

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Published Weekly as the Organ of the Socialist Party of New York, Left Wing Branches.

Vol. I. - No. 19. 401

Saturday, December 18, 1937

5 Cents per Copy

"Trotsky Innocent, Trials Frame-Ups"

"We find the Moscow Trials to be a frame-up! We find Trotsky and Sedov not guilty!"

The thunderous applause of 2,500 people greeted these findings of the International Commission of Inquiry into the Moscow Trials as announced by John Dewey, world famous educator and commission chairman, at a mass meeting held Sunday, Dec. 12 in New York City.

The commission report was the greatest triumph of truth against frame-up since the brilliant Emile Zola, French author, exposed the Dreyfuss trials at the close of the 19th century.

Withdraw America's Forces from China!

An Editorial

The sinking of the United States gunboat, *Panay*, in Chinese waters by Japanese bombers, has let loose a veritable wave of jingoism in the United States.

All the war-mongers are screeching for "strong measures". Both the yellow press and the "respectable" Big Business press are demanding "action". Joining the blood-pack is the Daily Worker, the organ of the Communist Party. It rushed to endorse Roosevelt and to demand that American imperialism join with French and British imperialism to take common action against Japan.

"Our" gunboat has been sunk.

"Our" flag has been insulted.

"Our" honor has been sullied.

"We" must be avenged.

These are the cries of the hypocritical scoundrels who would like to rush the American workers and farmers into another war to "make the world safe for democracy".

We say, however: Call a halt to the imperialist war-mongers now, before it is too late.

All our sympathy and support go to the valiant Chinese people who are fighting against such terrific odds to preserve their independence from Japan's attempt to convert the country into a colony. In China, it is the elementary duty of every man and woman to fight to the bitter end against the monstrous invasion by Japan. In Japan, it is the elementary duty of every working man, every peasant, to promote the defeat of his ruling class, to sabotage its criminal war, to overturn its despotic sway by revolution. In the United States, it is the duty of every worker, especially everyone in the maritime industry, to refuse to load any ships destined for Japan and to speed all ships destined

(Continued on page 12)

It was a mortal blow to Stalinism.

The commission's conclusion flatly challenged the verdict of the Moscow court on twenty-one separate counts. Basing its judgment both on the trial records and on a mass of new documentary evidence and new affidavits, the Commission affirmed, among its more important findings:

"That Trotsky never instructed any of the defendants or witnesses in the Moscow trials to assassinate any political opponent.... to engage in sabotage, wrecking, and diversionism.... or to enter into agreements with foreign powers against the Soviet Union."

"On the basis of all the evidence we find that Trotsky never recommended, plotted or attempted the restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R."

"Fantastically Falsified Trotsky's Role"

"We find further that the prosecutor fantastically falsified Trotsky's role before, during, and after the October Revolution."

Once again, Trotsky's place in history as the co-leader with Lenin of the Russian revolution in 1917 was re-affirmed by the commission's findings.

Once again, Trotsky's role in world politics as the greatest

(Continued on page 2)

Dewey Broadcasts on Trials; Hits Minneapolis Frame-Up

NEW YORK.—Warning that the methods used in the Russian frame-ups are increasingly being transported for use against opponents of Stalinism in the rest of the world, Dr. John Dewey followed up the publication of the findings of the International Commission of Inquiry Into the Charges Made against Leon Trotsky in the Moscow Trials Monday night in which he discussed the implications of the ver-

(Continued on page 2)

Trotsky's Telegram to The Commission

The commission condemned nobody to death or to prison. Yet it is impossible to imagine a more terrible verdict. The commission says to the rulers of a great country:

"You committed a frame-up for the purpose of justifying the extermination of your political adversaries."

"You tried to deceive the toilers of the world."

"You are unworthy to serve the cause which you invoke".

The commission, which includes people of different political views, could not follow our political aims. But its verdict has an immeasurable political importance. The methods of lying and blundering frame-ups which contaminate the inner life of the U. S. S. R. and the workers' movement of the whole world received today a terrible blow.

Let the official friends of the U. S. S. R. and the other pseudo-radical bigots say that the verdict will be used by reaction. This is untrue. Nowhere and never did the truth serve the cause of reaction.

And nowhere and never is progress fed on lies. The commission, it is true, delivered a blow to the bureaucracy, but this bureaucracy has become the main brake upon the progress of the Soviet Union.

Aiming to serve the truth, the commission served the liberating struggle of all mankind. From now on the work of the commission as well as the names of its participants belong to history.

The Stalinist Frame-Ups From Moscow To Minneapolis

Speaker

James P. Cannon

Just Returned from Minneapolis

FRIDAY EVENING, DEC. 17, 1937, 8:00 P. M.
WEBSTER MANOR, 125 East 11th Street (Near 4th Ave).

Auspices: Socialist Party (Left Wing), New York Local

"Trial Procedure Flimsy and Vicious"

(Continued from page 1)

Living exponent of Marxism, of the teachings of Lenin, the genius of the October revolution, has been emphasized by the exposure of the hideous crimes and betrayal of principle by the Stalinist.

The Commission's report is an 80,000 word document, soon to be published in book form, continuing the series of publications begun with the report of the preliminary hearings held by the Commission in Mexico City and published by Harpers as "The Case of Leon Trotsky."

Signatories of Report

The final report is signed by Professor John Dewey, Chairman; Suzanne LaFollette, editor and author, secretary; John Chamberlain, formerly of the staff of The New York Times; Alfred Rosmer, former member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International and former editor-in-chief of L'Humanité; Professor Edward Alsworth Ross, Department of Sociology of the University of Wisconsin.

Otto Ruehle, biographer of Karl Marx, former member of the German Reichstag and close political associate of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg; Benjamin Stolberg, labor journalist; Carlo Tresca, editor of Il Martello; F. Zamora, liberal Mexican publicist; and Wendelin Thomas, former member of the German Reichstag; John Finerty, counsel to the commission, concurring.

Contradicting the assertions of the English jurist, D. N. Pritt and others, the Commission reported that "the conduct of the Moscow trials violated Soviet law at every important point." In support of this statement the report cited an official Soviet textbook on criminal law by Professor M. S. Strogovich, published in 1936, and edited by the state prosecutor himself, A. Y. Vishinsky.

Contradicted Precepts of Soviet Law

In this Professor Strogovich writes that "denunciation"—the testimony of a defendant implicating another defendant or extraneous individuals—is regarded under Soviet law as "the least meritorious" category of evidence.

The Commission found that it was upon precisely this category of evidence, entirely uncorroborated by documentary proof, that Trotsky and Sedov were declared convicted in both verdicts. Professor Strogovich declares that whereas "The Fascist criminal trial fixes its course upon the admission of guilt by the accused, extorting this admission by all sorts of violence and torture," the Soviet procedure requires that "the testimony of the accused, particularly his admission of guilt, like every other piece of evidence, is subject to verification and careful evaluation as a result of juxtaposing it with all the other evidence gathered in the case."

The Commission found that despite this stated requirement of Soviet law, no other evidence of any importance was presented in either case than the confessions of the accused and of self-inculcating witnesses.

Besides Dr. Dewey, the full commission was represented at the meeting by the following members: LaFollette, Stolberg, Finerty, Thomas, Tresca and Chamberlain. Each told why he joined the commission and how the inquiry was conducted.

The Commission members made quite clear their opposition to the political and theoretical position

of Trotsky and the 4th International.

In presenting the report of the commission, Dr. Dewey declared in part:

Dr. Dewey's Speech

"It is not too much to say that, particularly as this new evidence accumulated, the members of the Commission have been without exception appalled by the utterly discreditable character of the whole Moscow trial proceedings, at once flimsy and vicious. Others, like a distinguished colleague of mine who declined to share our labors, may still take the position that it is impossible to prove a negative, hence, in that technical sense impossible to prove Trotsky guiltless of the fantastic charges made against him.

"It is, however, possible to prove beyond reasonable doubt, the existence of a frame-up, and I submit that the Commission has done just that.

"The implications of this finding are of course profoundly disturbing. These implications are not a matter of intellectual speculation; they have been fulfilled and demonstrated by the events which followed close upon the trials.

"The continuing arrests and executions of Soviet officials and citizens on charges of terrorism, wrecking, sabotage, 'Trotskyism,' etc. have strengthened the suspicion of thousands of genuine friends of revolutionary Russia that the present regime is seeking to identify political opposition to itself with criminal activity against the Soviet Union and people.

"Still more shocking is the systematic use by the Communist parties throughout the world of the vicious 'Trotskyist-terrorist-fascist amalgam' as a means of destroying political opposition and even of justifying gross frame-ups and assassinations, as in Spain in the case of Andres Nin and others.

"Even in this country, the Communist Party and its labor and liberal sympathizers have used this strictly amoral tactic, indistinguishable from the tactic of Fascism, to slander and persecute opposition, with a resulting confusion and disruption of the forces of economic and political progress which cannot be too strongly condemned.

Cannot Be Ignored

"This is no strife of personalities or of political factions, which the American public can afford comfortably to ignore. It signifies the repudiation by a disciplined political organization, world-wide in scope and influence, of the principles of truth and justice

upon which the foundations of civilization are laid.

"It signifies an extraordinary corruption of the idealistic heritage of the Russian Revolution. It signifies a danger against which our own people must guard themselves without illusion and without compromise."

Much of the new documentary evidence obtained by the Commission focused upon the testimony given at the trials by Holtzman, Pyatakov, and Vladimir Romm. At the first trial E. S. Holtzman testified that on the invitation of Leon Sedov, Trotsky's son, he went to Copenhagen during Trotsky's stay there from November 23 to December 2, 1932; that by previous arrangement he met Sedov in the lobby of the Hotel Bristol and went from there with him to see Trotsky. The Commission found that there was no Hotel Bristol in Copenhagen in 1932, and that Sedov was not in Copenhagen during his parents' stay there.

Checked Dates Closely

One of the most important witnesses against Trotsky and Sedov in the second trial was Vladimir Romm, former Washington correspondent of Izvestia, who claimed to have met Trotsky in the Bois du Bologne in Paris at the end of July, 1933.

The Commission cited a mass of cohesive evidence covering the movements of Trotsky from his departure from Turkey on July 1933 to October 9th of that year, which conclusively disproved Romm's testimony. The Commission declared that, despite six separate efforts on its behalf, two of them by high French officials, it was unable to obtain the existing police records of Trotsky's movements at this period. In every case the answer was that "for reasons of State" the record could not be given out.

On the charges of sabotage, the Commission presented new evidence in the form of a long and completely documented deposition by Ivar Windfeld-Hanson, the Danish engineer mentioned as "Wienfeld" an alleged Trotskyist saboteur, by the accused Hrasche in the January trial.

This deposition and the documents submitted with it prove that from the time of his arrival in Russia in 1932, Mr. Windfeld-Hanson warned the Soviet authorities that the chemical fertilizer industry was headed toward disaster.

The complete text of the Abstract of the Commission of Inquiry's full report is published on pages 5, 6, 7, and 8 of this issue of the Socialist Appeal.

Report Cabinet Absolves Jailed P.O.U.M. Leaders

LONDON, England.—A report was received here from Fenner Brockway, leader of the British Independent Labor Party that the People's Front regime in Spain was forced to absolve five arrested P.O.U.M. leaders of charges of espionage.

According to the report, the Minister of Justice, Senor Irujo, informed the People's Front cabinet that after a thorough investigation into the charges made against the P.O.U.M. leaders, he and his advisers have concluded that there is no case against them to present to the Special Tribunal for espionage.

The cabinet voted seven to two, to liberate the prisoners

quietly one by one, Brockway says.

The two voting against the freedom of the P.O.U.M. leaders were the representatives of the Stalinist party.

Putting pressure on the cabinet, the Stalinists forced a reconsideration of the question and it was finally agreed to keep the prisoners in confinement without penal conditions, but not to proceed with the trial.

The Stalinists indicated that a failure to vote for their proposals would be considered a major issue in the Kremlin and might affect the "co-operation" between Spain and the Soviet state.

Dewey Broadcasts on Trials; Hits Minneapolis Frame-Up

(Continued from page 1)

dict for workers and free-minded people in the United States.

"There is the question which is constantly asked: What of it?", Dr. Dewey said. "What difference does it make to us in the United States? I want to tell you why the Moscow trials and our inquiry have a claim on the attention of every American citizen, especially those who call themselves progressives, liberals or who are interested in labor. I want to tell you why the Russian situation, as it is illustrated in the Moscow frame-ups and the blood purges reported almost daily in the columns of the press, are living events, in the consequences of which the American people and our democracy is involved."

Calling attention to the fact that the frame-up artists have already intervened with disastrous results in the internal life of the Spanish working class and the anti-fascist front, Dr. Dewey said that the method of branding Trotskyists and other opponents as "Fascists" is being carried into every other country by the Stalinists by means of propaganda around the fake court proceedings in Moscow. He pointed out that a start in this direction has already been made in the United States.

Brands Frame-Up in Minneapolis

"Only the other day," he continued, "a trade union official was murdered in Minneapolis, which is certainly an American city. 'Already Communists and their sympathizers are asking us to

believe that, because Moscow courts held Trotsky guilty of conspiring with Hitler and Japan, therefore Minneapolis workers friendly to Trotsky assassinated Corcoran. When unionists who are not in any way connected with Trotsky ridiculed the charge, they were at once denounced as Trotskyite stooges. This is a fresh example of the way what went on in Russia is used to disrupt the ranks of labor in this country. It won't be the last time. American labor and progressive groups are going to be asked over and over again to decide local questions on the basis of charges against Trotsky and Trotskyites in Moscow."

While making clear that he was opposed to Trotsky's political views, the eminent educator expressed the opinion, concurring with Trotsky's, that the results of the inquiry and the establishment of the true facts cannot help reaction, but on the contrary, are the surest way of aiding the progress of humanity. The brief summary he gave of the Commission's findings, and his appeal to every thinking man and woman to read the facts contained in the full report and judge for themselves, were especially pertinent and effective.

The reply attempted by Corliss Lamont, Chairman of the "Friends of the Soviet Union" and a Stalinist apologist, sounded feeble in its hysteria, by contrast to Dr. Dewey's sober presentation.

Another powerful blow has been struck against Stalinist reaction, a blow which is bound to resound the world over.

Truth

The International Commission investigating the charges made against Leon Trotsky and his son Sedov in the Moscow trials has found them Not Guilty. Truth is truly on the march. The historical significance of these findings can be translated into every day political action through the Socialist Appeal which has always stood for the TRUTH.

