

**HOW
RUSSIA
SMASHED
ITS
FIFTH
COLUMN!**

By

1/-

L. H. GOULD AND W. A. WOOD, B.A.

With an Account also of the Fifth Column
in Australia and Other Lands.

82

How Russia Smashed Its Fifth Column

By

L. H. GOULD AND W. A. WOOD, B.A.

Published by
CURRENT BOOK DISTRIBUTORS
14 Rawson Chambers
Sydney

Phone - - MA 5663

Registered at the G.P.O., Sydney, for transmission by post as a Book.

CONTENTS

	Page
How Russia Smashed Its Fifth Column	2
Fifth Column in Other Lands	22
Appendices:	
Definition of "Fifth Column"	35
Definition of "Trotskyism"	35
Lenin on Trotsky	36
Trotsky's Courage	37
Psychology and Murder	39
Bukharin—"A Cross Between a Fox and Swine"	39
Bukharin Plots in 1918	41
From His Last Plea	43
Bukharin Is Interrupted	44
Bukharin Confesses	44
Lady Paget—"Philanthropist"	45
Murder of Maxim Gorky	46
"Not a Spy"	49
Krestinsky Pleads "Not Guilty"	51
Trotsky and General von Seeckt	53
Unearthing a Provocateur 27 Years After	54
More on Trotsky and the German General Staff	57
Traitor Generals	58
Radek Torments the G.P.U.	61
No Shouting Match with Radek	61
Handing Over Russia to the Fascists	64
Trotsky Negotiates with Hess	66
Wrecking and Murder	67

FOREWORD

By L. Harry Gould and W. A. Wood, B.A.

In this pamphlet two responsible officials of their respective organisations, the Communist Party and State A.L.P., have combined to tell the story of how the Soviet Union smashed its Fifth Column.

Although they belong to different sections of the Australian Labor Movement, they thought it right to join in exposing those Fifth Column activities which are a menace, not only to their two Parties, but to the entire Labor Movement and to the nation as a whole.

They believe they have provided an instance of unity in action which should become general in the Labor Movement of this country.

INTRODUCTION

To turn from the heroic deeds of Moscow and Stalingrad to tell the story of the Russian Fifth Column is like putting aside Homer's "Iliad" to study the details of a rat-hunt.

Only with the deepest revulsion can one begin an investigation of the foulest conspiracy in all human history, and yet it must be done. The rout of the Trotsky-Bukharin-Zinoviev gangsters was an essential preliminary to the defeat of Hitler's armies in the field. Had it not taken place Russia would to-day be a slave State. Her vast territories and resources would be mobilised behind Hitler's attacks on the British Isles. Her constituent republics would be held down by representatives of the "vile race of Quislings" who strut and fret in the smaller capitals of Europe; in Moscow a Russian Petain, posing as a "Leftist," would be flogging a spirited people into subjection to Hitler's will. In the Soviet Far East a small holding force would be garrisoning the territories ceded to Japan by Trotsky's agents, while the powerful Japanese Kwantung Army, virtually intact, streamed away to ravage new lands in the South-West Pacific.

Australian homes are tranquil and Australian cities unscathed only because, five years ago, Stalin and his comrades in the Russian Government broke and utterly destroyed the gang of atrocious criminals appointed by Hitler as his advance guard in the seizure of Soviet Russia. It therefore befits Australians to know something of this episode so vital to their own destiny. But it is also essential that we should learn from it how to deal with one of the most potent weapons of the Axis Powers. The Russian Fifth Column was Hitler's first; it was merely part of a world-wide organisation which has yet to be tackled in a businesslike way.

It is reported that at an early stage Hitler divided all the nations of the world into two categories—those who could be taken by military assault alone and those which would require a preliminary softening by a carefully planted and nourished Fifth Column. Undoubtedly Australia fell into the second category; and can it be claimed that we have beyond doubt cleansed our soil of what he has sown here?

There is enough evidence of the contrary to suggest that we must still be on our guard. We must take pains to inform ourselves fully of how the Fifth Column works and, in particular, that part of it which in all countries chooses a "Leftist" disguise even if it does not always acknowledge the parentage of the nefarious Trotsky.

—THE AUTHORS.

How Russia Smashed Its Fifth Column

ATTEMPT TO SHOOT STALIN.

Down by the Red Square, beside the Tverskaya, Street of Gorky, and the Bolshoi Theatre in Sverdlov Square, the House of the Trade Unions was ablaze with banners.

With them, slogans that stirred the hearts of millions: "Proletari fsih stran, soedinyaites!" "Proletarier aller Lander, vereinigt Euch!" "Proletariens de tous les pays, unissez-vous!" "Workers of all lands, unite!"

It was August, 1935. One could not but wonder if even in the famous many-pillared Hall of Columns in this historic building had there ever been a more momentous gathering than that which was now in session.

Here was the old Nobles' Club of Tsarist Russia. Here the rank and file of the Moscow Bolsheviki, in the early days of the Revolution, showered angry scorn on Rykov and Nogin, delegates who had resigned from the first Soviet Government under the impact of enemy onslaught. Here, six years later, lay the body of the first Soviet Premier, Lenin, while tens of thousands filed past. . . . Here, in later years, were held many vital conferences, demonstrations, tournaments, trials—the arraignment, for example, of the Vickers' engineers in 1933, when State Prosecutor A. Y. Vishinsky built up an unanswerable case against wreckers and saboteurs.

In this hot August day of 1935 an historic gathering was assembled, the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International. As ever in the Comintern, world revolution was the goal on the horizon, but as practical men these delegates, representing every Communist Party in the world, saw a far more immediate need—the urgent necessity of organising a broad people's front in every country, and between countries, against the new and greatest menace the world had ever known—Hitlerite Germany.

Germany's No. 1 anti-Nazi, the Hamburg waterside worker Ernst Thaelmann, had already been in a German gaol for more than two years. In his absence he was elected honorary chairman of the great Congress.

Tough, hard-bitten revolutionaries from every land were there, many in disguise from Fascist-Government territories. General Secretary-designate George Dimitrov, from Bulgaria, hero of the Reichstag trial; Thorez and Marty and Cachin of France; Ercoli of Italy; Kuusinen of Finland; Pieck and Florin of Germany; Diaz and Pasionaria, the "Red Passion Flower," of Spain; Gottwald of Czechoslovakia; Foster and Browder of the United States; Tim Buck of Canada; Sharkey and Docker of Australia; Pollitt and Gallacher and Campbell and Dutt of Britain. . . . Leaders of

powerful working-class movements, some in Parliament, all united in planning the broadest possible united people's front against Hitlerism, against fascism and war.

And, of course, the Soviet delegation, headed by Stalin and Manuilsky, representing the Comintern's largest national group, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

At the back of the hall a grim-faced man, Ilya Israelovich Kruglyansky, alias Fritz David, gripped with clammy fingers a Browning revolver in his coat pocket, pointed it at Stalin as the Soviet leader exchanged a word with the Scottish delegate, Campbell, on the Presidium. A swirl of delegates put the would-be assassin out of range. His nerve shaken, he retreated with discreet haste out of the Congress hall.

In the same building, exactly a year later, Fritz David, in his confession, told the Soviet Supreme Court that he had acted on the orders of the Nazis, working together with the Trotskyists.

TROTSKY PLANS MURDER.

In December, 1934, a few months before the Comintern Congress incident, Stalin's close colleague Kirov had been murdered in Leningrad. This atrocity came as a brutal shock to thousands of Soviet officials who had become somewhat "dizzy with success," complacent, and inclined to believe that the enemies of Soviet power had retreated.

The investigations revealed an elaborate conspiracy, without mass basis but including high officials, to undermine the Soviet regime and to murder its leaders. The hands of the exiled Trotsky, whose name loomed large in 1917 as an "ultra-revolutionary" and demagogue, was clearly seen. Less clearly at that stage was suspected the complicity of Zinoviev and Kamenev, the two members of the 1917 Central Committee who voted against the armed uprising of November, but who occupied prominent positions in the years that followed.

When Zinoviev and Kamenev were brought to trial in August, 1936, in open court in the presence of the entire foreign press and diplomatic corps, graphic and sinister details were revealed. These showed that Trotsky, in blind hatred of Stalin and the other Soviet leaders, who were successfully proving the possibility of building a new Socialist order even amid capitalist encirclement, conspired with Nazis and other fascists against the Soviet Union.

At the Zinoviev-Kamenev trial on August 20, 1936, the Trotskyist, Berman-Yurin, confessed to a conversation with Trotsky's son, Sedov, who gave him Trotsky's instructions to set up Trotskyist groups in strict secrecy in the Soviet Union, in small groups not connected with each other, so that the discovery of one group would not expose the whole organisation.

