what we wanted..."²

Thus, the pretext for breaking off relations with the young Soviet state had been produced. The Soviet Ambassador, who had been declared *persona non grata*, left Berlin on November 6, accompanied by the whole Embassy staff. The telephone service at the Embassy in Unter den Linden had been conveniently damaged beforehand and all the approaches to the building reliably blocked.

¹ Philipp Scheidemann, *Memoiren eines Sozialdemokraten*, Dresden, 1928, Bd. 2, S. 252.

² Prinz Max von Baden, *Erinnerungen und Dokumente*, Stuttgart, Berlin und Leipzig, 1927, S. 580.

The fake had served its purpose: the papers raised a hue and cry over "Bolshevik instigators and their interference in German internal affairs". They did their best to discredit Soviet foreign policy. These were the first poisonous seeds of anti-Sovietism to fall on German soil. Since then political assassinations based on fabricated evidence became the reactionaries' weapon in their struggle against German working class leaders.

Brainwashing of Witnesses

The revolutionary tide of 1919-20 literally threw US ruling circles into a panic. To carry a red banner or wear a red tie in those days began to be considered almost a criminal offense. Thousands of Communists and progressives were victimized, arrested and deported.

Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, Italian immigrant workers, were among those thrown into prison. As trade union leaders they had taken part in the workers' struggle for better living conditions and helped to organize strikes. But that was not what they were accused of. The official charge against them was complicity in raiding a car and murdering its occupants—a cashier and a guard—who were driving with workers' pay to South Braintree. Proof: during arrest Sacco was carrying a gun (not that it was anything out of the ordinary in those days).

The trial was truly a mockery of justice. The "witnesses" had been brainwashed to testify that they "recognize the defendants" although not one of them had actually been present at the scene of the murder. One of the "witnesses" for the prosecu-

tion, a criminal as it transpired later, gave his testimony under a false name. The court interpreter deliberately distorted the statements made by Sacco and Vanzetti who could not express themselves clearly in English. The ballistics expert's report had been twisted so as to imply that the fatal shot had been fired from Sacco's gun.

But this is what really happened. Captain Proctor, chief of the Massachusetts state police, testified that the condition of the bullet made it possible to assume that it had been fired from Sacco's gun. Later he admitted that the wording of his statement had been previously agreed upon with the prosecutor. The understanding was that if asked whether he could produce any evidence to prove his statement, he would reply in the negative. But no one had asked him that question. Judge Webster Thayer, a diehard reactionary, took the police chief's statement to mean that it confirmed the fact that death had been caused by the bullet fired from Sacco's gun.

That was enough for the judge to pronounce the two trade unionists guilty. His argument was that even if the defendants were innocent of the crime they were accused of, they were guilty in a moral sense, since they were enemies of the existing order.

Thus Sacco and Vanzetti were sentenced because they had attempted to oppose exploitation and its bitter consequences.

The movement demanding a review of the unjust sentences lasted for over six years. Workers and progressive people throughout the world raised their voices in the defence of the condemned men. In November 1925 Celestino Medeiros, a convict, wrote a note from prison testifying to his own part in the South Braintree crime and stating the innocence of Sacco and Vanzetti. But the Massachusetts and

Washington authorities refused either to release them or to allow a new trial to be held.

On August 23, 1927, the sentence based on false evidence and slander was carried out: Sacco and Vanzetti were electrocuted.

In 1977 (only 50 years too late!) the innocence of Sacco and Vanzetti was confirmed by the Governor of Massachusetts.

In Search of the "Zinoviev Letter"

Election campaigns in capitalist countries invariably inspire those who deal in falsehood to impede democratic development and bring conservative forces to power.

One episode from English history. In 1924 the country was preparing for elections to the House of Commons. The Conservatives were determined to become the government, but to win they needed a trump card to play. Several days before the elections public attention was focussed on the so-called "Comintern letter", or "Zinoviev letter". It was asserted that it had been "sent in" from Moscow with "instructions" to the British trade unions and the Communists to stage a general strike and launch an armed struggle against the bourgeoisie. The letter was signed by the Chairman of the Comintern Executive.

True, it was only a carbon copy, but it would do. It was quietly planted in the editorial office of the *Daily Mail* and then passed on to other London papers and made known to the Government. This was the trump card the Conservatives had been looking for.

The fabrication was immediately exposed by the Soviet Government as a brazen attempt to hamper

the development of friendly relations between Britain and the USSR.

Firstly, the name "Third Communist International", as given in the letter, was not customary.

Secondly, the signature was forged.

Thirdly, it mentioned a non-existent military department of the British Communist Party.

But this did not embarrass the Conservatives. They had used a marked card and had won. The Labour Party was out of the Government.

After the elections the authenticity of the letter began to be called in question more and more insistently. The Government had to appoint a special commission to inquire into the origin of this "document". On November 4 the commission reported that neither the British Government nor any British Government institution had ever seen the original. A British trade union delegation then left for Moscow to investigate further. Its dispatch to London of December 10 stated that after a thorough and careful investigation it was established that no document signed by Zinoviev and bearing the least resemblance to the letter in question had ever been forwarded from Moscow either by a Soviet or by any other organization.

Meanwhile the Conservatives back in London were insisting that the letter was authentic. Their argument was that the authenticity could not be proved since it would threaten the safety of the person in the Soviet Union who had originally delivered it.

The Soviet Government let it be known that this person, that is, if such a person really existed, was free to leave the Soviet Union at his convenience.

But Foreign Secretary Austen Chamberlain declined the Soviet Government's offer "for the sake of security".

Speaking in Parliament on December 11, the British Home Secretary came out with a shattering piece of logic: the important thing was not whether the document was authentic but that it clearly indicated the aims of the Bolshevik Party. And he added that had the "Zinoviev letter" been printed in the *Daily Mail* in a less conspicuous manner it would not have attracted so much attention. But it was exactly "a lot of attention" that the Conservatives had needed to win the elections.

The Home Secretary then proceeded to note that the country was free to believe what it wanted, but he was sure it believed what he himself believed. Perfect reasoning!

On December 15, 1924, besieged by awkward questions, Chamberlain made a statement that threw some light on the real state of affairs. Some believed, he said, that the Foreign Office had been deluded by a forgery, one of many fabricated in many countries. The Foreign Office and the intelligence service were obviously more familiar with matters of this sort than the honourable Members of Parliament. If one were to reveal intelligence secrets then the intelligence service would lose its *raison d'être* and therefore, he added, he had to be careful about what he said.

But before Chamberlain spoke, Conservative MP Henry Croft tried to pass the whole affair off as a nuisance. He said that since it was too late to do anything about it there was no point in investigating the question of authenticity.

The forgery accomplished its purpose long ago, but it was only ten years ago that the London *Sunday Times* reported that the letter had been manufactured by a White Guard émigré for a handsome reward.

Forgers Versus US Senators

In the 1920's the Soviet Union was recovering from the consequences of the First World War and imperialist intervention. Despite the repeated attempts of its enemies to destroy it, despite the endless predictions of its downfall coming from vociferous hostile propaganda, the Soviet Union was surviving and carrying high the banner of the first victorious working class revolution. It had now come to be an important factor of international life and had established diplomatic relations with many capitalist countries. But not with the United States.

President Hoover, who had once had considerable investments in tsarist Russia, was still refusing to grant diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Union. But he had serious opponents of his policy in the United States itself. Among them were Senator Borah, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator Norris. Those who wished at all costs to disturb international tranquillity picked the two senators as the target of their unsavoury activities. Their idea was that it would be worthwhile to discredit some of the statesmen who were trying to create an atmosphere of mutual understanding with the Soviet Union, to accuse them of bribery and thus to dampen public feeling in favour of a Soviet-American rapprochement.

Accordingly, in 1928 "documents" came to light from which it followed that Senators Borah and Norris had been bribed by Moscow, that each had received 100,000 dollars from the Soviet minister in Paris through an American lawyer. Enclosed with the "documents" were the "receipts" and a "letter" of instructions from the USSR People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs. The "Soviet documents" had been sold in Berlin for 2,000 dollars.

The sensational discovery was just the thing for the gutter press of the newspaper baron, Hearst. With him anything would serve if it offered a chance of ruining normal relations between the two countries.

A US Senate commission carefully investigated the matter and in January 1929 reported that everything—the stamp, the signatures and all the rest—was a forgery, as was even the wording of the letter which was not what a Soviet statesman would write.

The forgers were traced in Berlin. It appeared that they were White Guard emigrants in the service of the Prussian Ministry of Internal Affairs and of some other departments. A certain Orlov admitted that he had scribbled the text of the "Borah document" in his Berlin apartment at 119 Potsdamer Strasse, using forms printed at the press of Nikolai von Schwabe, a fellow émigré, at Berlin Charlottenburg, in Litzenburger Strasse.

But what about Orlov? He was not somebody unknown. Under tsarism he had been a prosecutor in charge of political cases, during the First World War he worked as a military investigator for the Russian Supreme Command and was responsible for the mass court-martialing and shooting of soldiers campaigning for peace. After the revolution Orlov headed the secret service in Wrangel's army.