Even the capitalist press has been forced to accept and publish the innocence of Leon Trotsky and Sedov. The Appeal which is official organ of the American section of the 4th International knew the truth long before it

was rammed down the throats of the capitalist press and the Stalinist frame-up artists.

The Socialist Appeal must continue to spread the truth—not only about the Moscow Trials—but about every phase of the struggle of the international working class with the international bourgeoisie and the Comintern.

If you want the truth to be known you can do your part by subscribing at once to the Socialist Appeal or by contributing toward its maintenance. A blank is provided below.

Socialist Appeal
116 University Place
New York City

Date

I enclose \$..... for which please send me the Socialist Appeal. One year—(\$2.00); Six Months—(\$1.00).

I enclose \$..... as my contribution toward building the Socialist Appeal.

Name

Address

City

Convention Date Near; Locals Elect Delegates

After two months of a thorough-going discussion in all locals and branches on the most important questions facing the American and the world working class in this period of storm and stress the Rank and File Convention of the Socialist Party is to convene in Chicago on New Year's Eve. The convention, called by the State Committees of the Socialist Party in Minne-

sota, California, Ohio and Indiana, together with the National Executive Committee of the Young People's Socialist League and the Executive Committee of the Left Wing organizations in Chicago and New York, has since been endorsed by numerous locals and branches all over the country, in such important centers as Rochester, New York; Boston; Kansas City and St. Louis County, Missouri; Philadelphia, Bucks County, and Allentown, Pennsylvania, among others.

Everywhere the revolutionary socialists are determined to throw out from their ranks the LaGuardia traitors and to build solidly the foundations of the Marxist workers party.

Model of Discussion

The internal bulletins issued by the Convention Organizing Committee have given expression to the widest latitude of opinion among revolutionary socialists. All views have been represented. In sharp contrast to the stifling of democracy in the organization controlled by the Thomas-Altmann-Clarity faction, the atmosphere in the Left Wing has been vibrant with live discussion.

The militants in the ranks are now preparing to draw the practical conclusions from the discussion at Chicago and to settle down to the serious work of building the party of the American revolution.

Delegates are being elected from every section of the country. Steel workers from Ohio, automobile workers from Michigan, trade unionists steeled in the stirring organizational progress made in Minnesota and on the waterfront on the West Coast are making ready to depart. A wealth of experiences in the class struggle of America will be concentrated in the delegations.

Agenda is Revealed

The convention agenda, made public this week by the Convention Organization Committee, has allotted a place high on its list to an exchange of these experiences and to the elaboration of a line of strategy and tactics for mass work based upon them.

The Convention will meet under circumstances which will make it of world historic importance. Under the impress of the startling events in Russia, it will have to hammer out a policy embodying the attitude of revolutionary socialists to the Soviet Union—a policy that will stand up under the test of events to come.

Towards the crucial situation created for the Spanish workers and their fight against Fascism by the disastrous policies of the class collaborationists and the abominable treachery of the Stalinists and their G.P.U.—the convention will likewise have the task of evolving a clear and correct policy.

For 4th International

Finally, the convention will decide the question of affiliation to an international organization. Drawing the balance sheet of the betrayals of the Second and

To Defend Marxism

Conscious of the tremendous tasks facing them and proud to carry aloft the banner of revolution amid Stalinist treachery and the disasters of class collaboration, the delegates will come to Chicago to revive once more the flame of Marxism which once lit up the workers' world in the Paris Commune and in the October Revolution in Russia. The indomitable spirit of proletarian struggle which crushed Czarism along with all other obstacles in the glorious victory of the Bolsheviks twenty years ago will inspire the thoughts and the actions of the convention's participants. Theirs will be the glorious job of laying the basis of a party which, carrying aloft the banner of Marx and of Lenin, will not only lead the American workers to the establishment of a workers' state in the United States, but more than that, is destined to play an important part in building the Fourth International, the international of working class victory all over the world.

Third International, the militants gathered at Chicago will no doubt join with the revolutionists all over the world in the firm determination to set up a new instrument of international revolution in the Fourth International.

The Chicago convention will mark a milestone not only in American, but in world socialism. Revolutionists everywhere, in the Fascist dungeons of Hitler and Mussolini, in the jails of Austria and the Balkans, on the battlefields of Spain and on labor's battle front in France will be cheered by its decisions. In a world overshadowed by the advances of Fascism, the Chicago convention will be a beacon light to workers fighting capitalism in every country.

Convention Agenda

(Proposed by the Convention Organizing Committee)

1. Opening Address by *James P. Cannon*
2. Organization of the Convention
3. Political Resolution
4. Trade Union Resolution. Reporter: *J. P. Cannon*.
Supplementary Reports: *Glen Trimble*
B. J. Widick
V. R. Dunne
5. Unemployed Resolution
6. Russian Resolution. Reporter: *Shachtman*
7. Spanish Resolution. Reporter: *Albert Goldman*
8. International Resolution. Reporter: *Maurice Spector*
9. Youth Resolution
10. Declaration of Principles. Reporter: *James Burnham*
11. Party Organization and Constitution. Reporter: *Martin Abern*
12. Party Press. Reporter: *Martin Abern*
Supplementary Report: *Robert Browne*
13. Election of National Committee.

Steel Workers Meet; Progressives Ready To Fight for Democracy and Autonomy

PITTSBURGH, PA.—Over 1,000 delegates, representing as many Locals of the C.I.O. steel workers unions were gathered here this week to participate in the first rank and file gathering called by the Steel Workers Organizing Committee since it was set up two years ago.

While many delegates were under the impression that the gathering would be a regular union convention to elect officers, adopt a constitution, and create an autonomous international industrial union, authoritative reports beforehand indicated that the C.I.O. top leadership had an entirely different program, in mind.

It was a surprise to the inexperienced delegates to hear that the New York Times published a story by Louis Stark, its expert labor reporter, whose connections with the top C.I.O. leaders is well-known, which said, "the question of electing officers will not be before the delegates

as the meeting is not a constitutional convention."

A struggle by rank and file delegates to establish an international industrial union with the same autonomy as the United Automobile Workers, and other C.I.O. international unions was expected.

It was evident that no effort would be made by the Steel Workers Organizing Committee to draw the real lessons of the "Little Steel" strike fiasco. On the contrary, the mistakes of the past would be covered up with the approval of the Stalinists who control a bloc of the delegates.

A progressive bloc at the convention was preparing to lead the rank and file in its desire to create an international union. Also, the slogans of democracy within the union movement and for independent working class political action were among the rallying points of the progressive platform.

New Jersey C.I.O. Meets Challenge of Boss Hague

By Jack Wilson

JERSEY CITY, N. J.—The wide-spread publicity given to the C.I.O. organizing drive here because of the outrageous actions of "I am the Law" Mayor Frank Hague revealed the shocking extent to which this sweat-shop area is controlled by the Democratic party machine as a brutal dictatorship without any civil

rights for the exploited workers. Labor is terrorized in this city by the cops acting under Hague's orders. He promised the chamber of commerce that he would keep Jersey City open shop and he's doing his best in that direction.

Raid on Organizers

When forty CIO organizers were run out of town recently and thirteen others were arrested for distributing leaflets, the oppressive conditions here were first exposed.

The railroading of the arrested organizers into prison without any pretence of giving them a fair trial (no jury or bond rights) emphasized the nature of the Democratic party regime here.

Not content with "teaching the C.I.O." that lesson, Hague closed all union halls and kept C.I.O. unions already organized from holding meetings.

Hague's influence is not a local affair. Last summer an exposure of Nazi activities in New Jersey brought a demand for a congressional investigation. Hague called Jim Farley, right hand man of President Roosevelt, and told him to get it called off! It was called off.

Tie-Up With Roosevelt

Roosevelt's plurality in New Jersey was due to the Hague machine, and Hague hasn't been a political boss for twenty years without knowing how to extract benefits for votes given!

Not since the late Huey Long smashed every pretence of so-called democratic government and ruled by the might of the National Guard has America seen a more dangerous menace to Organized Labor than "I am the Law" Hague.

The Hague-Democratic party machine in New Jersey is smoothly organized and operates with the power and influence that only Tammany Hall, in its greatest days, could be compared to it. Besides building a party bureaucracy on the basis of government jobs, Hague has devised a new and more effective method of keeping his machine intact and influential.

Basis of Hague Control

Every open shop employer is guaranteed no "labor trouble," if he allows Hague to control part of the jobs in the plants. Any man going to a factory with an OK by Hague is given work. Hague thus builds his political machine among the workers on the basis of his job distribution power.

Is it any wonder that Hague's machine has withstood various attacks for the past twenty years?

The employers know the power of Hague's machine and have been flocking to New Jersey to erect sweatshops because it of-

fers great profit-making possibilities at the expense of the defenseless workers.

Appalling Conditions

The state Department of Labor last week revealed that over 34,000 women and children were employed for less than \$6 a week working over 40 hours.

It also reported that over 292,000 women were employed at less than \$17 a week, which is considered the minimum wage necessary to stave off starvation.

Over 326,000 are employed at starvation wages in New Jersey! Magnificent prospects for profits!

Just as the open shop South threatens the unions in the Northern states because of lower wage levels etc., the Jersey sweatshops not only exploit their own employees but drag down wage scales in nearby areas, especially New York, whose "runaway" factories have settled in Hague's domain.

Even though the deepening of the crisis makes organizing campaigns infinitely more difficult, the C.I.O. is seeking to smash through the dictatorship over the sweatshops.

One of the leading militants in the C.I.O., Bill Carney, veteran of the Goodyear and General Motors strikes, is directing the C.I.O. campaign in New Jersey.

"Underground" Organizing

While the various legal moves of the C.I.O. have been receiving the bulk of the publicity in the drive, the chief work of the C.I.O. organizers remains in carrying out "underground" organizational activity in Jersey City.

Until the workers of Jersey City themselves can be placed in struggles against the Hague machine and the employers whom he represents, the C.I.O. campaign cannot assume major proportions.

Legal battles against Hague have been won, time and again, but he merely ignores the court decisions, with the silent approval of the judges who took office as his men.

The outstanding lesson to date of the Jersey City situation is that the workers who voted Democratic because Roosevelt and his administration pretended to be "friends of labor" were deceived and are beginning to realize it.

The sentiment for a labor party is partly based in Jersey on the fact that the workers see they cannot get anything by tagging along with the capitalist parties, Republican or Democratic.

In fighting to smash the dictatorship of Hague and the Democratic machine, the workers learn that until capitalism itself is destroyed the sweatshops will remain.

"ALWAYS EXCITING SWELL TIMES"
to be had at

The Upper West Side Branch - 916 Ninth Ave. (near 58th St.)

PARTY DANCE — MUSIC AND DRINKS

Saturday, December 18th

DON'T MISS THE FUN!

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Vol. I. - No. 19. - Saturday, Dec. 18, 1937

Published every week by the

SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASS'N.

Published at 116 University Place, N. Y.

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for 6 months. Foreign: \$2.50 per year. Bundle order 3 cents per copy. Single copies 5 cents.

All checks and money orders should be made out to the Socialist Appeal.

Entered as second-class matter September 1, 1937 at the post office at New York, New York, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

The Dewey Report

No more vigorous blow has been dealt the Stalinist assassins in recent times than the report of the Commission of Enquiry into the Moscow trials, headed by Professor John Dewey.

It is not only the unchallengeable probity and intellectual integrity of the commissioners that give such weight to their report, but also the fact that none of them shares the political position of Leon Trotsky and the Fourth International; in fact, they are its adversaries.

The hysterical cries of the Stalinist press and spokesmen, the charges that the commissioners themselves are only part of a world-wide plot to overthrow "democracy" on the part of Hitler, Trotsky and the Mikado, are taken least seriously by those who are paid to utter them. As insiders, they are best equipped to know the hideous frame-up system and methods of the G.P.U.

These cries cannot drown out the firm and unassailable conclusions of the Commission which demonstrate the ghastly mockery that has been made of the great ideals of the proletarian movement by those who pretend to represent them in the seats of power of Russia. And though the Commission itself draws no political conclusions of its own—nor was that its purpose or province—its report serves to underline a conclusion which we consider inescapable:

The Stalinist bureaucracy has become a cancer which disgraces, betrays and undermines the great Russian Revolution and its imperishable ideals. Unchecked, the cancer will rot the whole body. In the ruthless removal of this bureaucracy and the restoration of proletarian democracy lies the salvation of the Soviet Union. The Dewey report is another weapon in the struggle to achieve these aims.

Stalin's Victory

The entire world is laughing at the latest Soviet elections, even the Stalinists who pretend to take them seriously.

Only, it is no laughing matter. The elections are a tragic commentary on the decline and degeneration of the Russian Revolution, undermined by a counter-revolutionary bureaucracy.

The "democratic" elections were a travesty, which could be justified only by people with a Hitlerian attitude towards the masses, or those who never saw anything wrong in a trade union when a reactionary machine prevented any minority from contesting an election by presenting its own candidates.

The "nominations" were made in public meetings, and heaven help the person who ventured to nominate a candidate who was not a 100 per cent supporter of the Stalinist machine—for the G.P.U. would not help him. That is why the vast majority of the districts had only one candidate running. Only a totalitarian regime could regard such phenomena with joy and pride. In actuality, it only shows how the bureaucracy has crushed the last remnants of workers' democracy.

The only "right" the Soviet voter had was to cast his ballot for Stalin and those designated by Stalin. He had no right to nominate a candidate of his own choosing; he had no right to run on any platform of his own, regardless of how pro-Soviet it might be; and he had no possibility of voting effectively against the candidates he had pushed under his pencil.

What a revealing light is thrown on the "democracy" of the elections when we read that at the last minute, without the electorate acting or being consulted, "regularly nominated" candidates were withdrawn by a "mysterious" hand and new ones put in, guaranteed the same unanimous vote as those whose place they had taken if the latter had remained.

How significant is the fact that one of the last-minute candidates was born in 1913, the very year in which the man whom he replaced became a member of the Bolshevik party. The old revolutionists, however servile, are being replaced by the representatives of the new and rising strata of Soviet society who want to put the last nails into the coffin of the revolution and restore a regime of capitalist exploitation.

Browder Announces C.P. Purge Coming In U. S.

A purge is being prepared in the American Communist Party. If it is not as bloody as Stalin's purge in the Soviet Union, it is only because the Browder gang does not have state power.