Berman-Yurin told the Court how he met Trotsky in Copenhagen, Denmark, at the end of November, 1932. Trotsky said to him: "The principal question is the question of Stalin. Stalin

must be physically destroyed." Trotsky added that other means of struggle were ineffective. It was also necessary to assassinate Kaganovich and Voroshilov.

"During the conversation," said Berman-Yurin, "Trotsky nervously paced up and down the room and talked of Stalin with exceptional hatred." Berman-Yurin gave the name of Fritz David as a man who might be able to commit a terrorist act against Stalin on behalf of Trotsky.

Fritz David told the Court how he met Sedov and, later, Trotsky in Denmark, at the end of 1932.

Vyshinsky: During the meeting with Trotsky was there talk of terrorism?

Fritz David: Yes . . . on Trotsky's initiative.

Trotsky favored a defeatist attitude to be taken up by his followers in the Soviet Union in the event of war. "Trotsky stressed the point that there is a closer prospect of the Trotskyists coming to power—the prospect of the physical removal of Stalin."

"Trotsky proposed that I should go to the Soviet Union and personally commit a terrorist act, without the aid of others," said Fritz David. "Trotsky told me that this affair involved risk, and there was no point in exposing the Trotskyist organisation in the U.S.S.R. to that risk. The second instruction was to the effect that this terroristic act was to be committed at an international assembly. This shot, as Trotsky put it, was to echo throughout the world.

"Trotsky instructed me to behave in the U.S.S.R. in such a way as not to show any deviations from the general line of the Communist Party . . . and under no circumstances to reveal the threads after the terroristic act was committed."

Fritz David arrived in the U.S.S.R. in March, 1933, and made various attempts to attend meetings at which Stalin was present. Finally he obtained entry to the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern, July-August, 1935.

Vyshinsky: So you gained entry to the Congress.

Fritz David: Yes, I was at the Congress.

Vyshinsky: Why was the terroristic act not committed?

Fritz David: The indictment states quite correctly that I was not able to get near Stalin. . . ." (See Appendix.)

TROTSKY-ZINOVIEV BLOC.

On the morning of August 20, 1936, in the presence of the foreign press, L. B. Kamenev made his public confession on the murder of Kirov and other terroristic acts aimed at Stalin and the Soviet Government.

"The terrorist conspiracy," said Kamenev, "was organised and guided by myself, Zinoviev and Trotsky. I became convinced that the policy of the Party, the policy of its leadership, had been victorious in the only sense in which political victory in the land of Socialism is possible, that this policy was recognised by the masses of the toilers. Our banking on the possibility of a split in the Party also proved groundless. We counted on the Right

group of Rykov, Bukharin and Tomsy. The removal of this group from the leadership and the fact that it had become discredited in the eyes of the toiling masses deprived us of this trump card as well.

"It was no use counting on any kind of serious internal difficulties to secure the overthrow of the leadership which had guided the country through extremely difficult stages, through industrialisation and collectivisation.

"Two paths remained: either honestly and completely to put a stop to the struggle against the Party, or to continue this struggle, but without any hope of obtaining any mass support whatever, without a political platform, without a banner, that is to say, by means of individual terrorism. We chose the second path.

"In this we were guided by our boundless hatred of the leaders of the Party and of the country, and by a thirst for power with which we were once so closely associated and from which we were cast aside by the course of historical development."

Kamenev added that the followers of Zinoviev and himself decided to make common cause with Trotsky (through his followers Smirnov and Mrachkovsky) "because Trotsky's instructions on terrorism coincided with our own inclinations. We concluded what is here called a 'bloc,' but which should be called a narrow terrorist conspiracy. This conspiracy took shape in 1932 as an organisation which had no platform at all, and which set itself the aim of seizing power by disorganising the Government by terrorist means, by assassinating Stalin, as leader of the Party and the country, as well as his nearest comrades-in-arms."

Vyshinsky: Was the assassination of Kirov directly the work of your hands?

Kamenev: Yes. The centre of the conspiracy consisted of myself, Zinoviev, Evdokimov, Bakayev and Kuklin, for the Zinovievites; and Smirnov, Mrachkovsky and Ter-Vaganyan for the Trotskyites. . . . Knowing we might be discovered, we designated a small group to continue our terrorist activities. We designated Sokolnikov. It seemed to us that on the side of the Trotskyists this role could be successfully performed by Serebryakov and Radek. . .

"In 1932, 1933 and 1934 I personally maintained relations with Tomsy and Bukharin and sounded their political sentiments. They sympathised with us.

Vyshinsky: What can we call the articles and statements you wrote in 1933, in which you expressed loyalty to the Party? Deception?

Kamenev: Worse than deception.

Vyshinsky: Treachery?

Kamenev: Worse.

Vyshinsky: Worse than deception, worse than treachery—find the word. Treason?

Kamenev: You have found the word.

Vyshinsky: Accused Zinoviev, do you confirm this?

Zinoviev: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Treason, treachery, double-dealing?

Zinoviev: Yes.

"Our differences with Trotsky after the Fifteenth Congress," said Zinoviev, "when Trotsky used the word 'treachery' in relation to myself and Kamenev, were really slight zig-zags, petty disagreements. We committed no treachery whatever against Trotsky at that time, but committed one more act of treachery against the Bolshevik Party to which we belonged."

Vyshinsky: Did you and Smirnov designate the persons against whom terrorism was to be directed in the first instance? Is it true that these persons were Comrade Stalin, Comrade Kirov and Comrade Voroshilov?

Zinoviev: That was the central question.

LINK WITH NAZIS.

Vyshinsky asked the Trotskyist terrorist, Olberg: Connection between the German Trotskyists and the German police—was that systematic?

Olberg: Yes, it was systematic and it was done with Trotsky's consent. . . . My connection was established with the sanction of Trotsky.

Vyshinsky: Your personal connection with whom?

Olberg: With the Fascist secret police.

Vyshinsky: You yourself admit connection with the Gestapo?

Olberg: I do not deny this. In 1933 there began organised systematic connection between the German Trotskyists and the German fascist police.

Another terrorist, Nathan Lurye, told the Court of his career as a German Trotskyist, and his association in the Soviet Union with Franz Weitz, who, he said, "was a member of the Nazi Party." He arrived in the Soviet Union on the instructions of Himmler, who at that time was chief of the German S.S. (Black Guards) and later became chief of the Gestapo. Franz Weitz arrived in the U.S.S.R. on the instructions of Himmler for the purpose of committing terroristic acts.

"I arrived at the conclusion," said Nathan Lurye, "that, since the Trotskyists had adopted the method of fighting with arms, this had its logic, that is to say that if a fascist offered his services for the purposes of terrorism, those services should be made use of. I continued my connections with Franz Weitz and worked under his practical guidance."

Lurye told how for months he tried to shadow Voroshilov's car with the intention of shooting the Marshal with a revolver or hurling a bomb. The car travelled too fast, however, for Lurye to think there was a chance of committing this terroristic act. He said he planned to murder the Commissars for Heavy Industry and

Railways, Orjonikidze and Kaganovich, and, later, in January, 1936, he was instructed to shoot Kirov's successor in Leningrad, Zhdanov, at the First of May demonstration. He took part in the march through Uritsky Square, armed with a medium Browning revolver, but could not get near enough to shoot at Zhdanov.

TRAITORS CONFESS.

First of the accused to make his final plea was Mrachkovsky, a man well known for desperate physical courage and mental instability, who told how in 1923 he had been lured by Trotsky into a campaign against the Communist Party, first by political intrigue, then by terrorism.

"Some may say," said Mrachkovsky, "that the Party gave no help; it might have been possible perhaps to wrest this fellow from counter-revolution and save him, but the Party took no measures. That would not be true. The Party did all it could to tear me away from counter-revolution. The Party helped me and helped me a great deal.

"Let everybody remember that not only a general, not only a prince or nobleman can become a counter-revolutionary; even workers or those who spring from the working-class, like myself, can also become counter-revolutionaries. I depart as a traitor to my Party, as a traitor who should be shot. All I ask is that I be believed when I say that during the investigation I spat out all this vomit."

"I, together with Zinoviev and Trotsky," said Kamenev, in his final plea, "was the organiser and leader of a terrorist plot which planned and prepared a number of terroristic attempts on the lives of the leaders of the Government and the Party, and which carried out the assassination of Kirov.