On June 10, 1929, government adviser Bartels, Deputy Chief of the Prussian Public Order Commissariat, admitted that the German authorities had at one time indeed cooperated with Orlov through their mission in Moscow; they had also used him against Left-wingers among German Social Democrats, and they were aware of the forgeries he had been producing.¹

¹ Internationale Press Korrespondenz, 12. Juli 1929, S. 1446.

III Under imperialism forgeries and arson became means of affirming and protecting reactionary governments. Fascism carried these methods to the extreme. A forged document and a firebug's torch became the criminal symbols of Hitler's dictatorship. It started with murder and arson and ended in a world conflagration and 60 million dead.

Why Fire Was Set to the Reichstag

On January 30, 1933, Hitler came to power in Germany. This was accompanied by an unbridled baiting of Communists, as well as revolutionary Social Democrats and members of the Democratic and Christian parties. Although the revolutionary workers' press had been banned, the Communist Party of Germany organized mass-scale actions by the working class against fascism. The Nazis had a hard time finding support among factory workers. There was little time left before the elections to the Reichstag set for March 5, but the Nazis did not have the absolute majority necessary to pass the law on granting emergency powers to the government, which Hitler's party was eager to get.

The Nazis decided to change the situation at one stroke. They had long compiled the lists of Communists and Social Democrats they wanted out of the way. What was needed was a pretext.

And then they embarked on a provocation of vast dimensions. This is how it happened.

... On January 31 Goebbels wrote in his diary: "In our discussions with the Fuehrer we have outlined ways of fighting red terror. For the time being we are going to dispense with outright countermeasures. Let the Bolshevik revolutionary flame catch on first. And then we are going to strike."¹

On February 24, 1933, the police again raided Karl Liebknecht House, the headquarters of the CPG Central Committee. Although the building had been kept under strict police surveillance for weeks, "incriminating evidence" was suddenly discovered.

¹ J. Goebbels, *Vom Kaiserhof zur Reichskanzlei*, München, 1934, S. 254.

Under banner headlines the Nazi press reported the discovery of "secret instructions" to "set fire to government buildings, museums, palaces and vital enterprises."

On February 26 arson in public buildings was reported. The arsonist, who invariably "escaped identification", tried to set fire to the welfare department in Cologne, the town hall and the Berlin Palace.

After the public attention had been drawn to the subject of arson, at 9 p.m. on February 27 the Reichstag burst into flames. On that day the commandant, a member of the National-Socialist Party, had relieved the officials on duty well in advance. Evidently, the plotters were being given the opportunity of entering the Reichstag unhindered through an underground tunnel from Goering's residence and of remaining unknown. Also on that day Hitler, Goebbels and Goering stayed in Berlin, although the election campaign was at its height. They had arranged for that evening to be free of pre-election meetings so as to be able at once to hurl accusations of arson against the Communists and Social Democrats. Without waiting for the results of interrogation of Van der Lubbe, a semi-blind Dutchman who had been arrested inside the Reichstag, Hitler declared that this was a sign from God, and now no one would prevent the Nazis from braining the Communists with an iron fist.

That night the police and storm troopers arrested over 10,000 Communists and Social Democrats. In keeping with the "scenario" the radio issued a false story according to which Van der Lubbe had been found to have a Communist Party card on his person. On February 29 the omniscient Berlin *Lokal-Anzeiger* reported: "The man who set fire to the Reichstag has studied in Russia."

On March 9 the arsonist's "accomplices" were arrested in a Berlin restaurant. They were the Bulgarian Communists Georgi Dimitrov, Vasil Tanev and Blagoi Popov.

The implication was that the arson was an international communist plot.

A few days later it became known that Van der Lubbe was an anti-communist agent hired by the Nazis and that he had started a fire together with some storm troopers who had left the scene in good time. It was reported that Lubbe's Communist Party card was red. But the CPG cards were black, nor did the Dutch Communists have red cards. At one time Van der Lubbe had been a member of the Young Communist League of Holland, but in early April, 1931, he left the league because he did not agree with its programme. Later Van der Lubbe showed up in Germany and entered into contact with Nazi leaders on the basis of homosexuality. That he was materially dependent on them is beyond doubt. He denied ever having been to Russia.

During the Reichstag fire trial, held in Leipzig in the autumn of 1933, the charge that the fire had been started by Communists fell flat. Georgi Dimitrov, an outstanding leader of the international workers' movement, showed incontrovertibly that it was the Nazis who were responsible for the fire. He became the accuser instead of the accused. The Communists had to be found not guilty.

Van der Lubbe was sentenced to death and several weeks later the sentence was carried out. His storm-trooper accomplices were liquidated a little later. The same fate overtook the SA Fuehrer, Karl Ernst, who had directed the operation, evidently on instructions from the Nazi leadership. He was killed on June 30, 1934, in connection with the "Roehm

plot". The more dead, the more secure, the Nazi leaders felt!

Ernst's complicity in the crime was confirmed by Goering himself during an interrogation at Nuremberg on October 13, 1945:

Question: "Let's be frank about Ernst."

Answer: "He was capable of anything."

Question: "Why did you mention . . . his name and SA troops in connection with the fire?"

Answer: "Ernst had a definite part to play in that . . . He was the master mind. At any rate, he was indispensable to Hitler."

Question: "Who were Ernst's friends?"

Answer: "I don't know who was in close contact with Ernst. . . In general, I didn't like Ernst, didn't like his inclinations."

Question: "Do you mean his homosexual inclinations?"

Answer: "Yes. . ." ¹

The Gleiwitz Provocation

At the end of the 30s the "Great German Reich" swallowed up two European states—Austria and Czechoslovakia. An unbridled arms drive cost Germany 90,000 million marks. Germany was armed to the teeth. Her aggressiveness knew no bounds.

Full employment had been attained, but it was the temporary result of militarization. The spectre of an economic crisis was waiting just around the corner. To ward it off and to play down the rising wave of discontent with the regime in the country

¹ *Das dritte Reich im Kreuzverhör*. Aus den unveröffentlichten Vernehmungsprotokollen des Anklägers Robert M. W. Kempner, München/Esslingen, 1969, S. 18, 20 und 21.

a new objective for aggression had to be found. It was then, following the unceasing anti-Polish provocations including the "Bloody Sunday in Bromberg", that the Nazi press carried, on September 1, 1939, two sensational official reports by the DNB (German News Agency), headed: "Poles Attack Gleiwitz Radio Station."

The first report said:

"DNB. Breslau, August 31.

"Today at about 8 p.m. the radio station in Gleiwitz was seized by Poles. They burst into the studio and broadcast an address to the population in Polish and partly in German. Several minutes later they were arrested by police who had been notified by radio listeners. The police were compelled to open fire; some of the attackers were killed." ¹

The second report said:

"DNB. Oppeln, August 31.

"The following further details on the Gleiwitz events have come in: The attack on the radio station must have been a pre-planned signal for the all-out invasion of German territory by Polish guerrillas. It has been ascertained that at about the same time insurgents crossed the German border in two other sectors. They comprise well armed detachments which were obviously supported by regular units of the Polish army. Police units and security service detachments have repulsed the insurgents. Heavy fighting continues." ²

The provocation in Gleiwitz enabled Hitler at 5 a.m. on September 1 to move the Wehrmacht divisions that had been concentrated on the border with Poland against that country. Thus began a murderous crusade which resulted in the death of

¹ *Völkischer Beobachter*, September 1, 1939.

² *Ibid.*

every fourth Pole; thus began the Second World War.

What did actually happen in Gleiwitz on August 31, 1939? Light was shed on those events on November 20, 1945, in testimony given under oath by Alfred Helmut Naujocks, former member of the SS and SD, and presented to the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg.

Document PS-2751 says:

"Around August 10, 1939, Chief of Security Police and the SD Heydrich ordered me personally to stage an attack on the radio station in Gleiwitz near the Polish border, making the whole affair appear as though it had been perpetrated by the Poles. . . I was ordered to go together with five other SD operatives to Gleiwitz and, at a prearranged signal from Heydrich, to capture the radio station and hold it for some time to enable a German who spoke Polish to make a broadcast. Such a man was placed at my disposal. . .

"Between August 25 and 31 I got in touch with the Gestapo chief, Heinrich Mueller, who was near Oppeln at the time. In my presence Mueller discussed with a man named Mehlhorn the plan of a border incident involving the faking of an attack by Polish soldiers against German troops. . . Mueller said that he had 12 or 13 convicted criminals who were to be dressed in Polish uniforms, and that later their dead bodies were to be left at the site of the incident to make it appear as though these men had been killed during the attack. . . Mueller told me that he had been ordered by Heydrich to place one of those criminals at my disposal for carrying out my task in Gleiwitz. . .

"At noon on August 31, I got a prearranged signal from Heydrich by telephone, informing me that the attack on the radio station was to be made

at 8 p.m. that day. As ordered, we captured the radio station, made a three- or four-minute broadcast with the help of an auxiliary transmitter, fired several pistol shots and left." ¹

That is how the provocation was staged. The Fuehrer, who pushed the button signalling the start of the attack on the radio station, pushed another button 12 hours later and the German Wehrmacht launched a crusade that started the Second World War.