If officials and members of the American Communist Party are not to be sent to prison or to Siberian concentration camps, it is only because the American purges do not have them at their disposal in this country.

Threat Made Public

In the threat delivered to the recent Plenum of the Central Committee of the American Stalinists, Browder, the party's general secretary, declared (according to the Daily Worker of Dec. 3, 1937):

"Our party is operating today in the midst of the great mass movement. The spotlight is on us. The slightest weaknesses are exaggerated and made use of by our enemies. And let no one think that you can separate personal from political life. You cannot do it; not in leading work in the communist movement. We must create a much keener realization of this fact in all our members. Any manifestations of looseness or penetration into our ranks of bourgeois habits, particularly with respect to personal life, must be rooted out, because it is precisely from such things as this that the enemies recruit in our ranks. It has been an almost invariable result of examination of political degeneration that it almost always is accompanied by personal degeneration. We must begin to examine the private lives of all our leading cadres as a necessary and unavoidable part of the guarantee of the political integrity of our party. And this applies to everybody, from top to bottom. And to the degree that we find problems that cannot be corrected, let us know in advance that there is always a final way of guaranteeing the party against dangers—that is, removing people from responsible positions if they cannot give us a guarantee of their ability to protect the party, to protect its line, to protect its prestige, protect its reputation among the masses. Every member of the leadership of the party has got to contribute positively, making the party's reputation spotless, untackable among the masses."

A "Uriah Heep"

Browder's announcement that the private lives and conduct of all the Stalinist functionaries are to be investigated, immediately reveals the nature of the frame-ups in preparation. The hypocrisy of Browder's piety is of course perfectly obvious. It is not because of their "Twentieth Century Americanism" that the Stalinist chieftains are taking over the traditions of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, which indiscriminately hunts pornographic postcards and great works of art. The only qualification that Earl Browder has for donning the mantle of the late Anthony J. Comstock or his successor, John S. Summer, is that part of his character which for years earned him the name of "Uriah Heep" in the Communist Party.

The mind of anyone who is even slightly acquainted with the General-Secretary of the American Stalinists, cannot conceive of him in the position of a moral judge, any more than it could

grasp a Phil Frankfeld, let us say, in the role of Carrie Nation or Pussyfoot Johnson.

No, the whole point of the impending American purge, as is the case in Russia, is that it pursues not moral but political aims. And political aims no less base and reprehensible than the immorality and immodest behavior which Browder pretends to combat.

The Stalinists are intent on making the Communist Party as respectable as possible in the eyes of the American bourgeoisie—to make it entirely acceptable to the ruling class, to prove that it is fully house-broken—anything at all if Wall Street will only decide to join the "democratic front against Fascism". Stalin demonstrates his suitability as a not-to-be-feared ally of the French and British bourgeoisie by physically annihilating every man and woman who to the slightest or remotest degree symbolizes or incarnates the revolutionary ideas that make the October insurrection of 1917 possible. Essentially, that is what is what is being planned for the American Stalinist "cadres".

Their Only Way

These "old-timers", all of them reduced by this time to obliging hacks of the political machine, must be shoved into the background or wiped out of the party entirely. That cannot be done on political grounds, for a political purpose. And what shadow, or even evanescent whisper of a disagreement is permissible in the ranks of the party bureaucracy?

The only way of getting rid of burdensome elements with something of a past, is by framing them up. And since the most loathsome way is the one usually preferred by the wholly degenerated "cadres" of the Stalinist leadership, the frame-up is to be based on the "immoral conduct" of the victim.

We are not among those who hold up the decadent lives and manners of the bourgeoisie as anything like a standard of morality. Nor are we so ignorant as to believe that the wanton, irresponsible Stalinist bureaucrats—from top to bottom and excluding precious few of them—conduct what Browder calls their "private lives" in a way that guarantees them canonization by the Catholic Church. Nor, moreover, are we very much interested in that question; the political lives of the Stalinists are, heaven knows, sufficiently repulsive.

Significant Fact

It is, however—we repeat—political aims that Browder pursues. Highly significant is the fact that in appointing the editor for the new Chicago daily paper of the C. P., Browder went over the heads of a dozen more or less indicated "old-timers"—Weinstein, Minor, Amter, Bedacht, W. Dunne, Don, Gannes (who is morally qualified, to boot), Darcy, Williamson, and others—and selected for the post a man who virtually just entered the party, Louis Budenz.

The purge is coming—for Browder's threat was no idle or accidental remark. Protestations of loyalty, which prospective victims are sure to make, will avail them as little as they did the capitulators to Stalin in the Soviet Union.

Packinghouse Workers Repudiate Fake C.I.O.

MINNEAPOLIS—A smashing blow against the Stalinist attempt to link the progressive labor movement here with gangsterism was delivered at the December 5 St. Paul meeting of the Minnesota State Council of the Packinghouse Workers of the C.I.O.

Contrasting the national C.I.O. policy with the rule or ruin policy of the Stalinist-controlled C.I.O. of this state, the Packinghouse Council unanimously went on record against the Stalinist attempt to dishonor the memory of Pat Corcoran by terming his death the result of gangster struggle for control of the A. F. of L.

The Packinghouse Council is constituted by representatives from all the Packinghouse locals in the state. It represents the only real union locals in the C.I.O. here, outside of the needle trades which also oppose the Stalinist policy. The resolution follows:

WHEREAS, the labor movement is at present divided, and

WHEREAS, such a condition is of benefit only to the enemies of the labor movement and cannot continue without virtual civil war,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Minnesota State Council that we stand definitely for a unified trade union movement, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that we call upon the Washington Unity Negotiations Conference to make all possible haste in unifying the labor movement on the basis of democratic industrial unionism in the mass production industries.

WHEREAS: The Minnesota State Council of Packinghouse Workers is a labor organization founded on the principles of militant and democratic industrial unionism and on the firm belief that Labor as a class must fight its class enemies,

AND WHEREAS: We fully realize as class conscious workers that Pat Corcoran was slain by the mortal enemies of organized labor and that his murder, therefore, is equally a blow at our section of the labor movement as well as against all labor, and must be avenged by the united struggle of all workers regardless of their affiliations,

AND WHEREAS: We deeply resent the vicious blow struck at all labor in the brutal assassination of Patrick J. Corcoran, militant Minnesota labor leader—a death which we deeply mourn,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the M. S. C. hereby go on record against Corcoran's enemies—the enemies of powerful workingclass organizations—and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that we do our very utmost to find and convict those responsible, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that we protest against and deplore the erroneous actions of the State C.I.O. Committee and the Hennepin County C.I.O. Council for their policy of interposing and injecting the issue and cry of "gangsterism" in the labor movement of Minneapolis—a policy which we feel is most harmful to the welfare and future of the C.I.O. and a united labor movement—one which can only lead to the destruction of bonafide unionism—and which we feel is certainly in sharp contradiction to the policies of the C.I.O. nationally, especially in view of the fact that George Cole, Regional Director of the C.I.O., at the Coroner's inquest clearly repudiated these expressions of the State C.I.O. Committee and their Hennepin County Council and its newspaper on "gangsterism."

Copies to be sent to: The Unionist, The Packinghouse Worker, and the C I O Industrial Unionist, and to the national and regional offices of the C.I.O.

Adopted unanimously by the Minnesota State Council of Packinghouse Workers, December 5, 1937.

Last Minute Minneapolis News

Important developments in Minneapolis, reported as we go to press, are being held over for full publication for the next issue of the Socialist Appeal. Among them are the following:

1. Teamsters Union wins the strike of the Wholesale Grocery Drivers.

2. Detlaf Wieck, a Stalinist paid official of the Carpenters Union, was removed from office by the indignant membership following a slanderous attack on Pat Corcoran and the Teamsters Union.

3. Capitalist Press threatens a Vigilante Movement against unionism.

4. William Wright, A. F. of L. representative, exploded the "Bridges Assassination" hoax.

Abstract of the Final Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Charges Made Against Leon Trotsky in the Moscow Trials

This abstract is a condensation of the 80,000 word fully documented report of the Commission of Inquiry, released to the Press on Dec. 13, 1937.

Part One

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Commission finds, on the basis of all available evidence, both for the prosecution and for Leon Trotsky, that Leon Trotsky and his son Leon Sedov are not guilty of the charges made against them in the Moscow trials of August, 1936 and January, 1937. It also finds that the trials were frame-ups. Independent of extrinsic evidence, the Commission finds that the conduct of the Moscow trials was such as to convince any unprejudiced person that no effort was made to ascertain the truth; and that the confessions of the accused contain such inherent improbabilities as to convince the Commission that they do not represent the truth, irrespective of any means used to obtain them.

The Commission, on the basis of evidence in its possession, flatly contradicts the verdict of the Moscow Court on twenty-one separate counts.* It presents new affidavits and new documentary evidence, which, in its judgement, prove conclusively that neither Holtzman, Ber- man-Yurin, nor David saw Trotsky in Copenhagen or received terrorist instructions from him; that Pyatakov never flew to Oslo to see Trotsky in December, 1935; that Olberg never went to Russia with terrorist instructions from Trotsky or Sedov. It finds that Vladimir Romm never met Trotsky in the Bois de Boulogne. It finds that the disproof of all this vital testimony invalidates the confessions of Karl Radek and other defendants.

The Commission is convinced that the letters in which Trotsky is alleged to have conveyed conspiratorial instructions to the various defendants in the Moscow trials never existed, and that the testimony concerning them is fabrication. Concerning the charges of advocating terrorism and sabotage, and of conspiring with fascist powers to attack the Soviet Union, the Commission finds that Trotsky throughout his career has been a consistent opponent of individual terrorism, never instructed any of the defendants or witnesses in the Moscow trials to assassinate any political opponent, never advocated sabotage or wrecking, has always been a forthright opponent of fascism, has always uncompromisingly advocated the defense of the Soviet Union, and has always opposed both the restoration of capitalism in the U. S. S. R., and its existence anywhere else.

Part Two

HISTORY AND PROCEDURE OF THE COMMISSION

The Commission of Inquiry into the Charges Made Against Leon Trotsky in the Moscow Trials was constituted in March, 1937, by the American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky, acting under mandates from similar bodies in France, England and Czechoslovakia. The Commission has acted as an independent body; its procedure has been similar to that of Senate investigating committees and the

The Commissioners

JOHN DEWEY, Professor of Philosophy, Columbia University, *Chairman*;
JOHN CHAMBERLAIN, editor and author, formerly daily book reviewer of the *New York Times*;
ALFRED ROSMER, former member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International and former editor-in-chief of *l'Humanité*;
EDWARD ALSWORTH ROSS, Professor of Sociology, University of Wisconsin;
OTTO RUEHLE, former member of the German Reichstag and biographer of Karl Marx (without any political affiliation since 1919);
BENJAMIN STOLBERG, author and labor journalist;
CARLO TRESKA, editor of *Il Martello*;
FRANCISCO ZAMORA, liberal Mexican publicist;
WENDELIN THOMAS, former member of the German Reichstag;
SUZANNE LA FOLLETTE, editor and author, *Secretary*;
JOHN F. FINERTY, counsel to the Commission, concurring in the report.

Members of the French Sub-Commission (Commission Rogatoire)

G. E. MODIGLIANI, *Chairman*, member of the Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International, leader of the Italian Socialist Party;
MME. CESAR CHABRUN, Chairman of the Committee for Aid to Political Prisoners;
M. MATHE, former secretary of the National Union of Postmen;
JEAN GALTIER-BOISSIERE, writer, editor of *Crapouillot*;
PROFESSOR JACQUES MADAULE;
MAURICE DELEPINE of the Paris Bar, member of the Permanent Administrative Committee of the Socialist Party of France, president of the Socialist Lawyers' group.

Reichstag Fire Commission. Its sole purpose has been to investigate the charges made in the Moscow trials of August, 1936, and January, 1937, against Leon Trotsky and his son Leon Sedov. For the past nine months the Commission has been occupied with uncovering all available facts, whether favorable or unfavorable to Trotsky and Sedov. It has succeeded in obtaining a mass of important evidence bearing on the case. Sub-commissions in Mexico, France and New York City examined witnesses, including Trotsky and Sedov, and their records have been accepted by the Commission.

After completing the preliminary work of investigation, the Commission met in New York City and examined all the evidence. Due to the failure of the Soviet government to produce records or to delegate representatives to examine witnesses, the published records of the Moscow trials embody the case for the prosecution.

The case for Trotsky and Sedov is based on:

1. Analysis of the trial reports.
2. Proceedings and reports of sub-commissions.
3. Verified depositions of witnesses, letters, telegrams, and other documents submitted in evidence to the Commission or its sub-commissions.
4. The testimony of the Russian refugees Tarov and Dr. Anton Ciliga, taken by the Comité pour l'Enquete sur le Procès de Moscou, and transmitted to the Commission.
5. The published writings of Trotsky, Sedov, Lenin, Stalin, Radek, Zinoviev and others.
6. The archives of Trotsky, consisting of thousands of documents, to which the Commission has had full access.

Part Three

THE TWO MOSCOW TRIALS

1. General Nature of the Charges.

The defendants in the trial of August, 1936, were charged with having organized and operated a terrorist center for the purpose of assassinating the leaders of the Communist state with the object of seizing power; and specifically with having organized the assassination, on Dec. 1, 1934, of Commissar S. M. Kirov.

The defendants in the trial of January, 1937, were charged with having organized and conducted a "parallel center" employing espionage, diversive, and terrorist activities to undermine the military power of the U. S. S. R., and with conducting treasonable negotiations with foreign powers with the purpose of overthrowing the Soviet power and restoring capitalism in the Soviet Union.

In both indictments Trotsky and Sedov are definitely charged with having instigated and led the criminal activities with which the defendants were charged.

2. Procedure of Soviet Court.

The Commission states, as one of its most important findings, that the Prosecutor A. Y. Vyshinsky, and the Soviet Court in the Moscow trials, violated Soviet Law on criminal procedure on every important point.

For authority on Soviet Law the Commission has taken Professor M. S. Strogovich's book entitled "Criminal Trial, a Textbook for Law Schools and Juridical Courses," edited by the State Prosecutor, A. Y. Vyshinsky (Third edition, corrected and amplified, 132 pp. Published by OGIZ, Moscow, 1936).