"For ten years, if not more," added Kamenev, "I waged a struggle against the Party, against the Government of the land of the Soviets, and against Stalin personally. In this struggle, it seems to me, I used every weapon in the political arsenal known to me—open political discussion, attempts to penetrate into factories and works, illegal leaflets, secret printing presses, deception of the Party, the organisation of street demonstrations, conspiracy, and, finally, terrorism."

Kamenev told how the conspirators took advantage of the clemency of the Soviet leaders, their reluctance to be ruthless with political opponents if it could be avoided.

"The proletarian revolution allowed us a period of time for our political struggle which no other revolution gave its enemies. The bourgeois revolution of the 18th century gave its enemies weeks and days, and then destroyed them. The proletarian revolution gave us ten years in which to reform and to realise that we were in error.

"Three times I was reinstated in the Party. . . . After all the mistakes I had committed I was entrusted with responsible missions and posts. This is the third time I am facing a proletarian court on the charge of terroristic intentions, designs and actions.

"Twice my life was spared. But there is a limit to everything, there is a limit to the magnanimity of the proletariat, and that limit we have reached. I ask myself," said Kamenev, "is it an accident that alongside myself and Zinoviev, Evdokimov, Bakayev and Mrachkovsky are sitting agents of foreign secret police departments, with dubious biographies and undoubted connections with the Gestapo? No! it is not an accident. We are sitting here side by side with the agents of the foreign secret police, because our weapons were the same.

"Thus we served fascism, thus we organised counter-revolution against socialism, prepared, paved the way for the interventionists. Such was the path we took, and such was the pit of contemptible treachery and all that is loathsome into which we have fallen."

NO FAITH IN THE WORKERS.

One reason, though certainly not an excuse, for the defeatist attitude of a number of the conspirators was their lack of confidence in the ability of the toiling masses of Russia to overcome every difficulty. The leaders of Communism—Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin—had a thousand times expressed their "unshakeable faith" in the workers, the capacity for the toilers for organisation, discipline, readiness to sacrifice, their "historic initiative." But not the Trotskyists. "Socialism in one country is an impossibility," was the Trotskyist formula. The logic of this illogicality led to opposition to the Party, and eventually to the criminal dock. Hear Radek:

"And so, if in 1933 or 1934 we proceeded from the assumption that defeat was inevitable, and considered it necessary to assist this fact, so as to get something out of it, we now saw that the idea of the destruction of the U.S.S.R. by western fascism and by the military-fascist circles in the east, which Trotsky took as his starting point, was now, from the standpoint of objective reality a fantasy, that all the conditions for victory existed. And so, in connection with this the question was bound to arise with us: in order that we might come to power—let the country be defeated! In 1934 we took defeat as our starting point, as a necessary fact. But in 1935 every one of us was bound to say to himself—if you are ready to do that you are thwarting a possible victory, which is already assured, even if against you. While in 1933 and 1934 we considered economic retreat as something necessitated by circumstances, as something essential for the country, and not only in order that we might come to power, we now saw that the country had emerged from its chief difficulties and that the Five-Year Plan had suc-

ceeded, not only in the fact that it had built factories, but because it had become a live reality."

Vyshinsky: And what was the conclusion?

Radek: And therefore the conclusion: restoration of capitalism in the circumstances of 1935. For nothing at all—just for the sake of Trotsky's beautiful eyes—the country was to return to capitalism. When I read this I felt as if it were a madhouse.

TROTSKYISM IS FASCISM.

"I want to say again," said Zinoviev, "that I admit that I am fully and completely guilty. I am guilty of having been an organiser of the Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc second only to Trotsky, the bloc which set itself the aim of assassinating Stalin, Voroshilov and a number of other leaders of the Party and the Government. I plead guilty to having been the principal organiser of the assassination of Kirov.

"The Party saw where we were going, and warned us," said Zinoviev. "Stalin, Voroshilov, Orjonikidze, Dzerzhinsky and Mikoyan did all they could to persuade us, to save us. Scores of times they said to us: you may do an enormous harm to the Party and the Soviet Government, and you yourself will perish in doing so. But we did not heed these warnings. We entered into an alliance with Trotsky.

"My defective Bolshevism became transformed into anti-Bolshevism, and through Trotskyism I arrived at fascism. Trotskyism is a variety of fascism, and Zinovievism is a variety of Trotskyism."

So Zinoviev, demagogic agitator, flamboyantly glittering pamphleteer and politician, whose name once rang around the world, ended his career in the dock with thugs and thieves, avowed gangsters and professional cut-throats, Trotskyist tools of fascism. "Believe me, citizens judges, if I say that I suffered the greatest punishment, greater than anything that awaits me, when I heard the testimony of Nathan Lurye and the testimony of Oldberg. I felt and understood that my name will be associated with the names of those who stood beside me. On my right hand Oldberg, on my left—Nathan Lurye . . . Nazi agents. Trotskyism has found its own level."

PHANTASY: A PETAIN IN MOSCOW!

The Germans are within 30 miles of Moscow. The whole population is rallying to the front. Russia has suffered grievous losses, but has yet a fine military organisation intact. It all hangs on the question, Will Russian morale hold?

To the world anxiously waiting on the wires the news burst like a bombshell. Marshal Tukhachevsky, Commander-in-Chief of the Red Army, has seized the Kremlin! With him are seven other high generals, including Marshal Gamarnik, chief of the Army

political commissars. It is announced that Stalin, Voroshilov, Molotov, Timoshenko and other Government leaders are under arrest. A new provisional Government has been established, headed by those old stalwarts of the Revolution—Rykov, Kamenev and Zinoviev. Trotsky, "organiser of the Red Army," is hurrying back to Russia—he has undertaken to "save the nation" once more as he claims he did in the dark days of 1919-21.

The world is reassured. This looks like business! The cumbersome Stalin bureaucracy has clearly broken down under pressure. Here are democratic masses of Russia rising to break the Stalin misrule!

Russia, however, is confused and divided. Most people, it is quickly established, are ready to denounce the insurrectionaries as traitors. But others point to the undoubted probity and the well-tried sincerity of the putschists. Tukhachevsky—is he not a brilliant general and devoted revolutionary? The political leaders are well known; and in addition to the central figures the new Government includes Yagoda, head of the G.P.U.; Bukharin, brilliant if erratic theoretician; Radek, the foreign affairs expert, ex-editor of Pravda. These prove that the Government is devoted as ever to the cause of world revolution. But the practical business executives are with it too—there is Pyatakov, Vice-Commissar for Heavy Industry; Rosengoltz, Commissar for Trade; Grinko, Commissar for Finance; with high foreign office officials such as Sokolnikov, Rakovsky (formerly of the London Embassy), and Krestinsky, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Why, even Tomsy, Trade Union leader, opposite number of Sir Walter Citrine in England, stands in with them!

The head of the G.P.U. in the Far East declares his support of the new Government. He is followed by the head of the Leningrad police and by a handful of high business executives and railways managers.

The new Government issues a proclamation declaring its intention to save the nation and to place on trial those responsible for "opening the front" to the German enemy.

Despite the turmoil in Russia there is general rejoicing in the allied world. From New York, Eugene Lyons proclaims that the Old Bolsheviks have come into their own again. In Sydney the "Century" and the "Bulletin" gloat over the consummation of the policy they advocated. More cautious newspapers pay tribute to Trotsky's much-touted "idealism" and to his ability as an organiser.

But what is the next announcement of the "Provisional Government"? Something like this: "Comrades, it is no longer possible to carry on the struggle. The country has been ruined and weakened by the excesses of the Stalin regime with its premature adventure into Socialism in one country. It is not the Government's intention to pursue the Imperialist war which, after all, was being waged only in the interests of British and American capitalism. Envoys have been sent to discuss peace terms with the Germans."

Peace terms are quickly announced. Russia is to be partitioned on the model of France and Quisling Europe. The Ukraine will be constituted as a separate nation under the Presidency of Hetman Skoropadsky, Hitler's nominee. A former Premier, Lyubchenko, friend of Trotsky, will serve him as Premier. In the Far East the Amur region and the maritime provinces have been ceded to Japan, which had just commenced an invasion. Other parts of Russia will be incorporated directly in the Reich. However, Hitler, most "magnanimous of conquerors," will consent to leave a large section of "unoccupied Russia" in return for trade concessions.

The Trotsky Government issues a further proclamation:

"Russian workers, it has become necessary to make a temporary retreat from socialism pending the world revolution. The industrialisation plans of the criminal Stalin will therefore be suspended. The collective farms will be broken up. German concerns will take over some of our big plants under a scheme of controlled capitalism. . . . Workers of the World! Down with the Imperialist war!"