A Man Responsible for the Extermination of Slavs and Jews

Lvov was captured soon after the Nazi government broke off the Soviet-German non aggression pact and a huge army of the Wehrmacht invaded Soviet territory on June 22, 1941. The radio and the press in Germany and in Nazi-occupied European countries launched a loud campaign of allegations that before retreating from Lvov the Soviet authorities had conducted mass shootings of the Polish intelligentsia. Goebbels himself took part in spreading that lie. Mass shootings did take place. But let's see who conducted them and at whose orders.

The data collected over many years by Polish and German anti-fascists shows incontrovertibly that immediately after entering Lvov a special battalion, designated "Nachtigall" and organic to the "Brandenburg" division, annihilated thousands of the city's inhabitants. The killers' victims were the Polish intelligentsia, primarily the teaching staff of Lvov's institutions of higher education.

¹ *The Nuremberg Trials*, Yuridicheskaya Literatura Publishers, Moscow, 1965, Vol. 1, pp. 532-534 (in Russian).

Lists of scholars and prominent specialists to be shot were drawn up on the orders of the Nachtigall battalion commander, Oberländer. These lists included Dr. Kazimierz Bartel, a university professor who had served as Prime Minister of the Polish government for three terms. Later his widowed wife testified under oath that her husband had been arrested by German fascists.

At a press conference in Berlin in October, 1959, this author gave the names and addresses of many university professors who died in the slaughter perpetrated by the Nazis. The victims included Boy Zelinski, a noted writer, and Longchamps de Berier, the rector of Lvov University.

Those arrested were shot without delay, since Hitler had decreed that the Polish intelligentsia was to be exterminated.

Later, Oberländer, that theorist and practitioner of murder, made a spectacular career in Federal Germany. In 1953, Adenauer appointed him Federal Minister "for the affairs of displaced persons". In that post Oberländer remained a spokesman for German imperialism's chauvinistic circles. He urged and incited the people of West Germany "to move the West's frontiers farther East". "One should not merely dream of a comeback," he said. "It must be planned and one day freedom must be restored to the East."

The international repercussions caused by the Berlin denunciations assumed such proportions that Adenauer was compelled to sacrifice his Minister Oberländer. But Oberländer was not arrested and no charges were made against him. He had evaded punishment. On the contrary, in 1958 he was awarded the Grand Cross of Merit, the highest distinction in Federal Germany.

So what was the need for the falsehood about a "massacre committed by the Russians"? What was the purpose of this fascist lie? The answer is obvious: the Nazis sought to discredit the USSR, the main force of the anti-Hitler alliance, and to sow distrust between the Polish and the Soviet peoples.

So the leader of the cutthroats of the Nachtigall battalion was later passed off as a democrat who was being falsely accused of a massacre "that had actually been perpetrated by the Russians."¹

But history cannot be deceived. Today no one except the fascists wishes to defend the likes of Oberländer who, as he did in Lvov, killed people by the thousand in Eastern and Western Europe.

¹ *Die Welt*, January 26, 1960.

IV The nations of the world
defeated fascism, with the
Soviet people bearing
the brunt of the battle. But
the resort to falsehood did
not disappear with fascism's
defeat. It remained in
the arsenal of those who
are plotting against peace and
socialism and who oppose
the rights of man. Experts
in shady affairs employ that
weapon where the people who
want to be masters of their
destiny are stepping up
the struggle: in Germany,
in the countries of people's
democracy, in South-East Asia,
in Latin America and in
regions where newly
independent states are emerging.

“Protocol M”

Imperialism's cold war against all progressive movements was in full swing. Germany was one of the centres of tension.

On December 15, 1947, the London conference on Berlin ceased its work. The Foreign Ministers of the United States, Britain and France had rejected all the proposals on normalizing life in both parts of Germany advanced by the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs. The Western powers sought to preserve the division of the country at all costs and to torpedo the Potsdam agreement on the democratization of Germany.

The US Congress was preparing to debate the Marshall Plan. Its purpose, Washington declared, was “to save Europe from Communism” with the help of Germany and US dollars.

The old battle cry again!

What forgery would be used this time?

On January 15 and 16, 1948, a world stir was caused by sensational press reports.

The West German newspaper *Kurier*, which was printed in West Berlin and whose subversive role was becoming increasingly obvious, featured the following headlines: “Cominform Plan for West Germany”; “Protocol M: Sabotage Programme of the Communist Party of Germany”; and “The Cominform's Secret Plan”.

Similar headlines were carried by all the imperialist press.

What had happened?

It turned out that a “Communist sabotage programme” had been discovered, which contained a special directive “to seize power in the Ruhr”. The sender was named: “The Communist Informbureau”. The report alleged blandly that an “Executive Com-

mittee for Carrying Out the Ruhr Operation" had been appointed to organize a general strike early in March 1948. To leave no doubt as to who was behind Protocol M, the text of the "protocol" said that the Soviet Union "can and will support the struggle by every means available". Although many Western politicians had had copies of the "document" long before it was published and although the names of the members of the dubious "Executive Committee" meant nothing to anyone (for the simple reason that such people did not exist), the unsavoury concoction did not leave the front pages of newspapers for several weeks.

On January 21, 1948, the British Secretary of State, McNeil, told the House of Commons that His Majesty's Government were convinced of the authenticity of the documents.

Three months later McNeil seemed to have second thoughts and had to voice them in the House of Commons.

On April 19, 1948, Reuter reported from London that State Secretary McNeil had announced in the House of Commons that the British government had doubts as to the authenticity of Protocol M. . . Foreign Secretary Bevin had declared that he, too, was beginning to doubt the authenticity of the Protocol.

This report, however, was not front-paged by the capitalist press. The forged document had served its purpose. It was designed to remind the public of the "imminent danger of Communism" and to distract attention from the real threat—that in the Ruhr, one of Europe's most important industrial regions, power was being reassumed by those who had played the decisive role in the appearance of fascism and the outbreak of two world wars—namely, a few uncrowned kings, the coal and steel kings of the Ruhr. Although the mystery of Protocol M had been

solved, the author of the "document" continued to remain in the shadows because, according to persistent rumours, he was a prominent West German politician.

Adenauer's "Prisoners of War"

The Federal Republic of Germany was established in 1949 as a separate state and as a "bulwark against Communism".

... On September 22, 1949, when the new state had been in existence for 48 hours, Max Reimann, chairman of the Communist Party of Germany, proposed a programme for building a united and indivisible Germany which would embark on the road of peace and democracy. Max Reimann said:

"The German people, who lost millions of lives in two world wars and are now paying for two crushing defeats, must not be involved in a third world war in the interests of foreign and resurrected West German imperialists (Shouts from the Centre and the Right). Such a war would destroy our homeland. We want to live in peace and friendship with all peoples and especially with the peoples in the East and South-East of Europe (Applause from the CPG Deputies). It is the revision of frontiers that not only hinders our relations with Poland but, in the final analysis, spells war. This is inadmissible; the Oder-Neisse frontier is a frontier of peace. (Cries of 'Shame! Out!' General commotion. The chairman rings his bell. 'I shall not leave until I have said everything!' Again a commotion and the chairman's bell)."

Chairman Dr. Köhler of the Christian Democratic Union: "Deputy Reimann, since yesterday I..." (Excitement and cries from the public of "Shame! Out!").

Deputy Franz Josef Strauss: "Send him to Moscow!"

Deputy Reimann: "I will not leave! Ladies and gentlemen!" (General excitement and cries of "Moscow agent! Stool pigeon!").

Deputy Reimann: "It is you who are stool pigeons!" (Commotion.)

Dr. Köhler: "Deputy Reimann you've said just now that the Oder-Neisse frontier is a frontier of peace. Therefore I call you to order!" (Cries of "Bravo!" and applause in the Centre and on the Right. Shouts and laughter among CPG Deputies). "Deputy Reimann!"

Deputy Strauss: "Leave the rostrum! Stop it!" (Commotion.)

Dr. Köhler: "Deputy Reimann!" (Cries of "Stop it! Enough! Out!").

Deputy Reimann: "I will not leave!"

Deputy Strauss: "Stop it! Get out!"

At that very moment something extraordinary in the history of bourgeois parliamentarism took place. Two characters who had passed all the Bundestag door-keepers without hindrance appeared in the hall through a special door for Deputies. Both of them, dressed in rags and wearing clogs on their bare feet, pushed their way down the aisle to the rostrum. They excitedly shouted that they had recently returned from captivity in Russia and, shaking their rags, they set on Max Reimann. The noise became an uproar. Chairman Köhler took the opportunity of depriving Max Reimann of the right to speak. CPG Deputy Renner demanded that the mastermind of this incident be exposed and said: "Last night it was said that an act would be put on here."

Deputy Strauss: "Look at what your policy has come to!"

This rash remark by the future war minister exposed those who had directed the show. Who hired the "actors" and who were they?

One of them, Siegfried Kluger, had spent his youth in charitable institutions and was indeed a POW, but... in Britain. Like Kluger, his accomplice Tilo Wagner had never been a POW in the Soviet Union. In 1947 he defected from Erfurt to West Berlin where this "political refugee" was welcomed with open arms, although the West German authorities had been informed that he was wanted by the police in Erfurt for larceny. In a West German refugee camp he stole from one of the refugees all his belongings and had been a tramp ever since.