The Commission finds that the accused in the Moscow trials were convicted on the basis of their confessions and those of self-inculcating witnesses uncorroborated by significant documentary evidence. It quotes Strogovich-Vyshinsky on the value attached to confession in Soviet law as follows:

Under the system of formal proofs the admission of guilt by the accused was considered the "best proof extant," "the sovereign proof of proofs." Nowadays faith in the absolute correctness of the defendant's admission has been in large measure destroyed. The accused might be pleading guilty falsely (for example, in a desire to shield another person, or, by pleading guilty to a minor crime, to avoid the accusation of a grave crime). Therefore, the admission of the accused, like any other evidence, is subject to verification and evaluation in the sum total of the circumstances of the case.

*See Summary of Findings on page 8.

The Commission also finds that since the witnesses were people who were brought into court under arrest and who inculpated themselves by their testimony, the following passage from Strogovich-Vyshinsky is especially pertinent:

In bourgeois juridical theory for a long time complete credence was placed in the testimony of witnesses, sealed by oath, while the "inner conviction" of the judges was deemed an adequate guarantee against mistakes in the evaluation of testimony of witnesses... Impressions are a basis which is quite flimsy and deceptive... a false witness who has learned his role by heart can give very seductive testimony because of its categorical and lucid character.

The Commission finds that the testimony on which Leon Trotsky and his son Leon Sedov were convicted belongs in the category of "denunciation," which Strogovich-Vyshinsky define as:

testimony of one of the defendants implicating another defendant or extraneous individuals and by virtue of this very thing mitigating the responsibility of the individual himself.

—a category of evidence characterized by Strogovich-Vyshinsky as "the least meritorious."

The Commission gives further quotations from Strogovich-Vyshinsky which show that the Prosecutor in the Moscow trials did not adhere to the principles of Soviet criminal procedure as stated in an official text-book edited by himself.

Among additional defects in procedure the Commission cites the failure of the Court to take into account the evidence in refutation of the charges published in the world press by Leon Trotsky and others during the course of the trials; the failure to produce the existing French police-record of Trotsky's whereabouts at the time of his alleged meeting with Romm in Paris.

The Commission holds to the generally accepted principle that adherence to procedure could not make the accused guilty, if the charges proved false; that only if a procedure enables the establishment of the ascertainable truth is it justifiable; and only in so far as prosecutor and court conform to the spirit as well as the letter of a justifiable procedure can they be held to safeguard the rights of accused persons. But the violation of Soviet legal principles and procedure by the Soviet Court and Prosecutor tended, in the Commission's opinion, to cast initial doubt upon the validity of both trials.

3. The Capitulators.

Trotsky testified that of the 18 accused in the two trials who were known to him, two had never belonged to the Left Opposition bloc of 1926-7, the remaining 16 had been expelled with it from the Communist Party, and all had capitulated to the ruling faction except Muralov, who withdrew from the Opposition without a formal declaration. He introduced in evidence material showing that great bitterness has existed between the Left Opposition and these capitulators, who were regarded as renegades. The Commission finds that his attacks upon them were introduced into the Soviet Union whenever possible, and considers it doubtful whether, if he had been conspiring with them, he would have attempted to undermine their prestige with the Russian masses. It finds also that these attacks considerably antedate the beginning of the alleged conspiracy. It finds that the mutual enmity between the capitulators and the Opposition should be given due consideration in weighing the testimony of the accused against Leon Trotsky.

4. The Zinoviev-Kamenev Trial: The "Trotskyite-Zinovievite Terrorist Center."

The indictment in the trial of August, 1936, explicitly states that the "Trotskyite-Zinovievite Terrorist Center" was formed "at the end of 1932" but the confessions contain fundamental contradictions on this point. The trial record contains no direct evidence of the attitude of

Trotsky or Sedov toward the formation of the center, or concerning their role, if any, in its formation. The only actual crime attributed to the terrorist center was the assassination of Kirov in December, 1934, after which the center, according to the indictment and some of the witnesses, broke up. The Commission, after analysis of the trial record, finds testimony concerning the alleged center and Trotsky's participation in it so contradictory as to throw doubt upon the "credibility of the confessions and of the whole record of the trial."

5. The Definitive Charges Against Leon Trotsky and Leon Sedov.

Much of the new documentary evidence obtained by the Commission focuses upon the testimony given at the trials by accused and witnesses claimed to have acted as Trotsky's emissaries or agents in terrorist activities against the leaders of the Soviet Union. In the Zinoviev-Kamenev trial the chief witnesses on this point were Holtzman and Olberg.

a) Holtzman.

In the Zinoviev-Kamenev trial, the accused Holtzman testified that on Sedov's invitation he went to Copenhagen during Trotsky's stay there from Nov. 23 to Dec. 2, 1932. He affirmed that by previous arrangement he met Sedov in the lobby of the Hotel Bristol, and went from there with him to see Trotsky. The Commission has evidence showing that there was no Hotel Bristol in Copenhagen in 1932, and that Sedov was not in Copenhagen during his parents' stay there, but was in Berlin. He could not leave Germany and return without renewal of his official permission of residence (*Aufenthaltserlaubnis*), which had expired, and without this renewal he could not receive a Danish visa. He received the renewal on Dec. 3, the day after Trotsky left Copenhagen, and on that same day received a French visa good for five days which enabled him to meet his parents in Paris on their way through France.

The outstanding documents in the Commission's possession on Holtzman's testimony are as follows:

1. Two class-books and one separate exercise-sheet bearing signatures of professors and stamps dated Nov. 25 and 27, 1932, showing Sedov's attendance at the Technische Hochschule in Berlin on those days; Sedov's attendance book at the Technische Hochschule also bearing signatures and stamps of Nov. 25 and 29, 1932, showing his attendance on those days.

2. The passport of Leon Sedov, showing the renewal on Dec. 3, 1932, of his permit to remain in Germany, good until Jan. 2, 1933; also a permit to leave and return to Germany dated Dec. 3, 1932, good until Dec. 17, 1932; also a French visa dated Dec. 3, 1932, and good for five days; also a stamp of entry into France dated Dec. 4, 1932.

3. A letter from Leon Trotsky to Leon Sedov written on board ship as Trotsky was leaving Denmark, and dated 3-12-32, expressing his disappointment at not having seen his son in Copenhagen.

4. A postcard from Natalia Sedov Trotsky from the port of embarkation in Denmark, stamped Esbjerg 3-12-32, to her son in Berlin, expressing her grief over their failure to meet in Copenhagen.

5. Six holograph letters from Leon Sedov to his parents during their stay in Copenhagen, dated Nov. 21, Nov. 26 (three), Nov. 28, and Dec. 2, 1932.

6. A telegram from Natalia Sedov Trotsky to Prime Minister Herriot of France dated Copenhagen Dec. 1, 1932, requesting that her son be allowed a visa in order to meet his parents in France. Also a telegram from the Minister of Foreign Affairs to the French consul in Berlin, Dec. 3, 1932, authorizing the visa.

b) Olberg

The accused Olberg in the Zinoviev-Kamenev trial testified that he had belonged to the Trotskyist Left Opposition since 1927-8; that he was put in contact with Leon Sedov in 1930 in Berlin by Anton Grylewicz (editor of Trotsky's *Bulletin of the Opposition*); and that Sedov passed on Trotsky's "commissions" to him by correspondence; that he met Sedov in May, 1931, when Sedov arrived in Berlin. Olberg stated that he left for the Soviet Union in 1933 as a trusted agent of Trotsky with instructions to prepare for an attempt on the life of Stalin. Having only a tourist visa, he could not remain long. He left, therefore, and went to Prague, where, according to his testimony, he finally obtained through a fascist agent, Tukalevsky, a Honduran passport for which Sedov paid 13,000 kronen.

He testified that he made two trips to the Soviet Union on this passport in 1935.

The Commission has the following documents bearing on Olberg's testimony:

1. Ten holograph letters in Russian from Olberg to Trotsky dated Jan. 10, 1930, to March 4, 1931, and copies of six typewritten answers in Russian from Trotsky to Olberg dated Jan. 30, 1930, to April 7, 1930. This exchange of correspondence proves:

a) That Olberg had not been a member of the Left Opposition from 1927-8, and was not a member of the Left Opposition at the time that his correspondence with Trotsky began.

b) That Olberg's contact with Trotsky and Sedov was not initiated through Anton Grylewicz, but directly by Olberg himself, in a letter to Trotsky.

c) That Trotsky's connection with Olberg was in no sense confidential, but entirely political; and that he wrote him nothing that he might not have said to any political sympathizer with whom he was not closely associated.

2. Fifteen holograph letters in Russian from Olberg to Leon Sedov, dated March 1, 1930, to Feb. 3, 1931, and one copy of a typewritten letter in Russian from Sedov to Olberg dated July 11, 1930. These letters deal almost exclusively with such matters as the publication and distribution of Opposition literature, Olberg's services in this work, etc.

3. A letter from Franz Pfemfert to Leon Trotsky dated Berlin, April 1, 1930, and one from Alexandra Pfemfert (Trotsky's German translator) dated April 2, 1930, informing Trotsky that they have met Olberg, who makes a very bad impression upon them, and warning Trotsky against employing Olberg as his secretary.

4. A holograph statement by Olberg's mother saying that her son went to Russia for the first time in 1933, having been expelled from Germany as an undesirable foreigner; that he used the passport of a friend, since he had only a Nansen passport with which he could go nowhere; that he received a Soviet visa through the Berlin Intourist, paid for by a relative (name in the possession of the Commission); that he left Russia again in 1933, and went to Prague. In Prague a lawyer whose name she does not remember undertook to get him a Honduran passport, for which he did not have money to pay, and therefore the same relative came to his assistance. These facts directly contradict Olberg's testimony.

c) Other Defendants.

The Commission has in its possession evidence bearing on the testimony of other accused persons in this trial implicating Trotsky and Sedov, namely: Smirnov, Dreitzer, Burman-Yurin, David, and M. and N. Lurye. On the basis of this evidence it finds the testimony of these accused to be worthless.

6. The Pyatakov-Radek Trial: The "Parallel" or "Reserve Center."

The Commission, after detailed examination of the testimony concerning the alleged "reserve" or "parallel center," which was involved in the January trial, concludes: "In none of this conflicting testimony is there the slightest evidence, direct or indirect, that Trotsky either instigated the formation of the alleged reserve or parallel center or selected 'its members.' The Commission declares: 'We consider that the shocking discrepancies... entirely discredit the testimony given in the trials themselves insofar as it concerns the alleged complicity of Trotsky and Sedov in any anti-governmental activities which may have been taking place in the U. S. S. R.'"

Definitive Charges Against Leon Trotsky and Leon Sedov.

Only two persons in the second trial, Pyatakov and Vladimir Romm, testified to having seen Trotsky personally; and on these two points the Commission possesses conclusive evidence to the contrary.

a) Romm.

The witness Vladimir Romm, alleged liaison man between the accused Radek and Leon Trotsky, testified that at the end of July 1933, he met Leon Trotsky in the Bois de Boulogne (Paris), and that Trotsky's purpose in meeting him was to confirm the contents of a letter he was sending Radek, containing instructions regarding terrorism and wrecking. Romm alleged that it was Leon Sedov who conducted him to Trotsky. Upon this crucial part of Romm's testimony hangs the credibility of his whole deposition, and also the credibility of the testimony

of Karl Radek, who allegedly communicated with Trotsky through him.

The Commission has a mass of cohesive evidence covering the movements of Trotsky from his departure from Turkey on July 19, 1933, to Oct. 9 of that year, which conclusively disproves Romm's testimony.

These documents show that Trotsky landed at Cassis near Marseilles July 24, 1933, was met by his son and three friends, and motored with them from the harbor of Marseilles across France to Royan, stopping one night en route. He remained in a villa near Royan continuously thereafter until Oct. 9, when he left for the Pyrenees. His friends, in agreement with the Sûreté Générale, arranged that his place of residence and his identity should be kept secret.

In addition to the testimony of witnesses who accompanied Trotsky on his trip and later saw him at Royan, the Commission has documents covering the arrangements for his removal to France, the leasing of the villa, Trotsky's mode of life and his visitors there. Outstanding among these is the deposition of Henri Molinier, at that time Trotsky's political sympathizer and now his opponent, who had complete charge of all arrangements concerning his sojourn in France, and who dealt directly with the Sûreté Générale. Mr. Molinier makes it clear that Trotsky was forbidden to live in Paris or any city with a large working-class population; he states that the secret police were informed of all Trotsky's movements, and declares that he himself supervised all those movements. He says that it would have been impossible for Trotsky in his bad state of health (attested to by many other documents, including an affidavit by a doctor who attended him) to have made a trip to Paris without elaborate preparations of which he, Molinier, could not have remained in ignorance. Another is the testimony of Vera Lanis, wife of a present political adversary of Trotsky, who testifies that she prepared the villa for occupancy, was there when Trotsky and his wife arrived, and remained continuously at the villa, helping with the housework, until the end of August. She testifies that Trotsky remained in the villa uninterruptedly during that period.

The Commission attaches great importance to the fact that six separate efforts, two of them by high French officials, made on its behalf to obtain the police record of Trotsky's movements at this period have been unavailing. In every case, the answer was that the record is in the keeping of the head of the Sûreté Nationale (formerly Sûreté Générale) and "for reasons of state" cannot be given out. This refusal, coupled with the significant fact that the Soviet government did not produce at the trial this record which it could presumably easily have obtained from the friendly government of France, in the Commission's opinion constitutes strong presumptive evidence that it does not bear out the testimony of Vladimir Romm.

The invalidation of Romm's testimony also invalidates that of Karl Radek, who explicitly stated that it was through Romm that he established contact with Trotsky.

b) Pyatakov.

In the January trial, the accused Pyatakov testified that in the first half of December, 1935, he flew in a special plane from the Tempelhof airdrome in Berlin to the airdrome in Oslo, and from this airdrome motored half an hour to a country suburb, where he met and conversed with Leon Trotsky. The Commission has evidence which proves that Trotsky lived, not one-half hour, but at least two hours from the airdrome in Oslo; that he did not leave the house between Dec. 1 and Dec. 20, 1935; and that no foreign airplane landed at the Oslo airdrome between Sept. 19, 1935, and May 1, 1936. The most important documents in its possession bearing on this testimony of Pyatakov are the following:

1. An affidavit by Konrad Knudsen, member of the Norwegian Parliament and Trotsky's host during his stay in Norway, signed also by his wife Hilda Knudsen and their daughter Hjordis Knudsen. The affidavit states that the Knudsen family met all of Trotsky's visitors, and that no one could have visited him without their knowledge. It states that Trotsky received no visitors during the month of December, 1935.