Must we pursue the nightmare further? It is based on fact. Every detail of it is contained in the material brought to light by the treason trials, in the published works of Trotsky or in the slogans used to-day by the British and Australian Trotskyists. The Russian traitors had promised to do for Hitler exactly what the French traitors did for him.

It is all there, down to the smallest details.

Here is Chernov, People's Commissar for Agriculture in the Ukraine, describing in Court how he was smitten with doubts as to the wisdom of collectivising agriculture. He had mentioned his doubts to many people, including Lenin's old enemy, Rykov, Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars. Rykov persuaded him that it's the Government's fault—that the Government must be overthrown, by a conspiracy. Chernov had to make a trip abroad for health reasons, and called on Rykov in Moscow to see if he had "any messages" for their friends in Germany. Rykov put him in touch with Dan, an exiled Russian anti-Bolshevik, and asked him to spread slanderous stories about the Soviet regime in the foreign press.

In Germany he interviewed Dan, who tells him that they cannot hope to get or maintain power in Russia without the help of capitalist States. "I, as a member of a Right organisation which was combating the Soviet power, should help the capitalist States in their struggle against the Soviet power, inasmuch as our aims coincided."

He left to return to Russia, but is arrested by the Gestapo on the way back. They repeat to him the substance of his conversation with Dan, proving that Dan is already a German agent. They pointed out that there is nothing for Chernov but to become a German agent, too. He struggles for a bit, but is firmly enmeshed. "Seeing how upset I was, Col. Oberhaus said: 'There is no need

to get upset. You are fighting the Soviet power and so are we, and even our methods of fighting will very like coincide in the near future.'"

Chernov returns to Russia, where his promotion to the position of Union Commissar for Agriculture gave him abundant opportunities for carrying out the German instructions, while at the same time removing him still further from suspicion. Together with other members of the German spy ring in the U.S.S.R. he worked out detailed plans of sabotage in the countryside. Seeds were wrongly labelled, crop rotation was scheduled so as to lead to the lowest yields, anti-anthrax serum for horses was withheld, over 25,000 of them perishing; pigs were infected with erysipelas and plague, cattle killed off like flies.

This story was repeated with variations dozens of times in the course of their trials.

The object of the conspirators in agriculture, industry, transport was to get every peasant and every worker "hopping mad" with the Government and ready to welcome the German invaders.

"TIME" MAKES AN ESTIMATE.

"If the Germans are able to send shirts, flashlights, bicycles, shoes, radios, etc., into Russia in large quantities, most peasants, and probably workers, will be satisfied to live under German domination.

"... All this produces a situation where any foreign invader who is able to feed the people, at least as well as the Bolsheviks—not a high standard—and give them a few consumer goods will be able to run the country without serious political difficulties."

So said a special correspondent of "Time" on July 7, 1941. In suggesting that the defenders of Stalingrad and Leningrad could be wooed to Nazism by the offer of a few flash lamps and bicycles the correspondent was not picturing Russia as it was, but as the Trotskyists hoped to make it (and actually thought they had made it) by a few years of sabotage.

How closely the military coup was intended to resemble that carried out by Petain was revealed at the trials. Vyshinsky recalled how Trotsky had written: "We must restore the tactics of Clemenceau . . . who rose against the French Government at a time when the Germans were 80 miles from Paris." The accused Pyatakov testified that during a conversation with Trotsky he undertook "during the war waged by Germany against the U.S.S.R. to take up a defeatist position and intensify diversionist activities, particularly in enterprises of importance for the defence of the country."

Further, he was "to act on Trotsky's instructions, which were adopted on agreement with the German General Staff."

As to what was to happen after the capitulation Sokolnikov,

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

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

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

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

Trotsky writes:

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

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

Such were the conspirators' plans.

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

U.S. AMBASSADOR UNDERSTOOD IT ALL—LATER.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Trotskyism is a department of fascism.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I. 1890's.

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

Right Opposition: Long live the Czar!

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

Combined Opposition policy: Lay off the Czar!

II. 1903.

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

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

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

Combined policy: No Bolshevism!

III. 1912.

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

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

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

Combined Opposition: Wreck the Bolshevik organisation.

IV. 1925-28.

Stalin: Let's build Socialism in Russia.

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

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

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

V. TO-DAY.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LENIN ON SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY.

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

But years before the Revolution, Lenin wrote:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LOUD LEFTIST TALK

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fifth Column in Other Lands.

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

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

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

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

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

CHINA'S TROTSKYISTS.

China also. In the years before Japan's full-scale war on China, Chiang Kai-shek waged many campaigns to exterminate the growing Chinese Soviets. An "anti-Bolshevik" society was started, and one of its most important functions was the organization of Trotskyist espionage and provocation. A good account is given in Agnes Smedley's "China's Red Army Marches."

Trotskyist treachery continued into the period when United China faced the Japanese invaders. In 1937 Chiang and the Kuo Ming tang were finally compelled to unite with the Communist Party of China for the great patriotic war of national liberation. But Trotskyist provocation continues as before.

Map Tse tung, national chairman of the Communist Party, has described how Trotskyists in the free territories masquerade as ardent champions of the united struggle for freedom, but that wherever the Japs set foot in a town or village the Trotskyists act as informers. Thousands of Chinese Communist and other patriots have been betrayed to the hated foe by these scoundrels.

FRANCE.

These are a few examples of many from recent history. The Second World War is full of other examples. As Hitler's armies advanced over half a dozen countries, they were helped by Fifth Columnists, Quislings, Laval, in Nazi pay or under Nazi influence. France, not many years ago the greatest military power in the world, was defeated in a few weeks. It was not primarily a defeat by military means. The Nazis won because they had their own agents in the very government of France.

Andre Simone, leading Paris journalist, in "J'Accuse," describes Petain as the general who in 1917 sent French armies to slaughter against the Kaiser's machine-gunners, without sufficient support; then suppressed the resulting mutiny by having each tenth man shot. In 1925, in suppressing the Riff risings in Morocco, Petain became the patron of Colonel De La Roque, France's No. 1 fascist undisguised; the old Marshal became the hero of De La Roque's terrorist-fascist armed band, "the Croix de Feu." He became intimately associated with Laval.

When General Franco and his generals, with German and Italian support, launched armed rebellion against the Spanish Government in 1936, Petain was Franco's most outspoken supporter in France. When Franco became Spanish Dictator, Petain was the first French Ambassador. In Spain he became firm friends with the Nazi Ambassador, von Stohrer. Petain shocked many when, a month after France and Germany clashed in the Second World War, he warmly shook hands with von Stohrer in public. During the entire course of the war he kept contact with the Nazi Ambassador, and at least three times the old marshal forwarded Hitler's separate peace proposals to Paris, with favorable comments added in his own hand. This was the man whom Paul Reynaud made Vice-Premier in May, 1940, after the Nazi Army had broken through the French lines at Sedan. With him into the French

Cabinet went other Ministers who "feared a Hitler defeat more than a Hitler victory." The Fifth Column, like the Trojan Horse of old, had been wheeled inside the Government.

Weygand was one of the guiding spirits of the Cagouards ("hooded men") who plotted to overthrow the democratic Government through terrorism and force of arms.

Simon's editor went to see Premier Daladier in 1933. Weygand told him that the rise of Hitler, directed against Communism, had its advantages for France.

Georges Mandel, who like Churchill succeeded in being a true-blue Tory and a true-blue patriot at one and the same time, describes how the Paris Police Chief, Jean Chiappe, worked hand in glove with the fascist terrorist organisations to overthrow the Government in 1934.

In February, 1934, an armed fascist mob, under the police protection of Chiappe, launched an attack on the House of Parliament. On the night of February 6-7, Daladier told Weygand he needed the Army to help the Government against the "howling mob." Weygand said he could not guarantee that the Army would obey orders. Daladier, terrified, resigned.

About 1938 a Croix de Feu armed plot was discovered to set up a directorate of Petain, Weygand, Chiappe, Doriot.

The last name is particularly interesting. Doriot was an open and avowed supporter of Trotsky, that "revolutionary" who claimed that Stalin should be destroyed because he had "betrayed the world revolution." Thus the Trotskyists once again are seen in the camp of the fascists.

The Fifth Column of France carried its work to completion. Among the final acts of treachery was the dismissal of hundreds of Communists and other democratic mayors of French towns, and their replacement by Cagouards and like fascists.

When the Nazis thrust into the country in May, 1940, these gentry went out to give them an open hearty welcome.

BRITAIN.

The Nazi Foreign Organisation presided over by Rudolf Hess had branches all over the world, Britain included. In August, 1937 (records Elwyn Jones in "Attack from Within"), Hess presented banners to delegates from Nazi groups in countries ranging from Bolivia to Greece, France and Paraguay, Panama and Great Britain, with special honors for leading group functionaries in India, South Africa, Holland, Belgium, Rumania and Egypt, China, Australia and Chile.