So these were the star witnesses for the prosecution against the CPG and the Soviet Union! In trying to stir up a new wave of anti-communist and anti-Soviet hysteria, its initiators, for lack of argument, had resorted to the services of criminals.

The background to the incident was as follows.

CDU Deputies found two persons with no specific occupation and invited them on September 21 to come to the Bundestag dining hall where Adenauer approached them and said: "You are my guests, so relax, and eat and drink as much as you like!" Their constraint having disappeared, the newly-elected chancellor's guests of honour began guzzling their food washing it down with plenty of wine. Next morning for facing the world public the two crooks were dressed like "those who came back from Russia", as little Moritz imagined them. At Adenauer's request they were given tickets of admission to the Bundestag by the then chairman of the Bundestag, Dr. Köhler of the CDU. When the Reuter correspondent in Bonn asked the "heroes" of this scandalous incident to show him their tickets of admission they gladly obliged—the tickets which entitled them to enter the conference hall had been signed personally by Adenauer.

Having played their part, the "guests" received fifty marks each from the Federal Chancellor and were dressed in brand-new clothes. Diogenes who searched for people with a lantern in the daytime cannot be compared to Adenauer, who buys them easily for fifty marks apiece. Many CDU Deputies deferentially clustered round the "martyrs" and collected donations. The heroes of the occasion grinned and put a sizable sum in their pockets.

These and other details came to light during the trial in Karlsruhe which began under pressure from progressive forces. On April 25, 1950, both crooks were sentenced to long terms.

The performers were behind the bars and the mastermind emerged unscathed. Adenauer did not even have to appear in the unpleasant role of witness, for the court flatly rejected the demand for him to be subpoenaed so that he could not disclose the political background to this swindle.

The Killing of the Rosenbergs

The beginning of the 50s. Anti-communism, anti-Sovietism and racism were rampant in the United States. The country was gripped with unprecedented mass hysteria. The policy of "brinkmanship" pursued by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles with regard to the Soviet Union resulted in dangerous situations. Schoolchildren were taught how to hide under their desks in the event of a Russian atomic strike. The luxury hotels offered their guests suites equipped with Geiger counters. Thousands of people were already seeing flying saucers in the sky, the Soviet Union's "secret weapon". A short circuit in the New York subway caused panic: Atomic war! The Russians have come! Even Secretary of Defence

James Forrestal was said to have fallen a victim to this hysteria—he ran out into the street in his pajamas at night and yelled in panic that the Red Army had landed.

In this atmosphere one of the greatest crimes against life, peace and mankind was perpetrated—the frame-up trial of the Rosenberg couple and their execution. The background to this crime was that the Soviet Union had put an end to the US monopoly of atomic weapons and the US “rolling-back” policy had come to a standstill.

Meanwhile “Communists” and “spies” were detected in the US here and there. Joseph McCarthy, chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, shook up the whole country. Such was the grim atmosphere in which the trial of engineer Julius Rosenberg and his wife Ethel began in 1950. Public opinion was systematically incited against them.

Officially they were charged with enabling the Soviet Union to threaten the US with an atomic bomb which would kill millions of Americans in the inevitable third world war. It was alleged that during the Second World War the Rosenbergs had been in contact with a spy ring and had revealed to the Soviet Union the secret of the A-bomb dropped on Nagasaki. That was why the US was using only conventional weapons in the Korean war. This enforced restriction, it was said, had resulted in the death of 50,000 US servicemen.

In actual fact US imperialism made up for its own strategic defeat by sacrificing the lives of two persons.

The charge against the Rosenbergs was built on lies and forgeries. McCarthy’s right hand, Roy Cohn, who, by the way, appeared in court in 1969 on charges of bribery, extortion and fraud, had been

“preparing” star witnesses for the prosecution, David and Ruth Greenglass, for a period of eight months. He made them choose: either to plead guilty of “complicity in espionage activity” and thus expose the Rosenbergs, or to be electrocuted themselves. Ethel Rosenberg’s brother, David Greenglass, testified that when he worked as a technician at the atomic experimental station in Los Alamos he accidentally heard scientists talking and exchanging secret information on the A-bomb, and that later he passed this secret information to his brother-in-law Julius Rosenberg.

Professor Urey, atomic physicist and Nobel Prize winner, wrote in a letter to the US President during the trial that a person like Greenglass simply could not have passed on the physical, mathematical and chemical secrets of the A-bomb.

The “main exhibit” was a “drawing” of the A-bomb dropped on Nagasaki which was prepared by David Greenglass and allegedly given to Julius Rosenberg for passing on to the Soviet Union.

Dr. Morrison, an atomic physicist who had taken part in developing the A-bomb dropped on Nagasaki, said that the drawing was a crude caricature of the A-bomb.

As a “reward” for their treachery the Rosenbergs had allegedly received from the Soviets a special table for photographing technical drawings. Ruth Greenglass described this table in great detail. The bottom portion of the table top allegedly had recesses for assembling photographic equipment.

Two years after the trial a reporter saw this table and testified that the Rosenbergs had bought it in a store and that it had no recesses.

One month before the trial Judge Irving Kaufman received a special assignment at a sitting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The minutes said that present were leading senators, members of the Federal Government, as well as the government prosecutor at the trial. The senators had demanded that prosecutor Saupel talk the judge into passing the death sentence on the Rosenbergs. The senators were of the opinion that only such a measure could make the Rosenbergs talk.

That is how the Rosenbergs were sentenced to death. Judge Kaufman supported his sentence by saying that the Soviet Union would never have been able to make the A-bomb by itself and that in all probability somebody betrayed the secret, adding that no one except the Rosenbergs could be the traitors. That is logic for you!

Such were the grounds for their electrocution on June 19, 1953.

Nine months later, on March 17, 1954, *The New York Times* published extracts from a report which Dr. James Beckerley, director of the Atomic Energy Commission Classification Office, had delivered to leading US industrialists. He said in part that it was time to "stop 'kidding' ourselves about atomic 'secrets' . . . The atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb were not stolen from us by spies."

The Rosenbergs were killed in order to show the American people that all Left-wingers are actually Soviet spies. The struggle of progressive Americans against Washington's war in Korea, against the McCarthy's "witch-hunt" and for peace, had to be paralyzed to make the profits from the arms race grow and to increase the power of the monopolies.

The Penkovsky Papers

One of the principal political aims of imperialist falsifications of events in political life is to find an

excuse for armament and to frustrate any attempts at disarmament. In the 1960s the so-called *Penkovsky Papers*—fabrications about the Soviet Union's "secret plans" for attacking the West and new types of "secret weapons"—were intended to justify the continued arms race and the equipment of Nato armed forces in Western Europe with nuclear weapons.

The New York Times wrote that *The Penkovsky Papers* had become a cold war bestseller above all in the US, one of the more than 250 English "masterpieces" whose publication had been prepared and financed by the CIA since the early 1950s.¹

Penkovsky, a former official at the USSR State Committee for Coordination of Scientific Research, offered his services to British intelligence and worked for it and later for the CIA as well.

In 1965 the spy's so-called diary, *The Penkovsky Papers*, was published by Doubleday and Company on CIA initiative and in accordance with a decision taken "for operational reasons"² by the Senate Intelligence Committee.

For a while sensation-hungry Western papers and magazines profited from the publication of these "papers" which poisoned the political atmosphere. *The Washington Post* and *The Observer* published extracts from them.

The Soviet news agency TASS regarded the campaign as an attempt to slander the Soviet Union by a patent CIA forgery and as a deliberate act in the spirit of the cold war.

Doubt began to arise in the West. The West German weekly *Die Zeit* published an article entitled

¹ *The New York Times*, December 25/26, 1977.

² *Ibid.*

*Genuine Hatred or a Good Fake?*¹ The questions it tried to answer proved that it was a poor fake: "To prove the authenticity of *The Papers* the publishers refer to bad style and frequent repetitions. But they cannot explain, why a man living in constant danger should take a further risk by writing a diary, and in his own home, too."²

Victor Zorza, a "specialist on Russia" working for *The Guardian* and other papers, wrote on November 16, 1965: "So far as can be established, the Russian manuscript of Penkovsky's memoirs just does not exist . . . The English text is peppered with words and phrases that no man with Penkovsky's Soviet background would use. . . These are not mistakes in translation, but they arise from ignorance of Soviet terminology. . . virtually, the whole section on the Soviet military doctrine appears to have been written by a Western pen. . . The book can have been compiled only by the Central Intelligence Agency."³ The publisher of the forgery, Gibney, said the book had been translated by defector Deryabin. But the latter does not know a single foreign language—he speaks only Russian.

Operation Plan 34A

History continues.

1964. The war of imperialist powers against peoples fighting for their freedom had been raging in Indochina for well over twenty years. Humbled by a crushing defeat, France had withdrawn from Vietnam only to be replaced there by the United States.

¹ *Die Zeit*, December 3, 1965.

² *Ibid.*

³ *The Guardian*, November 16, 1965, p. 12.

The latter wanted to hamper social progress in the area and to assume the role of world gendarme. But ground operations against the courageous Vietnamese fighters brought the US no success. Trying to make up for its failures in South Vietnam the United States was planning to escalate the war to the north. It was plotting an air war against North Vietnam.