2. Original and certified notarized English translation of an article from *Arbeiderbladet* (Oslo) Jan. 29, 1937, entitled "Pyatakov's Strange Voyage to Kjeller." The article gives an account of an interview with Director Gullichsen of the Kjeller airdrome in which he stated that no foreign airplane landed there between Sept. 19, 1935, and May 1, 1936.

3. Two letters from Director Gullichsen of

the Kjeller airport to Andreas Stoeyle, Trotsky's attorney, confirming the above statement published in *Arbeiderbladet*.

4. A telegram from Konrad Knudsen to Prosecutor Vyshinsky dated Jan. 29, 1937 (the trial ended in the morning of Jan. 30). Mr. Knudsen informs Vyshinsky that it has been officially verified on that day that in December, 1935, no foreign or private plane landed at the airport near Oslo; also that as Trotsky's host he affirms that no conversation can have taken place in Norway between Trotsky and Pyatakov.

On the basis of this evidence the Commission finds that Pyatakov did not fly from Berlin to Oslo as alleged. Moreover, it finds that since the lives of the accused Pyatakov and sixteen others presumably hung upon the truth or falsity of his testimony, Vyshinsky's failure to confront Pyatakov with this telegram in court constituted, in its opinion, criminal negligence. Indeed, it provides strong justification for the widespread suspicion that the whole trial was a frame-up at which the Prosecutor himself connived.

Part Four

CONCLUSIONS FROM OLD AND NEW EVIDENCE ON:

1. The Charge of Terrorism.

The charge of individual terrorism against the leaders of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union is the only charge against the accused in the first trial, and it is one of the most important charges in the second trial. The Commission finds that although the records contain a great deal of testimony concerning the existence of terrorist groups in various parts of the Soviet Union, and that although there is a great deal of testimony to conversations about terrorism, only one assassination is charged against the defendants in either trial—that of Commissar S. M. Kirov on Dec. 1, 1934. Thus a conspiracy widely ramifying, including large numbers of people, and lasting for five years, resulted, according to the records themselves, in only one assassination. Although the alleged conspirators testified that they were very determined and that their activity was intense, the Commission finds that the general ineptitude of the alleged attempts at assassination to which various accused confessed is entirely out of keeping with the records for determined and even heroic revolutionary action made by several leaders of the alleged conspiracy during the October Revolution and the Civil War. It finds that the prosecution made no attempt to establish any credible motivation on the part of the people delegated to carry out these alleged attempts, which would have inevitably involved the sacrifice of their own lives. It finds that while the alleged leaders who were actually tried, testified that they expected to come into power through the alleged conspiracy, no attempt was made to secure the testimony of Leon Trotsky, the alleged instigator of this conspiracy. The Preliminary Commission took Trotsky's testimony on this charge of terrorism, and the Commission has examined this testimony and the writings of Trotsky on this subject throughout his career. It finds that Trotsky throughout his career has resolutely opposed individual terrorism as incompatible with the teachings of Marxism.

The Prosecutor cited only two of Trotsky's writings as allegedly substantiating this charge. The first was Trotsky's Open Letter to the Executive Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, published in 1932 in many countries and languages. In this letter Trotsky called upon the Executive Committee to fulfill Lenin's advice to the party in his so-called testament, to remove Stalin from his post as General Secretary. This phrase, "remove Stalin," the Prosecutor misinterpreted to mean "put Stalin out of the way." The Prosecutor also falsified the meaning of an article by Trotsky from the *Bulletin of the Opposition* Nos. 36 and 37 of October, 1933, and in doing so, identified the revolutionary mass action advocated by Trotsky with individual terrorism. The distinction is obvious and historical.

The Commission therefore finds that, apart from evidence which disproves the testimony linking Trotsky with this alleged conspiracy, the charge of individual terrorism is incredible, on the basis of Trotsky's attitude toward individual terrorism throughout his career.

2. The Charge of Sabotage.

On the charge of sabotage the Commission cites, together with other expert testimony on

conditions in Soviet industry, a long deposition by Ivar Windfeld-Hansen, the Danish engineer mentioned as "Wienfeld," an alleged Trotskyist saboteur, by the accused Hrasche in the trial of January, 1937. From this deposition, which is fully documented, three facts emerge:

a. Windfeld-Hansen was extremely critical of the processes in use in the Russian chemical-fertilizer industry and the methods of planning, construction, and research. He constantly tried to persuade the officials to adopt more efficient and suitable methods, and to take more into account the nature of Soviet raw materials, and geographic and transportation conditions in making their plans.

b. Windfeld-Hansen, in spite of his differences with certain officials, was sympathetic with the Soviet Union and eager to help in the building up of its fertilizer industry.

c. His criticism provoked a struggle in the Soviet chemical-fertilizer industry over the processes in use, the consequence of bad planning, extravagance, etc., which was reflected in critical articles in Soviet technical papers.

Mr. Windfeld-Hansen declares that from the time of his arrival in Russia in 1932 he warned the Soviet authorities that the chemical-fertilizer industry was headed toward disaster. Concerning the confession of the accused Rataichak that he had sabotaged the Voskressensk fertilizer plant, Windfeld-Hansen says:

Such a complete mess was made of all details in connection with the designing, purchase of equipment, and actual construction of the precipitation plant that sabotage on the part of Rataichak or any other administrative officers was wholly superfluous, indeed, one can say impossible.

In Mr. Windfeld-Hansen's opinion, the reason for the removal and criminal prosecution of the accused Hrasche and Rataichak was as follows:

Scapegoats had to be found for the catastrophic developments in the chemical industry. There is no indication that acts of sabotage were involved... I cannot believe that my friend Hrasche could have committed acts of sabotage or espionage. I knew him too well for that.

The Commission took Trotsky's testimony on the charge of sabotage, and has read his writings which he submitted to substantiate it. This entire material indicates that Trotsky's public criticism of Soviet industrialization and collectivization has been animated by an evident desire to avert, rather than to induce, disaster.

The Commission finds from the evidence in its possession that the wrecks, delays, and damages charged against the accused in the Moscow trials are explicable in terms of haste, inefficiency and overreaching, and that the charges of sabotage, wrecking and diversion, insofar as they implicate Leon Trotsky, stand not proved and not credible.

3. The Charge of Agreements with Foreign Powers.

In the first trial, two of the accused testified to connections with agents of the secret police of the Hitler government (Gestapo), even before the period of the Gestapo's organization. Indeed, the defendant Olberg stated that this connection was the regular line of the Trotskyists, in conformity with Trotsky's instructions.

The charge of agreement with the Gestapo is vigorously repudiated, not only by Trotsky and Sedov, but by Eugene Bauer, one of the former leaders of the Trotskyist group in Germany but since 1934 a political opponent of Trotsky, who states that the Trotskyists in Germany never had any connection with the Gestapo, and were not spared by the Nazis in their persecution of political opponents after their rise to power.

The Commission possesses 12 depositions by Trotskyists now living in forced exile from Germany. It also possesses handbills and copies of a mimeographed news-sheet issued in 1936 by the Trotskyist group in Danzig, containing bitter attacks on the Nazis in that city; also copies of the Danzig Nazi newspaper *Vorposten* for December 9, 1936, and January 8 and 12, 1937, containing accounts of the arrests and trial of members of the Trotskyist organization in Danzig and violently abusive attacks upon them for seditious revolutionary activities.

All the evidence at the disposal of the Commission goes to show that, far from being friendly, the relations between the Trotskyists and the Nazis in Danzig are the characteristic relations between a revolutionary opposition and the Hitler régime.

In the second trial the accused were charged with conducting espionage and diversive and terrorist activities on Trotsky's direct instructions

for the purpose of undermining the military power

of the U.S.S.R., accelerating an armed attack on the U.S.S.R., assisting foreign aggressors to seize territory of the U.S.S.R., and to dismember it, and of overthrowing the Soviet power and restoring capitalism and the rule of the bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union.

This charge is supported in the record of the second trial, according to the accused Radek, only by his testimony and that of Pyatakov—a statement which the Prosecutor does not challenge. The Commission has found that the testimony of Pyatakov and Radek to their treasonable communications with Trotsky is disproved by the evidence in its possession.

In addition, it has a large quantity of material showing the nature of Trotsky's political preoccupations during the period when he is alleged to have been conspiring with Germany and Japan against the Soviet state. This material, which consists of affidavits, oral testimony, and a sound film made by Trotsky in Copenhagen for Left Opposition propaganda, as well as his published writings and private correspondence, shows that Trotsky has consistently opposed fascism in Germany and elsewhere, as well as Japanese imperialism.

The Commission finds on the basis of all this evidence that the charge of agreement with foreign powers is not only not proved but preposterous.

4. The Historical Connection.

In his summation in the second trial, the Prosecutor attaches great importance to "the historical connection which confirms the theses of the indictment on the basis of the Trotskyites' past activity." He maintains that Trotskyism has "spent the more than 30 years of its existence on preparations for its final conversion into a storm detachment of fascism, into one of the departments of the fascist police." He maintains that it has been waging a struggle for decades "against the working class and the Party, against Lenin and Leninism."

The Commission finds, after a careful study of the relevant historical material, that the Prosecutor's argument is based upon systematic distortion of history, and that the fact that the Prosecutor resorted to historical falsification inevitably reflects upon the entire conduct of the trials, by revealing that their purpose was to discredit an opposition faction past and present within the party, rather than to discover the actual truth through a fair procedure.

The Commission makes clear that its purpose, in considering all this material is in no sense to determine who was right or wrong in any historical controversy within the Bolshevik Party or the Soviet State, but solely to establish whether or not the Prosecutor's alleged "historical connection" represents historical truth.

Part Five

FINAL CONCLUSIONS

In its concluding section, the report states that although the Commission does not presume to judge the motives which prompted the accused and witnesses in the two Moscow trials to confess that they were guilty of the charges, against them, it has taken the testimony of three former Soviet political prisoners: Dr. Anton Ciliga, Yugoslav Communist, Victor Serge, well-known Russian-French writer and revolutionist, and A. Tarov, Old Bolshevik and Russian mechanic. These three men have escaped or been released from Soviet prisons. From their personal knowledge and experience they cite cases of extortion of false testimony by the G. P. U. through the use of the most revolting methods. Their testimony indicates that the system of extorting false confessions and employing them to inculcate the confessions and others is today a common practice of the Soviet police.

The Commission finds that this testimony, taken in connection with the fantastic discrepancies which it has pointed out in the confessions of the accused in the two Moscow trials, justifies the presumption of duress in the obtaining of these confessions. This presumption, again taken in connection with the character of the charges and the testimony in the two trials, constitutes strong justification for assuming that the trials were frame-ups. The Commission has already cited the Prosecutor's contention that the alleged criminal activities of the accused in the Moscow trials followed logically from their opposition to the policies of the ruling majority of the Communist Party in 1926-27; and has pointed out that the Prosecutor here deliberately identifies political opposition to the régime with criminal activity against

it. In this section it cites Trotsky's counter-charge that the trials of August, 1936, and January, 1937, were the logical culmination of a series of frame-ups by the ruling majority of the Party, directed against the Left Opposition.

It quotes from a compilation, introduced in evidence by Trotsky, of quotations from statements to the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, letters, and articles from the Left Opposition press, showing that the attempts of the Majority to inculcate the Left Opposition began in 1927 and proceeded in a mathematical series to the trials of August, 1936, and January, 1937; also that the leaders of the Opposition predicted and warned the Communist Party against those very developments which afterward took place. This document shows that in 1929 Trotsky warned that Stalin would "try to draw a line of blood between the Party and the Opposition. He must absolutely connect the Opposition with terrorist attempts, preparations for armed insurrection, etc."

In connection with the conclusions inevitably flowing from the mass of material on which previous sections of this report are based, the Commission finds that this document substantiates the argument that the Moscow trials of August, 1936, and January, 1937, constituted the culmination of a series of repressive measures against a political opposition.

Moreover, the Commission finds that the official reports of previous Soviet trials alluded to either in the reports of the Moscow trials or in that of the Preliminary Commission, indicate that political motivation on the part of the prosecution is not exceptional in Soviet trials. It adds, in illustration of this point, the trial of the Industrial Party in 1930 and that of the Mensheviks in 1931. In each case the accused were alleged to have formed an anti-Soviet center for the purpose of bringing about the overthrow of the Soviet régime and the restoration of capitalism through wrecking activities, disruptive work in the army, and the furthering of armed intervention against the Soviet Union. The Commission finds that the only significant difference between the indictments and confessions in these trials and the trials of August, 1936, and January, 1937, is in the names of those foreign powers and interests whom the accused were alleged to be serving. In these previous trials the accused were alleged to have conspired with the Polish, French, and British governments, with White Russians, and, in the case of the Menshevik trial, with the Social Democratic parties of foreign countries and with the Second International. The Commission finds that the conclusion appears to be inevitable that the indictments and the confessions in the series of widely publicized trials of alleged plotters against the régime, were governed in each case by current internal difficulties, economic and political, and by the current situation in the foreign relations of the Soviet Union. In other words, that the trials have been not really criminal, but political.

All these considerations, in connection with its previous conclusions, lead the Commission to the conclusion that the trials of August, 1936, and January, 1937, were frame-ups.

On the basis of all this evidence and these conclusions, the Commission finds Leon Trotsky and Leon Sedov not guilty.

Summary of Findings

Conduct of Trials

Independent of extrinsic evidence, the Commission finds:

1. That the conduct of the Moscow trials was such as to convince any unprejudiced person that no effort was made to ascertain the truth.

2. While confessions are necessarily entitled to the most serious consideration, these confessions themselves contain such inherent improbabilities as to convince the Commission that they do not represent the truth, irrespective of any means used to obtain them.

The Charges

3. On the basis of all the evidence, we find that Trotsky never gave Smirnov any terrorist instructions through Sedov or anybody else.

4. On the basis of all the evidence, we find that Trotsky never gave Dreitzer terrorist instructions either through Sedov or anybody else.

5. On the basis of all the evidence, we find that Holtzman never acted as go-between for Smirnov on the one hand and Sedov on the other for the purposes of any terrorist conspiracy.

6. We find that Holtzman never met Sedov in Copenhagen; that he never went with Sedov to see Trotsky; that Sedov was not in Copenhagen during Trotsky's sojourn in that city; that Holtzman never saw Trotsky in Copenhagen.

7. We find that Olberg never went to Russia with terrorist instructions from Trotsky or Sedov.

8. We find that Berman-Yurin never received terrorist instructions from Trotsky in Copenhagen, and that Berman-Yurin never saw Trotsky in Copenhagen.