For purposes of Nazi organization, writes Jones, Britain was divided into five regions, the chief being the London district whose leaders were directly responsible to Wilhelm Bohle, head of the Berlin office. The organisers were officially designated as jour-

nalists, such as R. G. Rosel, supposed to be London correspondent of the "National Zietung," or else "business men" sheltering in the offices of well-known German firms operating in Britain.

The gang was organised with typical Nazi thoroughness; sooner or later nearly all Germans living in England were confronted with an "invitation" which was not meant to be refused. "We need each individual," said one such letter issued by the German consul at Liverpool, "including you, dear German abroad, you, who are keeping away from the community. Do not evade this urgent reminder. Join up without delay."

By dint of threats addressed to the individuals themselves or to their relatives in Germany, the Nazi crooks rounded up their countrymen for the work of espionage and propaganda. Regular meetings for celebration of German anniversaries or for tuition in Nazi doctrine were held from once to three times a month in all the main cities of Britain. Captured documents reveal that the Central London Nazis would meet at 28 Cleveland Terrace, W2, or at 18 Belgrave Square, SW1. The Liverpool group had a room at the corner of Canning and Bedford Streets, the Manchester gang in Ducie Street, the Sussex branch in a Brighton tea room. Always, attendance was compulsory and members were bidden to wear their party badges when meeting in a "closed room."

Although Bohle's Department was officially incorporated in the German Foreign Office and he therefore claimed official diplomatic protection for his intrigues, the activities of the Nazis could not be wholly ignored even by the Chamberlain Government. In April-May, 1939, Rosel, Lahrmann, the consul in Liverpool, and a handful of others were deported back to Germany. But plenty remained to be rounded up when war broke out in September.

No Quisling or Trotskyist has ever reached cabinet rank in Britain—so far as we know—though the son of the Secretary of State for India is broadcasting from Berlin sentiments about Bolshevism comparable with those which have often been on his father's lips.

Chamberlain was not a wrecker of mines; Halifax did not sell secrets of State to the Nazis; even the late Sir Nevile Henderson, although he loved Goering like a brother, did not operate a Nazi spy ring in Britain. The nearest approach the Nazis could find to a native Fifth Column in Britain was Sir Oswald Mosley's fascists and the more respectable Anglo-German Fellowship. Substantial sections of each were jailed in May, 1940, and little more was heard of either movement, except when reports leaked out of the super-luxurious circumstances in which Sir Oswald was living and of riots staged by blackshirt gorillas in their cage on the Isle of Man. Doubtless the influence of the many still at large persisted, but they could not safely proclaim their belief in Hitlerite "principles." They were thrown severely on the defensive. Thus Lord Londonderry, author of "Ourselves and Germany," had to threaten libel action against rumor-mongers who said that he had been interned. The group of pro-Nazis whom, according to Churchill and Stalin,

Hess tried to contact were probably not all in jail when he arrived (nor are they yet). But they were far removed from the posts of authority held by Petain and his followers in the last days of the Third Republic, or by Zinoviev and Co. at the time of their exposure. Churchill's advent to power had largely removed that particular danger.

How grave it had been at one stage is revealed by a brief study of the Anglo-German Fellowship and the high influence pro-Nazis were able to exercise through it on British policy. In an interview with the "News-Review" (January 23, 1936) the Secretary said that its members were "distinguished representatives of British Big Business who claim Hitler has an unanswerable case."

They planned, he continued, to set up a lavishly-equipped club in London at which Nazism can be preached and ministers of National Socialism feted. (See Ivor Montague, "The Traitor Class.")

"It isn't numbers that matter," the Secretary continued. "We want names. Otherwise how can we influence the Government and the Foreign Office?"

The "names" they got hold of to join in their preaching of Nazism were certainly big enough to cause alarm.

One was the Hon. W. W. Astor, son of Lady Astor of Cliveden, and at that time Parliamentary Private Secretary to the Home Office. Others were Lord Lothian, subsequently sent as Ambassador to Washington, and Wing Commander A. W. H. James, now of the Madrid Embassy, Lord Londonderry, former Air Minister, and Sir Thomas Moore, M.P. Big business representatives were Lord Stamp (later Chief Industrial Adviser to the Government), Lord Nuffield and Lord McGowan, head of the vast Imperial Chemical Industries mammoth, which had about £11,000,000 invested in the German dye trust.

In his book "Night Over Europe," Professor Frederick L. Schumann records that this sinister "Fellowship" had its headquarters in the offices of Unilever, the vast soap combine. "Among its members were the son of Lord Runciman, a director of Lloyd's Bank and Imperial Airways; Andrew Agnew of Shell Oil, Sir Robert Kindersley of the Bank of England and until November, 1938, Lord Mount Temple, its president."

Professor Schumann testifies that the Fellowship was founded on the inspiration of von Ribbentrop, the Nazi Ambassador, who through it was able to get far more substantial results for Hitler than was Bohle through his spy-ring of avowed German Nazis.

In January, 1939, Chamberlain appointed a committee of six to advise the cabinet on armament questions. They included **F. B. Bennett**, a director of I.C.I. (whose German affiliations have already been noted), **D'Arcy Cooper**, president of Unilever, in which the German firm of Schicht brothers were partners, **Geoffrey Clarke**, a prominent member of the Anglo-German Fellowship, director of the Gelegraph and Maintenance Company, linked with

the Siemens company of Germany through Submarine Cables Ltd., and I. A. Addison, president of the rayon trust, who had close contacts with the German Vereinigte Glanstoff-Fabrik.

Just what advice these people tendered to Chamberlain on how to mobilise British industry for a war against Nazism is, of course, an official secret.

Professor Schumann also notes that Bruno von Schroeder of the I. Henry Schroeder Bank was a fellow member with Mr. Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, in the Bankers' Industrial Development Company. He is related to the notorious Kurt von Schroeder who financed Hitler.

It is not surprising to find Professor Schumann commenting that (in 1939) "in British financial and industrial circles hopes of a gentlemanly 'deal' with Hitler refused to die."

Exactly how far the pro-Nazi big business bosses achieved their object of swaying the British Government and Foreign Office cannot be determined. It is undoubted, however, that Hitler was able in one way or another to get from Britain tangible benefits at least equal to those yielded by his Fifth Column in any other country.

For example, Paul Einzig, anti-Soviet editor of "World Finance," records in 1939 that "practically the whole of the free exchange available to Germany for the purchase of raw materials was supplied directly or indirectly by the British Government." Nor did Major Quisling himself do a better job for Hitler than the English gentlemen who on the eve of war opened to him Britain's stores of essential war materials.

"To execute the orders in time, heavy withdrawals were made from stores in the United Kingdom. A third of our stocks of rubber and a quarter of our supplies of nickel have gone and are on their way to Germany. All deliveries had to be made before September 1" (the day when Hitler attacked Poland). "Mr. Burgin, Minister of Supply, had power to ban the deals, but refused to do so." ("Evening Standard," 21/8/39.)

The Anglo-German Fellowship is dead. But its soul is marching on in little groups of individuals who, no longer able openly to praise Nazism or to attack Britain, have to content themselves with attacking Britain's ally, the Soviet Union, and in spreading disruption and defeatism in general. Such an individual is Mr. Kenneth de Courcy of the Imperial Policy Group. He runs a small sheet called the "Review of World Affairs," on which the Sydney "Bulletin" appears to draw heavily. Courcy's group was formed in 1933 by a number of reactionary M.P.'s with the specific object of countering the British electorate's leftward swing. The group took a lively interest in Hitlerism from the start. In 1936 de Courcy undertook a tour of Europe and was received in audience by Mussolini; just prior to the outbreak of war three years later he was again in Rome and also conferred with the Hungarian Premier, Count Teleki. On Russia's entry into the war de Courcy's news-sheet undertook a steady campaign to belittle the Red Army's

prowess and to discourage dispatch of aid to Russia. In June, 1942, he overstepped the bounds of propriety and caution with a statement that Britain could view the Russo-German contest "with a certain measure of detachment."

This roused a storm in the House of Commons in which members of all parties joined, but de Courcy survived it and remains a serious influence for evil; his sheet percolates into officers' messes, Government departments, university common rooms and the House of Commons lobbies.

With him to the death is Lord Phillimore, Chairman of the Friends of Franco Spain, and, later, of Mannerheim's Finland Committee; the dossiers of Lord Mansfield, Victor Raikes, M.P., and Major A. R. Wise, M.P., are similarly lurid in content. None could be convicted of plotting with the enemy, but it is nevertheless uncomfortable for British soldiers to go into battle with such men at large behind their backs.