On February 1 on the recommendation of Defence Secretary McNamara and by order of President Johnson a covert war was started under the code name Operation Plan 34A. The escalation was to be carried out in three stages: "a. Intensification of the current 34A raids; b. 'Covert U.S. support of overt. . . aerial mining and air strike operations' by Saigon; c. 'Overt joint. . . aerial reconnaissance, naval displays, naval bombardments and air attacks' by the United States and South Vietnam."¹ Congress was not informed of these operations.

But upon the instructions of the White House a resolution was drafted on May 25 to be passed by Congress at an appropriate time. The resolution virtually gave the President a free hand to declare war on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. At the same time a list of 94 targets for air raids against the DRV had been drawn up.

In the last days of July and the first days of August South Vietnamese naval commandos under General Westmoreland's command carried out night raids against North Vietnam by land and sea. At the time of these assaults two US destroyers, the *Maddox* and the *Turner Joy*, were on patrol in the Gulf of Tonkin in close proximity to DRV territory. They were intended as bait. American strategists

¹ *The Pentagon Papers*, as published in *The New York Times*, 1971, p. 245.

hoped the North Vietnamese would attack the destroyers thus providing the long-awaited pretext for an air war in the north.

At 9.30 a.m. on the morning of August 4 the Pentagon received a message that an attack on both the *Maddox* and the *Turner Joy* might be imminent shortly. The destroyers, it said, had intercepted North Vietnamese radio messages indicating preparations for an assault. At 11 a.m. came another message saying that the destroyers were actually engaged. This was claimed to have been the second "unprovoked" attack in the course of a few days.

It took McNamara only ten minutes to convene a meeting with Joint Chiefs of Staff in his conference room for a purely formal discussion of the long-planned "retaliatory action". Twenty-five minutes later a previously scheduled National Security Council meeting began.

Another several hours passed and bombers were already airborne on a predetermined course to drop their deadly loads on North Vietnam. Vying with one another, the press, radio and TV flashed reports about the war.

On August 7 the Johnson Administration secured adoption of its previously drafted resolution by the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Administration's intention to use this resolution, if necessary, for declaring war was kept a close secret. Thus the goal toward which the Johnson Administration was moving was achieved: at long last it had obtained a *carte blanche* for escalating the war to please the military-industrial complex.

As became known later, the resolution had been passed by resorting to a falsehood.

Back on August 4 Defence Secretary McNamara had learned from Admiral Sharp in a telephone conversation at 4 p.m. that there was confusion in

Honolulu because nobody knew for sure that the destroyers had actually been attacked. The Secretary told Admiral Sharp that the "reprisal" order would remain in effect.¹

An urgent message from Captain Herrick of the *Maddox* was also kept secret. It read: "Review of the action makes many radar contacts and torpedo fuel seem doubtful. Freak weather effects and over-cager sonarman may have accounted for many reports. No actual visual sightings by *Maddox*. Suggest complete evaluation before further action."²

Anthony Austin in his book *The President's War* wrote that contrary to the assertions of the Johnson Administration "there was no attack" on the US ships.³

In short, the captain of the *Maddox* knew nothing about the attack on his ship and never identified a North Vietnamese boat as such. Yet the escalation machine was put into high gear in Washington. It was never reversed. Congress remained totally unaware of actual developments. Thus began a ten-year war, one which not only took a toll of tens of thousands of lives but nearly plunged the world into the abyss of a third world war.

An 18-Point Programme

The year 1970 was one of major social changes in Latin America. In Chile the progressive Popular Unity forces came to power. Their programme and policy were directed against the foreign monopolies

¹ *The Pentagon Papers*, p. 262.

² James A. Nathan and James K. Oliver, *United States Foreign Policy and World Order*, Boston-Toronto, 1976, p. 363.

³ Anthony Austin, *The President's War*, A New York Times Book, J. B. Lippincott Co., 1971, p. 345.

and the local oligarchy. The Chilean people were now able to start the gradual revolutionary remaking of society on a democratic basis in keeping with the Constitution. The Popular Unity government and all the people of Chile declared war on poverty. The country's economy improved noticeably and living standards rose. Every child received a free bottle of milk a day.

In three years the lawful Popular Unity government carried out reforms which its predecessors had been unable to introduce in one and a half centuries. It gave education to the youth, land to the peasants, work to the unemployed and homes to the homeless, it handed over big factories to the workers and returned the copper mines to their lawful owners, the people.

The US multimillionaires regarded their Latin American "backyard" with growing apprehension. Of one thing they were sure: the new developments had to be stopped lest a new Cuba should emerge on the continent. Neighbouring countries might follow suit. . . One had to show that the Popular Unity front was unable to govern the country.

A conspiracy was plotted by US corporations, CIA headquarters, the offices of Chilean monopolists, their political parties and traitors among the military, and it resulted in a coup d'etat.

The facts prove that the events of September 11, 1973, and the following days were not an "ordinary mutiny" by a clique of venal generals but were the result of the criminal intrigues of US concerns, big international banks, the local oligarchy and fascist rabble. They were all conspiring against the lawful government and against Chile's progressive advance. Their aim was to overthrow the Popular Unity government and to restore the unrestricted power of local and foreign monopolies.

It was a cunning and ruthless scheme. Systematic disruption of the functioning of government agencies, economic sabotage, boycotts, attempts on people's lives and other acts of terrorism, the incitement and support of Right extremists and pro-fascist elements, all these were designed to plunge the country into the abyss of chaos and violence.

The conspiracy was directed by the International Telephone and Telegraph Company, one of the leading US multinationals, whose investments in Chile totalled 200 million dollars. Mr. William R. Merriam, head of ITT's Washington office, submitted to Mr. Peter G. Peterson, Personal Representative of President Nixon, an 18-point programme of struggle against the Popular Unity government.

In this unique written testimony exposing the conspirators he said he believed it should be pointed out that the situation in Chile should be considered out of turn at an administration's session. Working in strict secrecy it was necessary to do everything so that Allende did not last for the decisive coming six months. The White House should set up a special-purpose headquarters within the framework of the National Security Council and bring pressure to bear on Chile.¹

This headquarters, the programme went on, should take the following steps among others: sharply reduce credits from international, above all, US banks; suspend copper purchases from Chile; cause a shortage of US currency; close US markets to Chile and immediately stop the export of US goods which the Allende government badly needed.

Implementation of the programme began. A week after Allende was elected President General Motors

¹ *Der Spiegel*, July 9, 1973.

postponed indefinitely plans to manufacture three models of cars in Chile. The US copper concern Kennecott urged other customers to boycott Chilean copper. West European companies cancelled their contracts with Chile, curtailed their trade with that country and engineered the outflow of capital from it. The CIA, acting in league with ITT, launched a broad anti-communist campaign with the help of more than 40 radio stations and numerous reactionary newspapers. They organized anti-government demonstrations and worked ceaselessly, knocking together opposition groupings. Owners of big and small shops were bribed to put away daily necessities and sell them in the black market at exorbitant prices.

A comparison of the 18-point programme with actual events proves beyond all doubt that the programme was responsible for undermining Chile's economy, for creating an explosive atmosphere and untying the hands of Allende's murderers. It clearly bears the stamp "Made in USA".

One revolting aspect of the conspiracy is that ITT and the CIA first created difficulties for the Allende government, then shouted for the whole world to hear that the Popular Unity government and the Chilean people were incapable of governing their country. The ITT corporation, the CIA and their hirelings laid the blame for their own handiwork on the Popular Unity government and reviled it before the whole world. Their motto is: the more monstrous the lie, the more credible it is.

The sum of 13,400,000 dollars was officially allocated for the Chile action which was directed by the Nixon Administration, to say nothing of the millions granted by ITT and other concerns.

And this is not all. Another way of undermining Chile's economy was the issue of counterfeit escu-

dos. The Central Intelligence Agency flooded Chile with forged currency either directly from the US or via third countries. Mrs. Hortensia Bussi de Allende, the Chilean President's widow, has said in this connection: "They literally inundated our country".

Putting counterfeit money into circulation helped to solve several tasks:

First, financing the criminal activities of "Patria y Libertad", an organization of fascist spies and saboteurs, against the legitimate Allende government.

Second, "stimulating" prolonged strikes by truck owners in order to sap the country's economy and disrupt the supply of vital necessities to the population.

Third, artificially swelling the volume of money in circulation, creating a disparity between purchasing power and the available goods, which would cause inflation, encourage a black market and raise the cost of living.

The US government dared not disprove these facts. On the contrary, its silence amounted to an unwilling admission of their truth. Right after the putsch it ordered all escudo notes to be withdrawn from circulation and exchanged by February 26, 1974. Anyone keeping such notes—which were direct evidence against US forgers—risked a long prison sentence.

That is how spokes were put in the wheel of the progressive Chilean government. This was done in order to shake the Chileans' faith in the Popular Unity government, to wreak havoc in the country and prepare the ground for counterrevolution.

Thus the crimes committed by the CIA and the Chilean generals strangled freedom and democracy and trampled human rights underfoot in Chile.

Manipulations of a Secret Service

On June 23, 1975, several weeks before the successful conclusion of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the newspaper *Quotidien de Paris*, which describes itself as "left liberal", released a "secret", even "super secret" document (in the words of *Frankfurter Rundschau*). The document was supplied by the Portuguese newspaper *República* and had allegedly been written in Moscow. West German newspapers carried such headlines as: "Communists' Bid for Power in Portugal", "Moscow's Secret Instructions to Portugal's Communists Are Made Public", and so on.