9. We find that David never received terrorist instructions from Trotsky in Copenhagen and that David never saw Trotsky in Copenhagen.

10. We find no basis whatever for the attempt to link Moissei Lurye and Nathan Lurye with an alleged Trotskyist conspiracy.

11. We find that Trotsky never met Vladimir Romm in the Bois de Boulogne; that he transmitted no messages through Romm to Radek. We find that Trotsky and Sedov never had any connection with Vladimir Romm.

12. We find that Pyatakov did not fly to Oslo in December, 1935; he did not, as charged, see Trotsky; he did not receive from Trotsky any instructions of any kind. We find that the disproof of Pyatakov's testimony on this crucial point renders his whole confession worthless.

13. We find that the disproof of the testimony of the defendant Pyatakov invalidates the testimony of the witness Bukhartsev.

14. We find that the disproof of Vladimir Romm's testimony and that of Pyatakov completely invalidates the testimony of the defendant Radek.

15. We find that the disproof of the confessions of Smirnov, Pyatakov and Radek completely invalidates the confessions of Shestov and Muralov.

16. We are convinced that the alleged letters in which Trotsky conveyed alleged conspiratorial instructions to the various defendants in the Moscow trials never existed; and that the testimony concerning them is sheer fabrication.

17. We find that Trotsky throughout his whole career has always been a consistent opponent of individual terror. The Commission further finds that Trotsky never instructed any of the defendants or witnesses in the Moscow trials to assassinate any political opponent.

18. We find that Trotsky never instructed the defendants or witnesses in the Moscow trials to engage in sabotage, wrecking, and diversion. On the contrary, he has always been a consistent advocate of the building up of socialist industry and agriculture in the Soviet Union and has criticized the present régime on the basis that its activities were harmful to the building up of socialist economy in Russia. He is not in favor of sabotage as a method of opposition to any political régime.

19. We find that Trotsky never instructed any of the accused or witnesses in the Moscow trials to enter into agreements with foreign powers against the Soviet Union. On the contrary, he has always uncompromisingly advocated the defense of the U.S.S.R. He has also been a most forthright ideological opponent of the fascism represented by the foreign powers with which he is accused of having conspired.

20. On the basis of all the evidence we find that Trotsky never recommended, plotted, or attempted the restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R. On the contrary, he has always uncompromisingly opposed the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and its existence anywhere else.

21. We find that the Prosecutor fantastically falsified Trotsky's role before, during and after the October Revolution.

Conclusions

22. We therefore find the Moscow trials to be frame-ups.

23. We therefore find Trotsky and Sedov not guilty.

Signed: John Dewey, *Chairman*
Benjamin Stolberg
Wendelin Thomas
Alfred Rosmer
John R. Chamberlain
Carlo Tresca
E. A. Ross
Otto Ruehle
F. Zamora
Suzanne La Follette, *Secretary*

Session of the Commission
on Monday, September 20,
1937, held at 231 East
14th St., New York City

C.P. Acquits Capitalism; "Bad Monopolists" Held Responsible for Crisis

By James Casey

(This is the third article of a series on the economic situation).

With the industrial decline in its sixteenth consecutive week, Wall Streeters and Stalinists, alike, continue to refer to the new capitalist crisis as a "business recession." Workers will recall how, during the whole first year of the last economic debacle, Big Business had steadfastly refused to admit the existence of a crisis.

While misery and unemployment were spreading through the land, Herbert Hoover kept pouting about "prosperity being around the corner." Today Wall Street is pursuing a similar course. Only today Wall Street's efforts to blind America's toilers to the facts of the situation are being aided through the developed People's Frontist role of the Communist Party.

And Now.... "Honest" and "Dishonest" Bosses

In August, 1937, the C. P. Central Committee, in a statement published in the *Daily Worker* on the "furtherance of the People's Front", distinguished between "honest" and "dishonest" bourgeois elements and decreed that the Party membership support the "honest" bourgeoisie against the "dishonest" capitalists. In that statement, the Communist Party for the first time acknowledged its alignment with a section of the American ruling class.

Applied now to the economic situation, the advanced role of People's Frontism embraces the gravest attempt undertaken thus far by the American C. P., to undermine militant working class activity and to bury the class struggle.

On December 1, 2 and 3, the *Daily Worker* carried articles by Earl Browder purportedly on the economic situation. The essence of the first was the usual wild-name-calling attack on the "Trotskyites." The second assured the C. P. membership of the "correctness" of Roosevelt's view of the situation, as well as his program, with only a gentle hint to the President to be less conciliatory toward the economic royalists. Browder added that Roosevelt's position also proved the "correctness" (he didn't bother to explain how) of the aforementioned Central Committee statement on the furtherance of the People's Front. The third article discussed the need of "purity" in the private lives of the Party members. For reasons not to be discussed here Browder pointedly warned that this "order for spotlessness" applied to every member "from top to bottom."

In all these articles Browder referred to Alex Bittleman's analysis of the economic situation. It is this analysis that will now be given attention here.

Official Position

Bittleman, the Communist Party's foremost theoretician, submitted a report to the Political Bureau which was published on October 18. Political Bureau reports, when published for the consumption of *Daily Worker* readers, constitute the Party's official position on respective issues.

Along with the Wall Streeters, Bittleman concedes the existence of a "business recession" and a decline in the stock market. The coming on of this "recession" was not necessary, Bittleman says, and he continues:

"American capitalist economy has not yet entered the phase of a new cyclical crisis; or more correctly it need not necessarily enter the crisis phase, at this

time because, by all signs, it has not yet fully exploited all possibilities present for the continuance of the recovery trends."

After cramming unemployment, the high cost of living, the steel industry and the chamber of commerce into one paragraph, Bittleman embarks upon exploiting some of the possibilities of the Party's "new line."

"Honest" Monopolists Too?

The blame for the economic upset Bittleman places on the "reactionary" monopolists. It will be noted here that from "honest" and "dishonest" bourgeois elements discovered by the Central Committee last August, the Stalinist leadership, by October, had unearthed the startling phenomena of "reactionary" monopolists on the one hand, and "non-reactionary" and, presumably, "honest" monopolists on the other.

Says the Stalinist theoretician: "A very important contributing factor to the decline in the stock market, and the uneven recession in various branches of industry is this: that big capital, the reactionary monopolist (emphasis A. B.) may be considered as being on a sort of political strike."

The Bosses' "Strike"

"They have refused to expand, to make new investments, they sabotaged recovery, thereby threatening the nation's economy, they militate against the government's program for control of the stock market and in many other ways are striking against the well-being and security of the people."

And still further on, in discussing the special session of Congress, Roosevelt's program and "the role of the reactionary monopolists," Bittleman asserts: "But, most particularly, big capital sabotages the further development of recovery by failure to do the traditional thing, that is, to come to the support of a weakening market and weakened spots in industry during a period of recovery, by failure to energetically exploit the basis of still existing recovery by further expansion, narrow though this basis is." Let us for a few moments examine these statements of the Stalinist spokesmen.

The "reactionary" monopolists "refuse to expand, to make new investments," and further, "they sabotage by failure to do the traditional thing," to "come to the support of the market and industry." This Stalinist thesis affords no two meanings.

"Tired of Clipping Coupons?"

There are possibilities for a growth in trade, but the "reactionary" monopolists don't want it, according to the C.P. viewpoint. These monopolists can make new investments in unexploited fields that will garner more dividends for themselves, but they prefer to sabotage—on whom? According to the Stalinists, the monopolists are saying:

"Down with dividends, we're tired of clipping coupons!"

They can also send the stock market soaring, but these sabotaging monopolists simply spurn the idea of fleecing the public. They deliberately refuse to aid industrial recovery because, in the terms of Stalinist analysis, the monopolists vindictively have declared a moratorium on profits.

Moreover, says the Political Bureau report, these monopolists "are threatening the national economy." Just think of it! The "reactionary" monopolists are conspiring to wreck their own profit system and the "plot" has sent the Stalinist leadership into a lather.

Such is the analysis on the economic situation offered up by the party of "Twentieth Century Americanism." But the C.P. thesis carries other implications.

How To End Recession...

If these "reactionary" monopolists can create a "recession" by studied sabotage, can they not end the decline by "expanding and investing?" Naturally the Stalinist leadership does not yet dare to present to its rank-and-file the proposition of "an organized capitalism," but the People's Frontist line implies this very position.

Inasmuch as the "reactionary" monopolists "plan" recessions through sabotage and "political strikes", the role of the pure monopolists must be, according to the Communist Party, "to safeguard and promote the interests of the people and the government." The logical conclusion to this thesis is for the "non-reactionary" monopolists to win over to their side the naughty monopolists and, at long last, there would be an end to all capitalist recessions and crisis.

If the C. P. Political Bureau is correct in its People's Frontist analysis, then Marx and Engels never had the remotest conception of the origin and historical development of society and their works must be shelved at once as a curiosity.

Millions of the nation's workers, who will not be blinded by the Communist Party's drive to the right, by its rabid support of the Roosevelt wing of American capitalism, will see in the Bittleman thesis a frightful counter-revolutionary role on the part of the Stalinists, on both the labor and political fronts.

Revolutionary Socialists and all militant workers will expose and combat this counter-revolutionary activity in the trade unions, unemployed groups, fraternal bodies and in all other assemblies of the labor movement.

(The next article will deal in detail with the tasks of Revolutionary Socialist in the crisis).

SOCIAL and DANCE
Saturday Eve., Dec. 18
at LEAH DILLON'S STUDIO
137 E. 13th Street
Auspices: ADMISSION 20c
Lower Manhattan Branch
and Y. P. S. L.

G.P.U. Plot Against Grylewicz Collapses; Old Militant Freed

PRAGUE, Czechoslovakia. — Another clumsy G.P.U. frame-up has collapsed of its own weight. Anton Grylewicz, old German trade union militant and revolutionist who was arrested by the Czechoslovakian political police last Summer and imprisoned for several months as a German spy on the basis of faked documents, has finally been released and expelled from the country of his refuge.

Veteran of 32 Years

Grylewicz has been in the organized socialist movement for thirty-two years. Active in the metal workers' union in Germany since the days of his youth, he became during the War one of the leaders of the anti-chauvinist struggles of the Independent Socialist Party, which he afterwards left to adhere to the Communist Party of Germany. In subsequent years he played a prominent role as functionary of the C. P. and as deputy in the Prussian Landtag. In 1926 he was expelled from the C. P. as a Left Oppositionist.

As one of the chief founders of the German Opposition movement, he incurred the enmity of both the Stalinists and the rising Fascist movement. For many years he served as the translator and publisher of Trotsky's pamphlets in German, as editor of the German Opposition organ and of the Russian Bulletin of the Left Opposition.

Hounded by Nazis

This oldtime revolutionist, now denounced and framed by the G. P. U. and its police cohorts in "friendly" Czechoslovakia as a "Fascist agent", was one of the first to feel the blows of the Hitler regime. His home raided and destroyed by the storm-troopers, his person hounded by the Hitlerite police, he was forced to flee from Germany immediately after Hitler's assumption of power, and finally went to Czechoslovakia as political refugee.

But in exile, too, Grylewicz continued his activities in the Opposition movement, aided in the publication and distribution of the works of Trotsky and other Opposition literature. When the G.P.U. set to work executing its directives, received in May of this year from the Communist International, to exterminate Trotskyism on a world scale and to bolster up the Moscow trials by transporting them to other countries, Grylewicz was seized upon as one of the first victims of its campaign. The police of "democratic" Czechoslovakia, eager to satisfy its Russian ally and, in its own interests, to crush every vestige of revolutionary thought—were only too willing to cooperate in the technical work of manufacturing accusations and fabricating documents.

Grylewicz was arrested on July

12 under charges of "espionage". The political police confronted him with "extracts" from his archives and files, which he had given for safekeeping to a friend named Batany at the end of October, 1936. And here the clumsy hand of the G.P.U. emerges, with blunders as gross as those which permeated the Moscow trials. Among other "documents" presented was a short report allegedly written by a Czechoslovakian soldier concerning the movements of his troop, and a brief report in German concerning the plans of the German embassy for the occupation of Czechoslovakia—the latter dated February 17, 1937; that is, over three months after the archives from which it was supposedly taken had left Grylewicz's hands!

The true purpose of the arrest and imprisonment emerges with striking clarity from the procedure of the investigation itself. Several police officials begin to cross-examine the prisoner. Suddenly all but one leaves. The remaining official, conducting an examination of a "Hitlerite agent", begins a lengthy discussion, replete with names and details, of... Moscow trials! Grylewicz is shown prescriptions for the compounding of secret ink, false passports; and other elements of the stock-in-trade of the conspiratorial profession, all allegedly taken from his files.

Fraud Collapses

Grylewicz was able to establish irrefutably that this "documentation" was a police fraud from beginning to end. He was accordingly conducted back to his cell, kept imprisoned until November 2, then expelled from the country in a most brutal fashion without a real trial, hearing, or even a word of explanation. But this fact in itself furnishes the best expose of the vicious framed-up nature of the accusation, the political exigencies which motivated it, and the complicity of the G. P. U. in the entire affair.

The G.P.U., and with it the entire Stalinist bureaucracy, is today on the defensive throughout the world. For the first time its international system of repressions, terrorism and frame-up is cracking. The first blows were the apprehending of the agents who assassinated Ignace Reiss in Switzerland. Now, with the collapse of the Grylewicz frame-up, a new impressive defeat of Stalinist terrorism has been registered.

WORLD REVOLUTION

By C. L. R. JAMES. 440 pages. \$3.50
New Statesman:—"A book which is unique of its kind, very badly needed, and likely to excite more anger than anything yet published this year. A history of the last twenty years from a Trotskyist angle." (R. W. POSTGATE.)
NEW Leader:—"It must be read three times to realise its significance. It is a book which will influence substantially the thought of our time." (Fenner Brockway.)

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
100 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C.

Rivera Bares Mexican Plot Against Trotsky

MEXICO CITY, D.F.—A devastating exposure of the aims and frame-up plots of the Stalinist GPU operating on the North American continent was widely publicized here recently in *El Universal*, influential Mexican newspaper.

An amalgam against Leon Trotsky was attempted by the GPU here when Hernan Laborde, GPU agent and secretary of the Stalinist party, tried to link up Trotsky with the machinations of General Cedillo, fascist leader. Laborde made his slanderous charge at a People's Front meeting here.