In such work the Imperial Policy Group has always been able to count on the reactionary Roman Catholic section who have defied Cardinal Hinsley's declaration of full support for the Anglo-Russian alliance. To the Russians and still more to the French Catholics who are united with Communists in the anti-Hitler front, it must be puzzling that the Catholic "Herald" should be allowed publicly to "deplore the Government's spontaneous invitation to the present regime in Russia to be an equal and permanent partner in shaping the new world."

If that is odd, this from the same source is damnable: "Perhaps the disasters to the Allied cause in Russia are not the unmitigated evils they seem." (This was written in the autumn of 1942, when Hitler was advancing to Stalingrad.) To rejoice in Allied disasters, it might be thought, is the province of the Nazi rather than the British press.

As in other countries, the British Trotskyists have formed a valuable "left" claw to the fascist pincer. On the coalfields they have come out into the open; the Trotskyite "Socialist Appeal," complete with pictures of Trotsky, urges the workers to slow down the production of the coal needed to destroy Hitlerism. Today they advocate strikes; tomorrow, if history is any guide, they will plan pit explosions, arson and murder.

Side by side with the reactionary sections of capitalism they fight the production-committee movement which has transformed Britain's war effort since June, 1941.

Mr. Joseph Hall, President of the Yorkshire Miners, said last year that men were getting £10 a week to distribute Trotskyist subversive literature to young miners. For this sort of work Hitler's treasure chest never fails.

While Moore-Brazabon, Lady Astor and the Munichers have been striving to delay the opening of the second front with the frank purpose of weakening Russia, the Trotskyists have done the same under a smokescreen of talk about "bloodbaths in western Europe."

Their most active field of operations, however, has been the Independent Labor Party—a splinter group commanding four to six votes in the House of Commons. Using Trotskyist arguments the I.L.P. opposes the dispatch of aid to Russia; attacks Stalin and naturally enough attacks the British Government for allying itself with Socialist Russia.

For many years the I.L.P. had ranged itself alongside the appeasers and the Anglo-German Fellowship, doing so, of course, under the camouflage of Leftist phraseology. One of its leaders, McGovern, invested Chamberlain with a halo on his return from Munich with the words: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." On the same day Maxton, another of the group, cheered on Hitler. "What objections can you have," he asked, "to Herr Hitler wanting to defend the people of his own race and of his own nation wherever they may be?"

It is natural enough that the group which helped the pro-Hitlerite Chamberlain should fight to the death against the anti-Hitlerite Churchill. "If I had to choose between Hitler and the Prime Minister," said McGovern on July 1, 1942, "I should not know exactly on which the choice had to fall."

While French heroes and martyrs organise strikes against Hitler in France, Trotskyists organise strikes for Hitler in Britain ("Why increase the bosses' profits? Strike now for higher wages.") Whatever will help Hitler's cause in Britain—opposition to the second front, hatred of Stalin, hatred of Communism, attacks on national unity—is the policy of the British Trotskyists.

QUISLING OF NORWAY.

In the smaller countries of Europe, Major Quisling has been in many ways the archetype of the Fifth Columnist.

He became military attache at the Norwegian Embassy in Moscow, 1918, and remained there for a year. He often met Lenin and, says a biographer, "was not entirely unaffected by Communist ideas. He was a close associate of the great Norwegian philanthropist, Fridtjof Nansen, and headed Nansen's relief mission in the Ukraine."

In 1922 he returned to Moscow to resume his old post, which he held until 1929. He was thus a witness of the Soviet's successful emergence from the assault of the interventionist armies and the beginning of the Five Year plans which, he realised, were going to make Soviet Russia a world force.

The prospect filled him with horror and imbued in him a deep dread of Communism which, according to Professor Philip Noel Baker, became one of the dominating motives of his life.

In 1930 he returned to take part in Norwegian politics, wearing a British C.B.E. given him by Ramsay MacDonald's Labor Government for his services to the British while in Moscow. On the death of the staunch democrat Nansen, Quisling decided to rat on the Labor movement and devote his life to fighting Communism. He joined the semi-fascist Agrarian Party. Walter Tschuppik,

himself a bitter anti-Communist, writes: "Politically a Leftist up till then, his politics now assumed a totalitarian character. In answer to an inquiry as to how he could justify such a complete volte-face, Nansen himself always having been very democratic, Quisling declared in March, 1931: 'If you wish to get on you must sail with the wind, not against it.'"

The Nazi wind which Quisling had sniffed rose over Europe. Through Party influence he became Minister of Defence and began his preparations for selling out Norway to the Germans. In April, 1932, a special committee of the Storting was set up to investigate charges that he was collaborating with traitors. But Norway had no Vyshinsky and he escaped conviction.

The scandal, however, was big enough to drive him from office; he then broke with the Agrarians and set up an outright fascist party, the National Union, with a fascist newspaper, the "Free Nation."

He got no mass support (the last Norwegian election gave him 28,000 votes out of 1,241,000), but he got plenty of money from Nazis and wealthy Norwegians to bribe high officers and Government officials.

When the blow fell, Quisling's plans went like clockwork. The guns in Oslo fiord did not go off, mines mysteriously failed to explode, warships received urgent instructions from high naval officers not to resist. Soldiers rallying to the colors found the depots in Nazi hands. In Narvik, Colonel Sundlo, a Quisling appointee, handed over the port to the Germans. The Norwegians had no chance to fight except in the north and within two months the Nazis were supreme in their whole territory.

Such was the bitter price Norway had to pay for her leniency to traitors, for failing to read the lessons which the Moscow treason trials had displayed to the world.

FIFTH COLUMN IN HOLLAND.

The Dutch Mussert was of a similar type and performed a similar service for Hitler. His followers handed over to the Germans the complete plan for the inundation of Holland's famous water defences; they smuggled thousands of Dutch Army uniforms through to Germany. When the crisis came they removed the charges which were to have blown up bridges, railways and petrol tanks; most abominable of all, they turned their German weapons against their fellow countrymen. Tschuppik records that the officer who was to have blown up Rotterdam's vital Moerdyk bridge was shot in the back by a Dutch Quisling.

It is unnecessary to go further into the details of Hitler's Fifth Column, the most monstrous conspiracy ever launched against civilisation. Fresh in the public mind is the Iron Guard's assassination of the Rumanian Premier, Calinescu, to coincide with the arrival of Nazi troops on Rumania's Polish frontier; the activities

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

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

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

AMERICA—FIFTH COLUMNIST EXTRAORDINARY.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IN AUSTRALIA.

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

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

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

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

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDICES.

Excerpts from the reports of Court proceedings in Moscow in 1937-38 in the trials of "The Anti-Soviet Trotskyist Centre" and "The Anti-Soviet Bloc of Rights and Trotskyists."

Other authentic works dealing with the trials are: "Soviet Justice and the Trial of Radek and Others," by Dudley Collard, British barrister; "Moscow in 1937," by Leon Feuchtwanger; and "Mission to Moscow," by ex-Ambassador Joseph E. Davies.

The definitions of "Fifth Column" and "Trotskyism" are taken from "Glossary of Marxist Terms," by L. Harry Gould. Published by Current Book Distributors, Sydney. Price 6d.

DEFINITION OF "FIFTH COLUMN."

FIFTH COLUMN: Organised body in non-Axis country serving as agents for Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese militarist-fascists; the "advance guard of the fascist invasion." Methods are espionage, disruption, support for reaction, wrecking and murder, and preparations to open the gates to the enemy. Most notorious Fifth Columnists are Quisling in Norway, Petain-Laval in France, Degrelle in Belgium, Mussert in Holland, the "Australia First" movement in this country, and the Trotskyists everywhere.

DEFINITION OF "TROTSKYISM."

TROTSKYISM: Named after Trotsky, who was connected with the Russian Labor movement for many years. He and his followers were exposed and crushed as Fifth Columnists in Russia several years ago.

Trotskyism still persists in capitalist countries, and demands constant vigilance and struggle by the Party and all other sections of the Labor movement. Its danger comes from the fact that Trotskyists pose as "Communists," "Marxists," "Revolutionaries," etc., and that some Trotskyists are former Party members which gives them some knowledge of how the Party works. Trotskyism is a very useful weapon in the hands of the capitalists for fighting Communism under the label of "Communism." Trotskyists appear under various labels, such as "The Communist League," "Revolutionary Workers' League," "Labor Socialist Party," "Fourth International," etc.; in the Spanish war a fascist organisation, which directly served Franco, was called the "Party of Marxist Unification" (the notorious "P.O.U.M."). In Australia, U.S.A., Spain, China and everywhere, Trotskyists play the role of provocateurs and police informers.