The French AFP news agency revealed: "This document gives their tactical bearings to all Communist parties in the West."

"The instructions for the seizure of power" said it was necessary to paralyze the administrative apparatus and to suppress all the resistance of officialdom by accusing it, for instance, of intending "to carry out a coup d'état." A further recommendation was to set up united trade unions against "dissenters" and to seek a tactical alliance with the army.¹

To seize the press, radio and television.

Several weeks later, on August 18, 1975, the West German magazine *Der Spiegel* reported that the Portuguese Communists "have disrupted the army, following this prescription, and have seized control of the press, radio and television."

A firm denial of this crude provocation by the newspaper *Pravda* and the leadership of the Communist Party of Portugal forced the dealers in falsehood to make these admissions:

¹ *Frankfurter Rundschau*, June 24, 1975.

"It is not our job to verify the text given us by the journalists from the newspaper *República*," M. Philippe Sesson, chief editor of *Quotidien de Paris*,¹ said in self-defence.

M. Juan Esteves, a responsible official of the newspaper, gave an interview.

"*Question*: You never had the original of such an important document in your hands. . .

"*Juan Esteves*: No, I did not see the original.

"*Question*: Don't you think you could have been a victim of the manipulations of some secret service, the CIA or something like it. . . That you have been hoodwinked?

"*Juan Esteves*: No. . . If one doesn't trust one's colleagues, what can it lead to?"²

The "super-secret document" proved to be a crude distortion of an article by Boris Ponomarev, alternate member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, which was published in the June 1974 issue of *World Marxist Review*, a magazine which is freely distributed.

Another noteworthy fact: on March 3, 1976, *The Washington Post* reported that the US Embassy in Moscow had been subjected to radioactive radiation. The accusation was immediately echoed by *The New York Times*, *Newsweek* magazine and also by the West German, British and French press. All press organs in the West referred to statements made by spokesmen of the US State Department on February 10, 1976, but did not mention, however, that only two weeks later, on February 28, the State Department had to make another official statement to the effect that the accusations in question were groundless.

¹ *Berliner Extra-Dienst*, June 27, 1975.

² *Ibid.*

False Witnesses Against the Wilmington Ten

There is no end of talk about human rights in the United States. In practice, however, the civil rights movement in that country is discriminated against and its leaders are persecuted.

In early 1977, tens of thousands of Americans demonstrated in Chicago, Boston, Denver, Washington and Los Angeles, demanding freedom for ten civil rights fighters. They demanded respect for human rights in the US in deeds, not in words. Thousands of Americans and millions all over the world came out in defence of the Wilmington Ten.

For more than five years nine Negroes and one white woman have been held in prison. They were sentenced, on trumped-up charges, to a total of 282 years in jail. Such trials are nothing new: their victims have been Sacco and Vanzetti, the Scottsboro boys, Soledad Brothers and Angela Davis.

In 1970, a series of rabid racist provocations were launched in Wilmington, North Carolina, the Ku-Klux-Klan citadel, after black and white citizens began to implement their guaranteed right to integrated schooling. In late 1970, several pupils' clashes were provoked; as a result 17 black pupils were expelled.

In mid-January, 1971, one thousand Wilmington citizens held a peaceful demonstration demanding more discipline and order in schools, the engagement of more Negro teachers and the dismissal of racist-minded school instructors. Among the demonstrators was the Rev. Ben Chavis, a member of the Commission for Racial Justice of the United Church of Christ.

The racials retaliated by forming armed gangs and threatening a campaign of terror. Supported

by the police, for four days they besieged a small wooden church in the Negro community where Negro schoolchildren and their white friends had barricaded themselves in. Among them were Ben Chavis and the white priest Gene Templeton.

The church was kept under rifle fire day and night. Eighteen-year-old Negro Steve Mitchel was shot dead as he tried to leave the church building. Another racist bullet hit Harvey Cumber, one of the white attackers. A small grocery store owned by a white near the church was set on fire.

After the police refused to storm the church the district judge, John M. Walker, suggested: "Let us call up Lieut. Calley (guilty of the Songmy massacre in South Vietnam-*Ed.*), let him clear the place."

Nine months later Ben Chavis and his friends set up a political organization to defend civil rights for Negroes. At that time Chavis, eight other Negroes and one white woman who sided up with the movement for Negro civil rights were accused of murder, arson and obstructing the work of firemen.

After a jury of ten blacks and two whites was selected for a trial in Bergen where Negroes make up 49 per cent of the population, the prosecutor became ill. He resumed his duties only after an all-white jury was appointed. All civil rights fighters were pronounced "guilty", having been "exposed" by false witnesses. Chavis was sentenced to 34 years imprisonment, five school pupils to 29 years each, three to 31 years each, while Mrs. Sheppard Turner, mother of three daughters, received ten years imprisonment.

In his letter to US President Ben Chavis wrote that they were in jail for taking part in the civil

rights movement and that they were the victims of racism and political persecution.¹

Of the 42 witnesses for the prosecution only one said that Ben Chavis had made him set fire to the grocery store and that Chavis and others had shot a white man, that all of them had discussed a plan for assaulting the police. The "witness" was Allen Hall, a criminal suffering from a mental condition. Hall said that the prosecution had forced him to give false evidence, promising in return to take extenuating circumstances into account when examining his own criminal case.²

Later Hall testified: "All my earlier testimony against the Wilmington Ten is false . . . for my testimony District Attorney Stroud promised to release me from prison in half a year's time at the most. . ." ³

The second witness for the prosecution, Eric Junious, explained: "I did not hear, during the Negro unrest in February 1971, the Rev. Ben Chavis say in the church 'Take up arms!' and I did not see the accused take rifles and leave the church. If I stated the opposite at the trial, it was only because the prosecuting attorney Jay Stroud had promised to give me a minibike for Christmas. . ."

The third key witness for the prosecution was Jerome Mitchell. He later stated on oath that, contrary to his earlier statement, he had not been at the site of crime during the fire. "Jay Stroud gave me photographs which I was to memorize. I do not recall ever seeing Ben Chavis and others before the photographs."

¹ *Frankfurter Rundschau*, April 18, 1977.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Neues Deutschland*, June 5, 1977.

These key witnesses for the prosecution were 12, 16 and 17 years old during the Wilmington events. Their rejection of statements made earlier under pressure destroyed the entire case for the prosecution against the Wilmington Ten.

In early January, 1978, Governor James Hunt of North Carolina slightly reduced the prison terms for the Wilmington Ten but declined their appeal for a pardon despite the fact that their innocence had been proved.

Ben Chavis then appealed to President Carter. Several months later he received a reply from Mr. Drew F. Days, head of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, which said that President Carter regarded violation of civil rights in the United States as seriously as that in other countries.¹

Meanwhile the Wilmington Ten remain in jail.

And Again the "Soviet Threat" . . .

The "threat from the East" lie has long been in the arsenal of the psychological warfare waged by the enemies of peace and socialism.

Its purpose is to arouse fear, making impossible a sober, unbiased appraisal of Soviet peace policy. The natural sequel to this brazen lie is the doctrine of "averting the threat", which supplies a theoretical foundation for the imperialist arms race. A single thread of argument runs from Hitler, who used his notorious lie about "defending Western civilization from the Bolshevik menace" to cover up his plans for world conquest and war crimes, to the present-day ballyhoo about the "Soviet menace",

¹ *Frankfurter Rundschau*, April 18, 1977.

designed to camouflage the policy of aggression, mass annihilation and actual preparations for a new war.

An important factor in reviving this criminal lie in the postwar period was the book, "The Dynamics of Soviet Society". Its publication in 1953, was financed by the Central Intelligence Agency, as was the setting up of the Centre of International Studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1950. There Walt Rostow wrote the book in which he claimed that the Soviet Union was an imperialist power striving to conquer the world and that it was the duty and the task of the United States to repulse this threat. ¹

Mr. Rostow's fabrication bolstering up the thesis of an alleged "Soviet threat" was certainly to the liking of all the politicians and the military in the West who had defended and directed the imperialist aggression of the United States in Korea and of France in Vietnam in the 1950s, of those whose cold war policy had pushed Europe to the brink of the abyss, who had prepared and effected West Germany's entry into NATO, all the time playing up West Germany's role as a "bulwark against communism". The war monopolies continued to profit from their trade in death, growing fat on taxpayers' money.

Many years later, at the end of 1977, Lieut.-General Schmückle, Deputy Supreme Allied Commander of the NATO forces in Europe, very frankly explained how this is done: "The military, in league together, step up the arms build-up, inflating the military danger. If the enemy's strength is

¹ V. Marchetti, John D. Marks, *CIA*, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1974, S. 223.

exaggerated and a powerful military confrontation is recommended, this may give a new impetus to a further build-up of armaments".¹

How has this "impetus" been organized in the last 25 years?

In the 1950s, US and NATO generals launched a vociferous campaign around the alleged lag of the West in the manufacture of bombers, securing the adoption of unprecedented armaments programmes. The lie about a military threat is political and ideological camouflage for the build-up of arms. The military allocations of the United States trebled in the period 1949-54 alone, rising from 13,500 to 42,800 million dollars.