Tried Worn-Out Method

Pressed for facts or documents, Laborde failed to produce any. He tried the worn-out method of claiming that Trotsky knew a General who knew Cedillo, and that the general, whose name is Antonio Villarreal, was the link.

The article printed in *El Universal* exploded the myth of the "link" and vindicated Trotsky completely since it gave the real facts about Villarreal and also placed the GPU in the limelight which it hadn't expected.

The unmasking of the GPU and the publicity given to its every move was a severe set-back for the Stalinist frame-up artists.

El Universal printed the exposure in the form of a transcript containing a public conversation, in the presence of reporters, between General Villarreal and Diego Rivera, noted painter and friend of Trotsky.

The *El Universal* article, in part, reads:

An Incredible Charge

"How can Sr. Hernan Laborde, if he is in his right mind," said General Villarreal, "make the ridiculous and incredible charge that I am making 'political combinations' with Trotsky, and that I am a fascist?"

Diego answered:

"Because Laborde and his accomplices are trying to exploit the fact that the International Commission of Inquiry into the Moscow Trials, presided over in New York by the greatest philosopher, John Dewey, approached you, asking you to participate in it."

"But why did the Commission address itself to me, when I have no personal or political relations with any of its members, and moreover have never occupied myself with any of the matters in which it is interested?"

Record of Villarreal

"The Commission approached Gen. Antonio I. Villarreal," said Diego Rivera, "because he is one of the initiators of the Mexican Revolution; his struggles began before 1910, the official date of the beginning of this Revolution; he is one of the first labor organizers of his country; his initial trade union work prepared the famous revolutionary strike of Cananea, with Flores Magon, and at that time to organize workers in Mexico was a way to go to jail, exile, or the gallows; not as now, in the period of the Laborde, when it is a convenient way of getting into the Chamber of Deputies or the Cabinet, or of collecting salaries paid by the Moscow government or that of Mexico, or both...."

"The GPU," added Diego Rivera, "has committed a serious tactical error. You, before now, did not know in reality, through experience, of what sort, of what nature were the Stalinist slanders and lies about the Moscow

Trials, though you could deduce it from the documents and substantiating facts exhibited by the International Commission; but now, thanks to the slanders of Stalin's police agent, Hernan Laborde, you know from your own experience where leads the cynicism of the Moscow liars, by analogy with their Mexican colleagues who impute to you the fantastic, ridiculous, and even farcical intention of preparing a coup in Mexico in complicity with Trotsky.

A Ridiculous Charge

"On the other hand, what interest would Trotsky himself have in preparing a coup against the only government in the entire world that has given him asylum, above all without concerning himself with the taking of power by the proletariat?"

"The G.P.U. has placed you and Trotsky," he continued, "in the center of its concentric intrigue to hide the principal crime of its maneuver. The aim is nothing else but to create in Mexico a situation that would persuade President Cardenas that his only salvation against fascism is to deliver himself into the arms of Moscow. Patiently, like moisture, Stalinism has permeated the bureaucratic mediums of Mexico: the magistracy, all the dependencies of the Department of Education, a good part of another department and even organs very near to the Executive."

"The occasion arriving, it would cost Stalin or his G.P.U. nothing to spend a few millions for 'cannon shots' (as General Obregon called the attentions paid to his colleagues to interest them in being 'persuaded') to create a pseudo-sub-fascist uprising, with the purpose of bringing about an objective situation that would push the Government of Mexico into the arms of the G.P.U., and supplant the power of the present government by that of Stalinism."

Object of Maneuver

"The real object of this maneuver is to create in Mexico a base for action, blackmail or political racketeering against the Washington government. Stalin needs the collaboration of the United States not only for the exchange on a grand scale of the products of industry and for financial combinations but, above all, for political support at the international gambling table."

"Stalin not only needs the United States in the Orient, but in the entire world. Stalin wishes to use in Latin America (which remains the surest and nearest field of investment and market for the United States) and especially in Mexico, which shares a very extensive and vulnerable frontier with the United States, a tactic of pressure and concession toward that country. Through the control of the power of the G.P.U. in the Latin American countries, if the United States proceeds in agreement with Moscow, he will yield and make concessions to American capital in the name of the defense of the U.S.S.R., which needs the United States as an ally or at least as a sympathizer. But if the latter is stubborn in regard to aiding Stalin, he will use the 'Popular Front Governments' that

he has succeeded in establishing in America to bring pressure against the U.S. interests invested in the Spanish American countries in the name and title of 'anti-imperialism.'

"But this game, unfortunately for Stalin, cannot help being discovered and understood by Washington. This game will be particularly dangerous, even more than for Stalin himself, for the governments of Latin America, and especially for Mexico, which shows itself easily permeable by Stalinism, that is to say, by the G.P.U. Certainly Washington will not tolerate the Stalinist attempt at blackmailing and racketeering-pressure. The history of Mexico and all Latin America teaches us that the power of the United States has had vast means of action in this region to preserve its interests."

"But to hide this game which, whatever the direction it takes, threatens the national interests of the Mexican people, because it threatens them with falling under the tyranny of the G.P.U., there has been invented the new ridiculous and coarse slander, the cynical amalgam: 'Trotsky-Villarreal - Vasconcelos - Cedillo-fascism.' For its 'future' ends, the G.P.U., suffering from narcissism, is also preparing its candidate for the government of Mexico, which will be the next chapter of its activities here."

"Just An... Assumption"

Franklin D. Roosevelt was asked at a press conference the other day, what he thought of the present "recession". He answered: "Just an assumption."

I wonder, if when the 180,000 steel workers who have been laid off in the past few months tell their wives and families there is no food for them, that they will answer, "Just an assumption."

I wonder if the thousands who are standing in line at the relief offices all over the country can agree with "just an assumption"?

The Stock market seems to me to be going down. Or is that perhaps "just an assumption"?

Maybe I should turn the market graph upside down. Then the market would appear to be going up. Or is that "just an assumption"?

Roosevelt's State Department says that there is no war going on in China. Is that "just an assumption"?

The thousands of Chinese that are facing Japanese guns made from American scrap iron don't seem to think that it is "just an assumption."

Roosevelt seems to have been having trouble with his teeth lately. What would he have thought of his dentist if he had been told that it was "just an assumption"?

In the case of the tooth he knew that something was rotten. In thinking that a dentist who would make such a diagnosis was also rotten, he would not be making "just an assumption". We know that there is something rotten in the present capitalist system. And that is not "just an assumption". — John F. Dwyer.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

G.P.U. Supervises Soviet Election—Arrests and Shootings Continue—Last Minute Removals From Ballot.

By John G. Wright

Stalin Elects Himself

The elections in Russia are over—"officially". As was guaranteed in advance, 100% of the voters turned out "unanimously" to elect Stalin and 1,142 other members of the Supreme Council (569 for the Council of the Union and 574 for the Council of Nationalities), i.e., 1,142 stooges for Stalin.

Advised Ballots Be Signed

In addition to the previous vast mobilization of the apparatus, from the 900,000 school teachers down to all school children of "pioneer age", more than 1,000,000 "agitators" were sent out to the rural districts and 2,000,000 "volunteers" (as proudly reported by the *Daily Worker* for Dec. 13) assisted the G.P.U. in driving the people to the polls. The Soviet citizen in these elections had the choice between either showing up at the polls or explaining to the G.P.U. his failure to vote for Stalin. While the Stalin press cynically kept up the sham of the "secret" ballot—*Pravda* insisted, if you please, that unless the ballot was sealed it would be invalid—it at the same time made it quite clear to the citizens that they had better have iron-clad proof of having voted, suggesting, in fact, that they sign their names to the ballot, thus placing the illiterates on the spot.

Sender Garlin reports in the *Daily Worker* that "Children refused to stay at home and insisted on accompanying their parents to the polls." Apart from the fact that the absence of a schoolchild (previously "mobilized" for the campaign) would have to be explained by the parents, the presence of children constituted an additional proof that the parents had not been remiss in their duties.

Voting "Safe-Guarded"

Detail after detail provides proof of the vast reign of terror under which the elections were held. "Virtually nothing was allowed to interfere with the sacred right of all Soviet citizens to vote. People voted in home districts, in sanatoriums and vacationing places, on battleships on the Red Fleet and on trains which sped over the rolling steppes of Russia", howls the *Daily Worker*. Even being sick in bed was no excuse for failure to vote. A Soviet citizen could provide against such contingency either like Stanislavsky, "the venerable director of Moscow's history-making theatre", by making an official request "to be permitted to vote at home", or, if he happened not to be a dignitary, by applying for one of "the fleet of cars placed at the disposal of aged and invalid voters to drive them to and from the polls." (D. W. Dec. 13). It is hardly to be wondered at that many harrassed functionaries, seeking to safeguard themselves against corpses being suddenly resurrected or possible errors in documentation, placed on the rolls the names of people recently deceased, and of new born babes, to save nothing of the feeble-minded and the insane. (See *Pravda* for Nov. 25).

From the pages of the official Stalin press, it is quite apparent that toward the latter stages of the election campaign, particularly when it became clear that only those handpicked by Stalin would be placed on the ballot, a serious apathy, to put it mildly, set in among the "activists" engaged in organizing the elections. Thus, *Pravda* for November 25, after giving a glowing account of the progress of the campaign, comments cautiously: "However many party and trade union organizations, city and district Soviets forget about the organizational and technical preparation for the elections."

* * *

The drive against the "enemies of the people" has not abated and it is certain that far from slackening it will gather in momentum especially in the coming days before the convocation of the Supreme Council "sometime in January".

Last Minute Changes in Ballot

To the long list of Soviet embassies that are being purged, should be added the personnel of the Tokio embassy, the majority of whom have been "recalled." Rumours will not down of a pending trial of no less than 15 Soviet diplomats—on the charge of "Trotskyism." A purge, the scope of which will become clear only when the complete list of candidates is finally made public, is taking place even among the newly "elected" deputies. To the names of Postyshev, formerly of the Political Bureau, and Mezhlauk, who replaced Ordjonikidze as the head of Heavy Industry, and both of whom were previously removed from the roll of candidates, Stalin has now added the names of General Alksnis and General Bokis, head of the Air and Tanks Corps respectively. Alksnis was among those who sent Tukhachevsky and others to the executioner's block.

So brazen is the work of the frame-up artists that even the pages of *Izvestia* had to be devoted to the "exposure" of one over-zealous individual. The editor of *Russian Art* has been fulminating against the staff of another Soviet publication *Theatre* as guilty of every kind of anti-Soviet crime, up to and including "Trotskyism". Simultaneously, the editor of *Theatre* has been conducting the same sort of campaign against the staff of *Russian Art*. The "scandal" comprises the fact that one and the same individual, I. Altman, is editor of *Theatre* while he also happens to be editor of *Russian Art*. The gentleman was playing safe. (See *Izvestia* for Nov. 24).

In every one of its aspects the "election" reflects the depraved and brutal regime of Stalin. To the long list of his judicial frame-ups, Stalin has merely added an electoral frame-up.

The Massachusetts "Red" Investigation: A Further Stage in C. P. Degeneration

By Hal Draper

The investigation of the Communist Party by the special Investigating Commission set up by the Massachusetts State Legislature marked a new stage in the unfolding of the Stalinist line. The result of this investigation received scant notice except in the Boston press, but it is necessary to make the workers aware of the exact degree of degeneracy that the Stalinist movement has reached.

Three thousand dollars was appropriated for this inquiry to investigate "subversive propaganda in Massachusetts—Communist, Nazi and Fascist," which is a successor of a similar investigation of the C.P. about two years ago. The Commission as set up provided for three additional appointees by the Governor, who thereupon named three former State Commanders of the American Legion—Rose, Paul and Halloran.

Frankfeld Eats His Words

The C.P. denounced these three gentlemen as "notorious red-baiters," which was only stating the facts. But when Halloran confronted Phil Frankfeld (secretary of the Massachusetts C.P.) with these "insults," Frankfeld backwatered. "I wish now to apologize for the statement," he said; and all was forgiven.

Senator Burke, who was the most aggressive in his questioning during the hearing, was labeled an "illiterate" by the C.P. This was substantiated by the hearings—he pronounced bourgeoisie "boor-ga-wa-zee" for example—but it is not on record that Burke objected to this characterization.

It is indicative of the intent of the hearings that the testimony was recorded only by a Police Department stenographer, not by the Commission itself. The legislators felt apparently that they were just setting the stage for the cops to listen in. The Commission received only carbon copies of the police transcripts, and the official record of the proceedings is still not available. The quotations given in these articles are all taken from the Boston press—the Globe, Post, and Herald (none of them a Hearst paper, by the way)—which covered the case quite completely, citing much of the testimony verbatim. The accounts in these papers check against each other, though only one may be quoted here for any question.

There can be no doubt—and this appears also from the hearings—that shortly before the investigation started, the national leaders of the C.P. held a conclave to determine their strategy. The sense of their deliberations one can imagine: "Boys, we've hedged up to now and used weasel words, but now we have to come clean. We've got to go the whole hog." And they went the whole hog.

The Stalinists Confess

Before the investigation started, the State Committee of the C.P. published a pamphlet entitled "A Confession of Faith," with the slogan: "Let the Truth Be Known to the People of Massachusetts." This pamphlet, one of the most degrading ever issued by any working-class organization, is sold only in Massachusetts and is unobtainable elsewhere. It begins properly enough with some extra-fancy belly-crawling before the Commission. The C.P. is addressing the American Legion commander, illiterate red-

baiters and assorted fat-boys making up the Commission:

"Dear Madam and Gentlemen: In connection with the investigation you are now conducting, we wish to offer you our most sincere and hearty cooperation...."

"We believe that your Committee through this investigation can perform a truly distinct and great service to the people of our State and to the cause of Democracy...."

Unbiased Red-baiters

"The spirit of fair play will undoubtedly characterize the investigation. Any and all prejudices will be cast to the winds beforehand, and your Committee will enter upon the investigation in a truly judicial spirit. We Communists expect that we shall come before a tribunal unbiased towards the Minority Party in whose name we appear and speak... As legislators of our great Commonwealth, you will, we are confident, protect and safeguard the inalienable right of all American citizens to free speech, free assembly and a free press...."

All this refers to Calvin Coolidge's Great Commonwealth where an "unbiased tribunal" murdered Sacco and Vanzetti "in a truly judicial spirit!"

The confession, of course, goes in extensively for American traditions in the heavy-handed C.P. style. Earl Browder becomes a "Yankee revolutionist" and Brook Farm is singled out "to prove that modern Communism is Twentieth Century Americanism."