LENIN ON TROTSKY.

"The old participants in the Marxian movement in Russia know Trotsky's personality very well, and it is not worth while talking to them about it. But the young generation of workers do not know him and we must speak of him, for he is typical of all the five grouplets abroad, which in fact are also vacillating between the liquidators and the Party . . . Trotsky was an ardent Iskra-ist* in 1901-3, and Ryazanov described the part he played at the Congress of 1903 as that of 'Lenin's truncheon.'** At the end of 1903 Trotsky was an ardent Menshevik; i.e., one who deserted the Iskra-ists for the 'Economists'; he proclaimed that 'there is a deep gulf between the old and the new Iskra.' In 1904-5 he left the Mensheviks and began to vacillate, at one time collaborating with Martynov (the 'Economist'), and at another proclaiming the absurdly 'Left' theory of 'permanent revolution.' In 1906-7 he drew nearer to the Bolsheviks, and in the spring of 1907 he declared his solidarity with Rosa Luxembourg.

"During the period of disintegration, after long 'non-factional' vacillations, he again shifted to the Right, and in August, 1912, entered into a bloc with the liquidators. Now he is again abandoning them, repeating, however, what in essence are their pet ideas.

"Such types are characteristic as fragments of the historical foundations of yesterday, when the mass Labor movement of Russia was still dormant and every grouplet was 'free' to represent itself as a tendency, group, faction, in a word a 'great power' talking of uniting with others." (Lenin, "Violation of unity under cover of cries for Unity," Selected Works, Vol. IV., pp. 206-8.)

Note: Lenin's writings dealing with Trotsky abound with such characterisations as: "Trotsky, the hero of the revolutionary phrase"; "sonorous phrase-mongering"; to Maxim Gorky he said: "And yet he (Trotsky) isn't one of us. With us but not of us. He is ambitious. There is something of Lassalle in him, something which isn't good." Lassalle had helped found the Labor movement in Germany and, just like Trotsky, became in the end an agent of the enemy. In 1927, a letter from Lassalle to Bismarck, in which Lassalle is shown clearly to have betrayed the movement, was unearthed in the State Archives in Berlin.

* The old Iskra ("The Spark") was the paper in which Lenin expounded his revolutionary policy. The new Iskra was in the control of the Mensheviks.

** Ryazanov's designation was inexact. On the important question of the Party, Trotsky was already against Lenin at this Congress.

TROTSKY'S COURAGE.

(From the Speech by J. Stalin at the Plenum of the Communist Faction of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, delivered on November 19, 1924.)

Such are the facts:

Some say, Let us admit this. Still it is impossible to deny that Comrade Trotsky fought well at the time of October. Yes, that is true, Comrade Trotsky really fought well during October. But Comrade Trotsky was not the only one who fought well during the period of October; even such people as the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, who then stood shoulder to shoulder with the Bolsheviks, did not fight badly. In general, I must state that during a victorious uprising, when the enemy is isolated and the rebellion is spreading, it is not difficult to fight well. In such moments even backward people become heroes. However, the struggle of the proletariat is not a solid advance, a solid series of successes. The struggle of the proletariat has also its trials, its reverses. Not he who displays courage in the period of a victorious uprising is a genuine revolutionary, but he who, while being able to fight well during the victorious advance of the revolution, is also able to display courage during the period when the revolution is in retreat, when the proletariat is defeated; who does not lose his head and flinch when the revolution meets with setbacks, when the enemy gains successes; who does not become panic-stricken and seized with despair during the period when the revolution is in retreat. The Left Socialist-Revolutionaries did not fight badly in support of the Bolsheviks during October. However, who does not know that these "brave" fighters became panic-stricken during the Brest period, when the advance of German imperialism plunged them into despair and hysterics. It is an extremely sad but undoubted fact that Comrade Trotsky, who fought well during the October period, lacked the courage during the Brest period, the period when the revolution received temporary setbacks, to show sufficient firmness at that difficult moment and not to follow in the footsteps of the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries. Beyond dispute the moment was difficult, it was necessary to display special courage and iron self-control in order not to become confused, to retreat in time, to accept the peace terms in time, to withdraw the proletarian army from the blows of German imperialism, to preserve the peasant reserves, and after thus obtaining a respite to strike at the enemy with renewed vigor. However, Comrade Trotsky unfortunately did not display such courage and such revolutionary firmness at that difficult moment. In the opinion of Comrade Trotsky, the fundamental lesson of the proletarian revolution consists in not having flinched at the time of October. This is wrong, for this assertion of Comrade Trotsky's contains only a fraction of the truth about the lessons of the revolution. The whole truth about the lessons of the proletarian revolution consists in "not flinching" not only in the days when the revolution is

advancing, but also in the days of its retreat, when the enemy is gaining the upperhand and the revolution suffers reverses. The revolution has not been exhausted by October. October is only the beginning of the proletarian revolution. It is bad enough if flinching is evinced during an uprising in the ascendant. It is still worse when there is flinching after the seizure of power when the revolution is undergoing heavy ordeals. To retain power the day after the revolution is no less important than to seize power. If Comrade Trotsky flinched during the Brest period, at a time when our revolution was passing through a severe trial, when matters went almost as far as the surrender of power, he must understand that the October mistakes of Kamenev and Zinoviev had absolutely nothing to do with it.

Such is the case with the legends about the October uprising.

PSYCHOLOGY AND MURDER*

(After the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, messengers from Trotsky's son, Sedov, visited Fritz David on two occasions, and in Sedov's name accused the terrorists of not being sufficiently active and ordered them to speed up the terroristic act in accordance with Trotsky's instructions.)

Vyshinsky: These meetings took place on the basis of your terroristic plans?

Fritz David: These meetings were caused by the fact that the terroristic act was not committed at the Seventh Congress, and this made Sedov furious.

Vyshinsky: But did your terroristic disposition pass away after this, or did it continue until quite recently?

Fritz David: Yes, it continued.

Vyshinsky: Until when?

Fritz David: Until my arrest.

Vyshinsky: So we may sum up. You were a member of the Trotskyite organisation and met Trotsky personally. Trotsky personally commissioned you to go to the U.S.S.R. to commit a terroristic act and warned you to observe strict secrecy. That explains why you made no contacts with any other member of the Trotskyite organisation except Berman-Yurin. Together with Berman-Yurin, who had received analogous instructions, you made preparations for an attempt on the life of Comrade Staling, timing it for the Seventh Congress in 1935. Thanks to the contacts you had in the Comintern you personally gained entry to the Congress in order to commit this act, but you failed to do so owing to circumstances over which you had no control.

Fritz David: I question this last point somewhat, not in order to minimise my guilt, but simply to present the whole picture.

Vyshinsky: Then let's say: owing to objective circumstances? Fritz David: Owing to objective and subjective factors.

Vyshinsky: But you will not deny the charge against you that you failed to commit the act because you could not get nearer to the platform and had no chance to get near Comrade Stalin?

Fritz David: That was one of the reasons.

Vyshinsky: Yes, one of the reasons, but an obvious, objective reason. All the rest is mere psychology.

BUKHARIN—"A CROSS BETWEEN A FOX AND SWINE."

(Bukharin was the leader of "Right Bloc." In his cross-examination by A. Y. Vyshinsky, Bukharin twisted and squirmed, alternately denying and admitting, or half-admitting, the charges preferred against him. It was in the summing-up by Vyshinsky that the phrase—"a cross between a fox and swine"—occurs.)

Vyshinsky: But you were connected with Semyonov?

*From here on are printed relevant sections from the reports of the Trials in Moscow, 1936-38. A. Y. Vyshinsky was State Procurator ("attorney-general") of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Bukharin: Yes, I was connected with him. Rykov knew about this connection because I myself told him about it. Whether this was the form—

Vyshinsky: That is not important. The important thing for me now is to establish whether you were connected with the Socialist-Revolutionary terrorist Semyonov.

Bukharin: That is true, but Semyonov was a member of the Party.

Vyshinsky: You, too, were a member of the Party.

Bukharin: As for Semyonov, I—

Vyshinsky: You defended him?

Bukharin: Yes.

Vyshinsky: You, while being a member not only of the Communist Party but of its Central Committee, organised terrorist acts against the leaders of the Party?

Bukharin: Quite true.

Vyshinsky: Therefore, the fact that Semyonov was formally a member of the Communist Party makes no difference. Were you connected with him as with a Communist or a Socialist-Revolutionary?