The phoney "military threat" scare was brought into being in the late 1950s and 1960s, to conceal the craving of reactionary West German politicians for nuclear weapons for the Bundeswehr. On March 20, 1958, Herr Franz Josef Strauss, Federal Germany's War Minister, resorted to a pitiable falsehood by ascribing to Marshal Rodion Malinovsky, the Soviet Minister of Defence, the statement that Soviet weapons needed to be perfected in order "to cut short any attempts to stop the advance of communism".

Marshal Malinovsky's actual statement was as follows: "Instead of taking steps towards reducing international tension, as has been proposed by the Soviet Union to other states, the Western powers are intensifying the arms drive, in particular, deploying atomic weapons in Western Europe. The Party and the people will therefore continue to strengthen our armed forces so as to be prepared at any moment to rebuff aggression and to prevent the im-

¹ *Die Tat*, December 16, 1977.

perialists from hindering the building of communism in the USSR."

The bulletin for commanding personnel entitled "How to Act in Case of a Conflict With Communism" (code FÜ B I 6-A 35-20. 17-03 of June 22, 1962), issued by the Bundeswehr Command on the 21st anniversary of Hitler Germany's attack on the Soviet Union, said: "Bundeswehr soldiers must know of the existence of a threat to our freedom from communist terrorism, and should also be aware what a menace communist plans for securing world domination present to all the peoples of the non-communist world..." In a series of pamphlets entitled "Notebooks on Civil Training and Psychological Preparation", published by the Bundeswehr operations staff, von Hassel, the West German War Minister, formulated his basic idea as follows: "The creation of the Bundeswehr is a consequence of the communist threat..."

Also in the 60s, when West German politicians were clamouring for nuclear weapons for the Bundeswehr, NATO officials whipped up real hysteria over the alleged lag of the West in the field of rocketry. The arms race assumed unprecedented proportions, and profits from war investment rose fabulously. Between 1954 and 1969, US military expenditure nearly doubled—from 42,800 to 81,400 million dollars.

The policy of cold war, brinkmanship and blackmail has patently failed. Socialism, the peoples' striving for peace and their growing strength in the course of their struggle over many years have made possible a turn from the cold war to détente. But military circles and some politicians in the West are trying to obstruct and, eventually, reverse this process.

In order to make the "Soviet threat" more credible, vivid pictures are painted of imaginary "attacks" and "blitzkrieg operations" by the Warsaw Treaty armed forces against Western countries. Such fabrications often appear in syndicated newspapers hostile to the policy of detente.

The Declaration on Atlantic Relations of the NATO Council Session at Foreign Ministers' Level, held in Ottawa in June, 1974 during preparations for the European Security Conference, mentioned a possible attempt "by a foreign power to endanger the independence or inviolability of the territory of a NATO member country".¹

As if working to order, the French newspaper *Le Nouvel Observateur* carried an abridged version of a scenario entitled "Can America Win the War?" compiled by D. Middleton, military expert of *The New York Times*. "Within 48 hours they (Warsaw Treaty troops—Ed.) reach the Rhine. Generals of the NATO General Staff in Belgium escape by helicopter while the first tanks roll into Brussels. . . . Ten days after the beginning of the offensive Warsaw Treaty armies reach the Atlantic coast and the English Channel. . ."

When the draft Final Act of the European Conference in Helsinki was ready, Herr Georg Leber, then War Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, was the only war minister of NATO countries to support his American counterpart Schlesinger when the latter threatened that "in the event of a conflict" the US would be the first to deliver a nuclear blow.

Just over four months after the successful completion of the Conference on Security and Coopera-

¹ *Frankfurter Rundschau*, June 20, 1974.

tion in Europe a communique of the war ministers of the NATO countries (December, 1975) voiced "deep concern over trends to be observed at the present time", prompted by the "menacing military potential" of the Warsaw Treaty countries.

Early in 1976, the CIA made an "announcement" which "disclosed" that CIA experts "due to sheer misunderstanding" had for many years "underestimated" by nearly a half the level of military expenditure in the USSR. No proof or facts were given. CIA experts accordingly doubled their already considerably exaggerated estimates of Soviet military allocations. After these fanciful computations they were still to their surprise forced to conclude that spending on armaments in the Soviet Union in 1975 was still 50 per cent less than US military expenditure in that same year.

In mid-summer 1976, a little-known Belgian general by the name of Close stepped on the stage to add colour to the falsehood about the "Soviet threat". Duly given great publicity by Western scandal sheets, he depicted the horrors of a "Soviet blitzkrieg"—Soviet tanks would suddenly invade West German territory, occupy major cities and in 48 hours reach Rhine. These ravings were echoed by General Haig, Supreme Allied Commander of the NATO forces in Europe.

This hysteria enabled the conference of NATO ministers held in December, 1976, to draw a conclusion in its communique that the high level of military spending in the Soviet Union was causing grave anxiety¹ and that recent statements by Warsaw Pact members (proposals to stop the arms race made at the Bucharest meeting—A. N.) should be considered unacceptable.

¹ AP, Brussels, December 10, 1976.

In January, 1977, US Secretary of Defence Rumsfeld, commenting on the NATO communique, repeated the invention about a "possible" lightning strike from the East.¹

In May, 1977, a top-level NATO conference also referred to "particular apprehension caused by the permanent offensive potential of Warsaw Pact forces".²

Television, which is the key mass media in our time, was tuned to the cold-war wavelength in order to lend credence to the anti-detente pronouncements of the war maniacs, to erase the positive experience accumulated in the process of detente.

In the spring of 1977, TV stations in the United States and Western Germany transmitted a series of "war games". In these programmes NATO representatives observing military manoeuvres of the Warsaw Treaty countries, came to the conclusion that the Soviet Union intended to start a war. The NATO bloc was obviously required to retaliate in order to protect the West. To give more credence to the "military action" on the screen the makers of the TV programme employed the services of state officials, other well-known personalities and news announcers. One result of this frank whipping up of war hysteria has been a 20 per cent increase in the number of active supporters of greater war expenditure in the United States.

Today, when socialism and the peace-loving forces of the world have secured a turn towards detente, NATO brass hats and reactionary politicians are still clamouring about an imaginary "lag of the West in the field of mass-destruction weapons" and are fanning anti-Sovietism. They urge the produc-

¹ *DPA*, Washington, January 19, 1977.

² *Die Welt*, May 12, 1977.

tion of new types of such weapons and greater efforts to prepare for war in outer space.

The NATO military budget for 1978 is evidently destined to set a sad record: it will be nearly ten times bigger than NATO's budget in 1949—nearly 180,000 million dollars against 18,400 million dollars.

As for the United States, despite the fact that it suffered defeat in Vietnam and in the late 70s has been waging no war anywhere, its military spending has been steadily increasing—from 81,400 million dollars in 1969, to 117,800 million dollars in 1978.

For comparison we may mention that during the 1970's Soviet military expenditure fell from 18,000 million roubles to 17,200 million roubles in 1978.

Former US Secretary of Defence Rumsfeld once explained with cynical frankness what aims the aggressive forces of imperialism pursue when they resort time and again to the lie about a Soviet threat. He said that it was not so much a matter of the Pentagon suddenly discovering the growth of Soviet military potential as of exerting effective influence on the American people, of repeating the same facts until they were properly registered in people's minds.¹

Dr. Goebbels, Propaganda Minister of Hitler's Reich, used to say much the same thing.

On January 26, 1977, *The Times* warned against the possible fateful consequences of this policy: "The real source of danger, not of limited operations, but of world conflict, is the continuing arms race. . . . To constantly keep pressing the panic button and sounding the alarm of an imminent Soviet advance to the Rhine is to create the psychosis that

¹ See *Horizont*, October, 1977.

could cause a stampede. It also commits the human race to an arms race that no one will ever win and all may lose."

The constant references in the Western mass media to the provisions of the Final Act of the European Conference in Helsinki and their distortion of its spirit and letter (though many Western papers have never even published its text) are also part of the slanderous campaign around the "communist threat".

It is proper to mention in this connection that in the Final Act the European countries, the United States and Canada all pledge "to take effective measures which... constitute steps towards the ultimate achievement of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control".¹

Revelations of Falsifiers

When fabrications made by secret and intelligence services of West Germany are exposed by top officials of these services, albeit because of rivalry or in anticipation of big fees, it is a highly significant fact.

For example, Günther Nollau writes in his memoirs *The Agency*² about the Federal Agency for Ensuring Observance of the Constitution, a body he headed for 25 years, during which he was mainly engaged in fomenting anti-communism using the entire range of means at the disposal of the secret service and resorting to such falsehoods as only a wild imagination and ill will could be capable of.

¹ *New Times*, No. 32, August, 1975, p. 29.

² G. Nollau, *Das Amt*, Bertelsmann Verlag, Munich, 1978.