People's Front — Mayflower Product

And it would seem also that even the People's Front came over on the Mayflower: "The People's Front in Massachusetts would be a continuation under present day conditions of the same kind of People's Front that was established against British tyranny in 1776 and against slavery in 1861"—which is true enough since both were movements on behalf of American capitalism, when it was progressive.

Today when American capitalism has become reactionary imperialism, the People's Front is still advocated by the C.P. in order to preserve it. "The People's Front," defines the pamphlet, "is a movement for improvement and reform under present day society and conditions"—purely a movement to reform capitalism.

The entire tenor of the Confession has one aim: to convince the legislators that the C.P. is no danger to anything they hold dear, and that in two ways: first, by proving that they, the Stalinists, do not want to overthrow capitalism, and secondly, by abjectly describing how they are too weak to do it if they wanted to. The first statement will be proved in the next article; the second appears from the Confession.

No Danger

"The reactionaries deliberately exaggerate our strength and influence," it reads. "We Communists are the best and most realistic judges of ourselves." And it repudiates the "slander" that

the C.P. has mass influence by giving figures: a membership of only 1,000 in the state; its vote only 6,000; its budget only about \$8,000, etc. And from this it draws the moral that the legislators really shouldn't be afraid of the C.P.

"They know we are no danger. They know that we do not, never have, and never will threaten democracy!"

Other aspects of the Confession will be considered later under the proper head, but we must cite its contribution to the subject of "Family Life and Communism." The Communist Manifesto likewise takes up this question, it will be remembered, and the clownishness of the Stalinists becomes evident in comparison.

Some Twentieth Century Beliefs

"Communists do not believe in free love. Communists believe in getting married according to the given statutes of our Commonwealth and living in wedlock. Communists believe in having children and raising families."

Clownish as it is, this statement is the reflection of the new attitude toward the role and privileges of women that has developed in Stalin's Russia.

In this world of respectable, law-abiding, God-fearing and child-bearing Communists, the breath of the class struggle is a profanation, and indeed not a whisper of it can be found anywhere in the Confession. Its existence is not mentioned or even hinted at. It belongs to a different world.

In the next article, we shall take up the answers of the Stalinist spokesmen before the Commission with regard to their attitude toward overthrowing the government, toward force and violence, toward socialism through the ballot—that is, their attitude on the most elementary principles of revolutionary Marxism.

N. Y. Membership Meeting Sunday

Local New York, Socialist Party (Left Wing), announces an important membership meeting to be held Sunday, December 19th, at 2:30 P. M.—at Manhattan Plaza—66 East 4th Street.

LaGuardia and the Gravediggers

With Mayor LaGuardia threatening to send in City employees as strikebreakers, the strike of gravediggers at the Greenwood Cemetery, Brooklyn was ended last week. The men returned to work, pending probable appointment of a fact-finding committee by Mayor LaGuardia to study conditions at the cemetery and recommend possible changes. The committee is "probable," the recommendations "possible," the return to work "definite." The strikers are members of the United Cemetery Workers Union, C.I.O. The Mayor is a member of the A.L.P.

Relief Sit-Down Ends In Settlement

Protesting against delays in assisting relief applicants 76 men women and children staged a sit-down in the Department of Public Welfare building, 376 Lafayette Street, New York. After some 60 hours during which no food was allowed to enter the building the strike was settled with a promise of immediate action on the 25 cases which were the direct cause of the sit-down.

C. P. Disrupts Alliance; Drives To Expel Harrison

Charging Neil Harrison, chairman of Local 15 of the Workers' Alliance and an active member of the Progressive Group, with calling "bureaucrats" and "dictators" by their proper names and with agitating for and engaging in militant aggressive actions for the unemployed, the

Stalinist leadership of the Workers' Alliance has moved for his expulsion. This action, but one of a series of similar steps taken earlier in New York City, is in harmony with the general campaign of disruption, expulsion, slander and revocation of charters carried on by the Communist Party and its stooges in the Workers' Alliance all across the country including Chicago, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, State of Washington, etc.

Tries to Discredit Progressives

The action against Harrison was first made officially at the City Central Committee of the Unemployed Division of the Workers' Alliance held December 3. At this meeting Chairman Jerome Benton in his report to the Central Committee stated that: (1) stool pigeons had been sent into the Workers' Alliance by the Administration; (2) that other stool pigeons had developed within the organization. He then launched into an attack on the Progressive Group and Neil Harrison in particular. For more than an hour this young bureaucrat, plagiarizing from the old-time reactionary union leaders in their attempts to discredit progressive opponents, did everything he could to discredit Harrison and his group.

Proving their oft-proclaimed "love of democracy," Harrison was allowed three minutes—no more—to reply. Harrison used these brief minutes to pose questions to the leadership in line with the program of the Progressive Group. "Why not fight against the anti-union signs in the home relief bureaus? Why was the Washington march held after Congress adjourned? Why no fight on the part of the Alliance against the gradual elimination of the Workers' Alliance from the bureaus?"

Embarrassing Questions

"Why no fight against the dismissal of 'aliens' from W.P.A.?" Harrison was "answered" by over two hours of slanderous attacks by members of the Communist Party, in which he was called all the names in the Stalinist repertoire: "procurer," "stool pigeon," "thief," etc. Only two opponents of the Stalinists, Bertha Butler and Larry Selman, were allowed three minutes each. Harrison was not allowed to reply. Following this barrage of slander,

Chairman Benton, in the name of the Executive Committee, proposed charges be presented against Harrison. Immediately a stooge made the motion, which was carried by the C.P. majority.

The Charges

The written charges presented include the following: That Harrison called the W. A. leaders bureaucrats and dictators; that he wrote an article in which he said that members of the Alliance stoned a relief administrator; that he tried to cause "bloodshed and hysteria" at the relief bureau; that he permitted "degenerate expelled members" of the Alliance to speak at meetings; that he organized the Progressive Group, "a dual organization within the Workers' Alliance"

The Progressive Group is determined to fight against this expulsion to the end. They have been heartened in the fight by the letter sent to the Alliance by Charles Mack, Chairman of Local 17. The letter follows:

W. A. Official Resigns In Protest

"W. A. of G. N. Y. Unemployed Section Executive committee:

I hereby resign from the adjustment committee of the Unemployed Section of the W. A.

My reasons for resigning are the bureaucratic methods pursued in expelling militants from the W. A. for daring to express honest opinions within the ranks of the W. A. This, in my opinion, is the outcome of the desire of the leadership of the W. A. to drive out anyone who does not agree with them. This policy is being carried out in all parts of the country and is wrecking the organization.

The culmination of this procedure here in N. Y. C. is the slanderous attack upon Neil Harrison at the delegates council meeting—an attack such as would not be tolerated in any other trade union.

I have served faithfully the Workers' Unemployed Committee, the Workers' Unemployed Union, and the Workers' Alliance. I refuse to be used as a front and a stooge for the Communist Party leadership in the W. A.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Charles Mack
Member Adjustment Comm.,
Member of City Executive
Committee of W.A. Unemployed Division."

Christmas Eve Dance

Friday, December 24th, at 9 P. M.

IRVING PLAZA

15th STREET AND IRVING PLACE

Tickets: In Advance 55 cents — At the door 75 cents

For Sale at: Labor Book Shop, 23 East 12th St.

AUSPICES: Convention Arrangements Committee
Socialist Party (Left Wing)

Truth is On The March!

STALINISM



Withdraw America's Forces from China!

(Continued from page 1)

for China. That is the *working class*, the *progressive* way of helping China and smashing Japan.

But we haven't the slightest iota of confidence in the capitalist government of the United States. Any fight it undertakes with Japan is not conducted for the purpose of aiding China, but for the purpose of protecting and extending American imperialist interests against Japanese imperialist interests—nothing more and nothing less. Any war of the capitalist government of this country would be Wall Street's war, not ours.

And for such a war—not a penny and not a man!

What are American troops and American fighting ships doing in China, anyway? Are they there to "protect our citizens"? Or "our interests"?

Who are those citizens? Did we send them there? Are they the representatives of the American people? No, they are the business men who went to China for the purpose of squeezing profits out of the terribly oppressed and exploited Chinese masses. Why should we send one penny or one man to China to "protect" them?

If the investments of the Standard Oil Company are in jeopardy, that's Rockefeller's headache, not ours.

The American capitalist class, the Roosevelt government included, has no particular objection to shedding the blood of millions of American workers in a war to defend American imperialist interests abroad.

We have!

We know only one war: the war for the oppressed and exploited, against their oppressors and exploiters. There is enough of a war to fight right here: the war against wage-cuts, against relief-cuts, against unemployment, against the open-shoppers—and against the capitalist war-mongers.

Let's fight that war, and win it!

Meanwhile let's drown out the screams of the war-howlers with the peace cry of the masses:

Withdraw all American armed forces from China!

Withdraw every American soldier, sailor and marine from the soil or waters of China!

Withdraw every gunboat and battleship from Chinese waters!

Revived "New International" Rich in Content

Although printing the highest number of any period of its existence, *The New International* magazine, January issue, is already sold out and copies are in demand. The re-issued *New International* has met with an enthusiastic response, fully warranted by the excellent content and technical calibre of the magazine.

"Twenty Years of the Russian Revolution" by Max Shachtman covers in fundamental form the period from the Bolshevik uprising to the present situation in the Soviet Union.

Leon Trotsky, who contributes a special article for each issue of *The New International*, expounds on the significance and lasting values of the principles enunciated by Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto in an article, "The Communist Manifesto 90 Years After."

Dealing fully with the various conceptions concerning the Soviet Union now being expounded, Maurice Spector reviews recent books on Russia by Eugene Lyons, Feuchtwanger, Victor Serge, Fred Beal and Andre Gide.

"Archives of the Revolution" reprints of documents of the History and theory of the working class movement; editorials on the Dewey Commission and other matters fill out a solid and magnificent first issue of *The New International*.

Opportunity is now afforded to the large number who will want to receive *The New International* regularly to subscribe. The price is \$2.00 per year, and checks and money orders for same should be addressed to *The New International*, 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.

Left Jabs

Voting Machines and Machine Guns

In New York the results of the Council elections were not known until weeks later. Anxious to overcome the lag the City is investigating various types of voting machines. If they want the last word in time-saving devices they should look into those used to "count out" opposition candidates in Stalin's "most democratic" election. So effective did they work there that, "catching up with and surpassing the most advanced capitalist nation", Soviet authorities are able to report election results weeks ahead of the actual date of the voting. The machine used there, we understand, has a trigger attachment.

Flash!! Last minute news Mainovich and Vermontsky elected supporters of Stalin today. Shortly after the crack! crack! of dawn the widows of the opposition candidates conceded the election.

Revolution and Cinema Revolution

At long last the "inside story" can, or rather must, be told and in Moscow it is being told by the cartload through radio, books, press and film. The very newest "inside story" of the Revolution in film is about to be released under the title "October

Revolution". It is not ready for distribution yet but it has been reviewed by Stalin and under his direction will be completed. Its complete objectivity is thereby assured. Some reports of the preview have been published here. In the picture as "Lenin" steps of the train on his return to Russia, his first question is: "Where is Stalin?" After that his main activity seems to have been acting as a sort of John the Baptist for the great god "Josef." We can confidently assert that all the "100% Twentieth Century Morons" will enthusiastically acclaim this picture. Yes, just as enthusiastically as they condemned the real pictorial record of the October revolution when compiled and shown under the title "From Tsar to Lenin".

Zams "Bright future" in Reading

We understand now why Zam saw a "particularly bright future" in Reading. Zam is consolidating the forces of the "united left wing" in an effort to avoid playing the part of the corpse at the coming morticians convention of the Thomas-Tyler outfit. The "consolidation" in Reading includes those whose "clarity" was expressed by voting and campaigning for the Democratic Party against the Social Democrats in the November election. Zam has not lined up any Republicans yet but give him time, give him time. Anything, anything for a "united left wing," that is, anything and everything but a genuine left winger.

Robinson Case

World-Telegram headline: "OGPU To Hunt For Robinson." As it should be written: "To Hunt OGPU For Robinson."

Union Vigilance Necessary Against Employers' Offensive

By Manny Mills

As the time for renewal of contracts in most of the large industries rapidly approaches, the capitalist class is preparing to systematically smash the American labor movement which has grown so swiftly in the last year. The aggressive spirit of the bosses has been stimulated by the victory over the workers in Little Steel. Simultaneously, the defeat of the steel workers has resulted in the loss of that spirit of invincibility which has led the workers through so many successful struggles in the past. Moreover, the steel strike exposed Roosevelt's treachery to such an extent, that many narrow-minded capitalists have finally learned that not only is Roosevelt a vicious enemy of labor, but that he is by far the cleverest and smoothest defender of capitalism that has yet entered the White House. With such a bright picture before them, the bosses see nothing which can prevent them from successfully taking away all of the worker's recent gains.

There are many indications that the capitalists, in their drive to annihilate the labor movement, are proceeding in accordance with a well prepared plan. More than likely one step of the plan is to crowd the agenda of the National Labor Relations Board to such an extent that the Board will become hopelessly unable to cope with so great a volume of cases. Meanwhile, with the class collaborationist labor leaders martyring the Board and upholding the sanctity of a contract, capital will silently push its drive further by provoking small strikes in such a way that the near-sighted labor leaders will help break

them.

In order to see such a tactic in operation, we need only refer to the recent scuffle in Flint. There the bosses, in spite of a sacred contract, had discriminated to such a degree that it became necessary for the rank and file to call "wildcat strikes" in order to halt them.

Instead of converting these "wildcat strikes" into a general unified and effective protest, Homer Martin has joined hands with the bosses in strike breaking.

In this fashion the ground is being broken for the bosses' next move; namely, to push forth a decisive and final showdown with the union. In the case of General Motors, the corporation, knowing that the ranks of the union have been thinned, will proceed to a thorough and concentrated strike-breaking campaign during the struggle for a new contract. The degree of success which GM attains will, no doubt, determine the policy which the other corporations will adopt.

Whether or not the capitalist class will win in this intensive drive to crush the labor movement depends upon the alertness of the union rank and file. It is quite obvious that if strike-breaking by the leadership is permitted to continue, nothing short of disaster will be the result. If, on the other hand, the rank and file comes to a realization of its own intelligence, and it proceeds to meet the bosses in a fighting and uncompromising fashion, then the labor movement will once more be awakened to the militancy which, in the past, has carried it through so many brilliant victories.