His personal rival was General Gehlen, head of the federal intelligence service, who sold the instalment rights to his memoirs to Springer's *Die Welt*. In this connection Nollau writes about the primitive anti-communist techniques used by his former rival Gehlen, who had a brainwave about publishing fresh information on the part played by Bormann, Nazi Reichsleiter and Hitler's confidant. Here is what Nollau writes on this score:

"*Die Welt* began its series with an outsize canard presented by Gehlen. The title said: 'Gehlen States That Bormann Was Stalin's Agent'. To support his fabrication Gehlen says that after the war Bormann settled in the Soviet Union and now lives there under a safe cover. Well, this cover has, of course, turned out to be not so safe since Gehlen has been able to uncover it, although he does not say a word about how he did it. . . . At any rate he succeeded—and *Die Welt* backed him up in this—in starting a spy scare and bolstering up the false view that the war was lost 'only because of treason'. This is an absurd view, refuted by the facts, but it was already expressed after the First World War in the Reichswehr's publication *Invincible in the Battlefield* and it played an evil role. How Gehlen came to make a sensational announcement about Bormann being a spy, he later told a Frankfurt judge, who was instructed to find out whether it was possible to institute criminal proceedings against Bormann since it was claimed that he was alive. On this point Gehlen told the judge that one of his agents saw a report of a sports festival in Moscow in the East Berlin newsreel *Eyewitness* in 1946 or 1947 and recognized Martin Bormann in the crowd. Anyone who has ever had to deal with the evidence of witnesses knows what such testimony is worth."

The object of this fraud was crystal clear—to distract the attention of the world public, concerned about the infiltration of the state apparatus by former Nazis and their followers, by false accusations that it is the same in the Soviet Union.

The falsifiers do not limit themselves to public slander intended to delude the masses—they also try to poison the atmosphere by political and diplomatic means.

Nollau writes that in the spring of 1953 Gehlen's organization prepared a "fat volume" which was to be used as evidence of the aggressive intentions of the German Democratic Republic at the forthcoming Berlin Conference of Foreign Ministers of the USSR, the US, Great Britain and France. He says:

"The entire report was a heap of nonsense and lies. In my opinion, it was in no circumstances to be given to the four powers. Their experts—both American and Russian—would simply have ridiculed this concoction. My task was to uphold this point of view. But first it had to be proved that in the Thuringian Forest there were no schools for red 'sex-bombs' who were to be dropped as agents to the areas where Allied troops were stationed. We succeeded in proving some of these statements to be false. On one of the islands in the Schwerin Lake, as the report (Gehlen's—A.N.) said, a spy school run by the Ministry of State Security was allegedly located. I asked to be brought a special map on which this island was plotted. Indeed, I saw the name of the 'island' in the middle of the lake. What could this mean? One of our employees was born in Schwerin. I asked him about this island in the Schwerin Lake. 'Do you want to take foot baths there?' he asked. 'It is a sand bar that is submerged in winter and spring.' This was our trump card when gentlemen from the Gehlen orga-

nization came to us to discuss the report trying to look very important. In the end they had to abandon it."

There is no doubt that Nollau is far from being against anti-communist slander, nor is he opposed to falsification. He simply criticizes a rival organization for its crude methods of work.

Invention of "The Manifesto"

On the eve of 1978 a "document" pretentiously entitled *The Manifesto* was circulated by *Der Spiegel* in West Germany. *Der Spiegel* claimed that *The Manifesto* which had allegedly been prepared by "a group of top- and middle-ranking officials of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SUPG)" revealed "a split in the SUPG". Early in the New Year full-page reports of an "opposition among top- and middle-ranking SUPG officials" appeared in West Germany's biggest newspapers.

The "document" was intended to revive the spectre of the "Soviet menace", to slander the socialist countries, to hinder the building of socialism in the German Democratic Republic, to complicate relations between West Germany and the GDR and to slow down the process of detente.

Soon after the forgery was published, it was proved in the GDR that the West Berlin branches of the Federal Intelligence Service had taken part in preparing it. The director of the Spiegel publishing house, Hans Detlev Becker, who had worked in the counter-intelligence department of the Nazi Wehrmacht's radio espionage service, undertook to publish the pamphlet. We may mention, in passing, that his activities as an agent in Nazi Germany resulted in the arrest and murder of the members of

the Rote Kapelle international anti-fascist resistance organization.

A close examination of *The Manifesto* clearly shows that it is a compilation of statements and publications of different political forces. Among these materials are: an interview with, and articles written by, a certain "Sovietologist" invited to lecture at Yale University in return for his anti-communist services; the effusions of a professional "dissident" expelled from the SUPG in 1964, which were published in Western weeklies; commentaries by the US RIAS radio station in West Berlin; extracts from Trotskyite pamphlets circulated in West Germany; articles from *Rheinischer Merkur*, a paper close to the Christian Democratic Union, and *Bayernkurier*, published by Franz Josef Strauss, and so on.

Exposures made in the GDR impelled a section of Western mass media to take a more sober look at *The Manifesto*. The *Parlamentarisch-Politische Pressedienst* bulletin wrote that *The Manifesto* could have been cooked up by any journalist who knew his job a little. The Zurich *Tages-Anzeiger* said that it should be read with caution. Radio and TV commentators in West Germany began to call *The Manifesto* "imaginary". The *Deutschlandfunk* radio station said that its "authenticity is not free of doubt" and *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* observed "a certain confusion in the argument". The social-democratic *Vorwärts* wrote: "Above all it is the style that gives the authors away. Those who have received their theoretical training at the SUPG do not write like this; it is the way of writing of those who do their best to imitate the style of a smart Western journalist."

Becker made an initial partial confession by saying that the authors of *The Manifesto* were "not

full-time SUPG officials" as had been stated before, but "party workers on a voluntary basis".

In the full-page advertisements of the second instalment of *Der Spiegel's* publication (over 100,000 marks was spent on advertising) the big dailies no longer spoke of "top- and middle-ranking officials" but only of a certain "organized group of SUPG oppositionists". *Der Spiegel's* editor Erich Böhme said that "it was a rather loose organizational form of opposition groups in the GDR".

On January 9, 1978, Becker made a further partial confession in trying to prove that he himself had not been a BND secret service agent working for Hitler's spy network; at the same time he confessed that he "knew well" BND chief Gehlen and worked at the Wehrmacht's General Headquarters, at the radio interception department where he was locating spy transmitters, and that he had maintained radio communication between "coordinating centres in enemy countries and agents in the Reich". At that time he "submitted material which was used to destroy the Rote Kapelle resistance group".

According to Associated Press, on January 11, 1978, Becker stated that it was well known that he was a kind of journalist and expert in the secret service of the intelligence and counter-intelligence network.

The public learned from Böhme that the very title *The Manifesto* was an invention of *Der Spiegel*.

Herbert Wehner, chairman of the Social Democratic Party group in the Bundestag, regarded *Der Spiegel* pamphlet as a provocation. He added: "I am against the development of relations (between the two German states-A.N.) in reverse, that is to say, their return to nil, as it was in the 1950s."

This provocation made by West Germany's intelligence service and its blind "mirror"—*Der Spiegel*—was intended to torpedo detente and the further normalization of relations between states with different social systems, including relations between the GDR and West Germany.

TO DISARM THE FALSIFIERS

The report of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association to its Hague Congress in 1872 said in part that when the great conflagration took place in Chicago, the telegraph round the world announced it as the infernal deed of the International; and it is really wonderful that to its demoniacal agency has not been attributed the hurricane ravaging the West Indies.¹

Since then reactionaries, no matter what their guise, have attributed scores of "devilish intrigues" to the labour movement, the peace movement and their leading figures, and then to socialism!

Everything that was shameful, terrible and mean has been attributed to the working class movement. According to the strange philosophy of the dealers in falsehood which they have pursued in practice for over 100 years, the struggle for peace is a menace to mankind's future while the social and national emancipation of peoples means the end of mankind.

Industrial production with electronic control has replaced the old "manufacture" of falsification.

The coordinated actions of entire headquarter staffs of experts with special departments, research institutes and other organizations for "Communist studies" and extra powerful radio stations (whose names flaunt the word "free") have taken the place of the "not altogether pure" thoughts or whims of

¹ *The International Herald*, October 19, 1872, p. 3.

individuals—of a monarch, a chancellor, a privy counsellor or chief of police with criminal tendencies. Falsehoods are fed to newspapers obedient to the CIA or to capitalist press giants to be refined and passed on to the reading masses. They are promptly picked up by sensation-hungry radio and TV studios. Concrete and glass palaces, housing the headquarters and branch offices of lie factories, stand today where there used to be barracks in whose backyards émigré forgers were busy toiling by hand.

Falsehoods produced on an industrial scale delude people. The falsifiers are shamelessly employing the latest achievements of psychology and of the science of human behaviour.

Despite novelties the essence of this remains the same: falsehood, slander and distortion of the facts. The stronger our movement is the more lies our enemies invent.

There is and there can be no place in world affairs for falsifiers and their lies. The idea of peace and the realities of life will triumph. The movement for peace and socialism will sweep away all filth and lies, like the waves of the ocean.

62159'

7-5-79

Альберт Норден .
ОТРАВЛЕННЫЕ СТРЕЛЫ
ПРОТИВ МИРА И СОЦИАЛИЗМА
на английском языке
Цена 25 коп.

I. I. A. S. LIBRARY

Acc. No.

This book was issued from the library on the date last stamped. It is due back within one month of its date of issue, if not recalled earlier.

--	--	--	--



Library IAS, Shimla



00062159