Bukharin: I do not think I was connected with him as with a Socialist-Revolutionary but as with a terrorist who sympathised with the Rights.

Vyshinsky: That is why it is no use harping on the fact that he was a member of the Communist Party.

Bukharin: I did not want to minimise my guilt; I wanted to aggravate it.

Vyshinsky: I do not want to aggravate your guilt, I am talking about facts. Were you connected with Semyonov, the Socialist-Revolutionary terrorist; were they terrorist connections?

Bukharin: They did not start as terrorist connections.

Vyshinsky: I am not asking how they started, I am asking what they were at that time.

Bukharin: At that time they were terrorist connections.

Vyshinsky: You had then learnt from Semyonov that preparations were being made for an attempt on the lives of Comrades Stalin and Kaganovich?

Bukharin: No, Rykov is not putting it quite correctly. The position was as follows: Semyonov reported that he had connections with various Socialist-Revolutionary terrorist groups, and as he knew the moods among the Right counter-revolutionary organisations concerning terrorism, he proposed that these connections be utilised.

Vyshinsky: For what purpose?

Bukharin: For terrorist activities.

Vyshinsky: Of what kind?

Bukharin: For terrorist activities against the leadership of the Party.

Vyshinsky: That is?

Bukharin: A number of members of the Political Bureau were mentioned.

Vyshinsky: Including whom?

Bukharin: Including Stalin and Kaganovich.

Vyshinsky: And so, in 1932 you and Semyonov talked about this, that an attempt should be organised on the lives of Comrade Stalin and of Comrade Kaganovich?

Bukharin: I did not say that it should; I am saying what happened.

Vyshinsky: I say that in 1932 you had a talk on this, that an attempt was being prepared on the lives of Comrades Stalin and Kaganovich.

Bukharin: If you formulate it like that, it gives it an absolutely concrete character.

Vyshinsky: Very concrete.

Bukharin: At that time we talked about terrorist acts against the leading men of the Party.

Vyshinsky: Was it a theoretical talk?

Bukharin: No. Organising groups is not a theoretical talk.

Vyshinsky: What did you talk about?

Bukharin: We talked about terrorist plans on the organisation of preparations to carry out this plan against members of the Political Bureau.

Vyshinsky: Including whom?

Bukharin: Including Stalin and Kaganovich.

Vyshinsky: That, then, is concrete.

BUKHARIN PLOTS IN 1918.

Vyshinsky: I have a question to Bukharin. For all that, I am interested in whether you were one of the organisers of the plot against the Soviet power in 1918.

Bukharin: I, Citizen Procurator, gave testimony on this point and had a confrontation in your presence. I stated that I admitted myself—

Vyshinsky: I ask you. If you choose to answer, speak; if you do not, don't reply. I ask you, in 1918 were you one of the organisers of the plot of "Left Communists" and "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries against the Soviet power?

Bukharin: Of the preparation of such a plot, yes.

Vyshinsky: Despite all the questions you have put to witness Yakovleva, this question can be solved thus: that you were one of the organisers of a plot against the Soviet power?

Bukharin: But I am speaking of exact dates and exact facts, and say: Yes, there was a moment when I was a participant in negotiations of a conspiratorial character, undertaken through Pyatakov.

Vyshinsky: How long did this "moment" continue?

Bukharin: It continued for a comparatively short time, for the simple reason—

Vyshinsky: Approximately how long, though?

Bukharin: I think about several months.

Vyshinsky: A moment of your conspiratorial activity in 1918 that continued for several months.

Bukharin: This activity was expressed in negotiations.

Vyshinsky: In negotiations, calculated on success, in preparing all kinds of measures, etc.

With whom specifically did you conduct negotiations about the plot?

Bukharin: I admit two criminal conversations.

The first conversation was with Karelin, Pyatakov and Kamkov prior to the Brest-Litovsk Peace.

Vyshinsky: You consider this conversation a criminal one?

Bukharin: I consider the conversation a criminal one because—

Vyshinsky: Now the following question: Accused Bukharin, do you confirm that you had the intention of placing Comrades Lenin, Stalin and Sverdlov under arrest?

Bukharin: Yes, I confirm it, there was such a moment.

Vyshinsky: Such a plan?

Bukharin: I did not say a plan.

Vyshinsky: Such an intention?

Bukharin: Such an intention.

Vyshinsky: Initiative?

Bukharin: Yes.

Vyshinsky: And who was the initiator of this intention? Was it you?

Bukharin: The initiator of this intention was Trotsky.

Vyshinsky: Did Trotsky commission you with it?

Bukharin: No; our relations were not of the kind that he could commission me with anything.

Vyshinsky: Why then did you accept Trotsky's initiative and begin to put it into effect?

Bukharin: Because there was a certain inclination among the leading group of the "Left Communists" to accept this plan.

Vyshinsky: So you agreed with Trotsky's initiative, and supported his initiative in the question of placing Lenin, Stalin and Sverdlov under arrest, because you yourself had a similar plan?

Bukharin: In the question of negotiations with regard to this with the leading group of the "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries.

Vyshinsky: Was Trotsky the initiator of the idea of placing Lenin, Stalin and Sverdlov under arrest?

Bukharin: Yes, quite right.

Vyshinsky: Did you agree to this?

Bukharin: Yes, quite right.

Vyshinsky: Did you support this?

Bukharin: As a matter of fact I did.

Vyshinsky: And you started negotiations with the "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries about putting this plan into effect, is that right?

Bukharin: Yes, that's right.

Vyshinsky: With the object of forcible overthrow ?

Bukharin: With the object, as Trotsky formulated it at the time, of forming a new Cabinet.

Vyshinsky: A Cabinet?

Bukharin: Yes.

Vyshinsky: At the same time, it was not excluded, of course, that forcible means would be adopted with regard to Lenin, Stalin and Sverdlov?

Bukharin: Yes, if we consider that placing under arrest is a forcible means

FROM HIS LAST PLEA.

I once more repeat that I admit that I am guilty of treason to the Socialist fatherland, the most heinous of possible crimes, of the organisation of kulak uprisings, of preparations for terrorist acts and of belonging to an underground, anti-Soviet organisation. I further admit that I am guilty of organising a conspiracy for a "palace coup." And this, incidentally, proves the incorrectness of all those passages in the speech for the prosecution made by Citizen the State Procurator, where he makes out that I adopted the pose of a pure theoretician, the pose of a philosopher, and so on. These are profoundly practical matters. I said, and I now repeat, that I was a leader and not a cog in the counter-revolutionary affairs. It follows from this, as will be clear to everybody, that there were many specific things which I could not have known, and which I actually did not know, but that this does not relieve me of responsibility.

I admit that I am responsible both politically and legally for the defeatist orientation, for it did dominate in the "bloc of Rights and Trotskyites," although I affirm:

- (a) that personally I did not hold this position;
- (b) that the phrase about opening the front was not uttered by me, but was an echo of my conversation with Tomsky;
- (c) that if Rykov heard this phrase for the first time from me, then, I repeat, it was an echo of my conversation with Tomsky.

But I consider myself responsible for a grave and monstrous crime against the Socialist fatherland and the whole international proletariat. I further consider myself responsible both politically and legally for wrecking activities, although I personally do not remember having given directions about wrecking activities. I did not talk about this. I once spoke positively on this subject to Grinko. Even in my testimony I mentioned that I had once told Radek that I considered this method of struggle as not very expedient. Yet Citizen the State Procurator makes me out to be a leader of the wrecking activities.

BUKHARIN IS INTERRUPTED.

Citizen the Procurator asserts that I was one of the major organisers of espionage, on a par with Rykov. What are the proofs? The testimony of Sharangovich, of whose existence I had not even heard until I read the indictment.

The record of Sharangovich's testimony was submitted to me, from which it appears that I practically drew up the plan for wrecking.

Sharangovich: Stop lying, for once in your life at least. You are lying even now in Court.

The President: Accused Sharangovich, don't interrupt.

Sharangovich: I could not restrain myself.

BUKHARIN CONFESSES.

It seems to me that when some of the West European and American intellectuals begin to entertain doubts and vacillations in connection with the trials taking place in the U.S.S.R., this is primarily due to the fact that these people do not understand the radical distinction, namely, that in our country the antagonist, the enemy, has at the same time a divided, a dual mind. And I think that this is the first thing to be understood.

I take the liberty of dwelling on these questions because I had considerable contacts with these upper intellectuals abroad, especially among scientists, and I must explain to them what every Young Pioneer in the Soviet Union knows.

Repentance is often attributed to diverse and absolutely absurd things like Thibetan powders and the like. I must say of myself that in prison, where I was confined for over a year, I worked, studied, and retained my clarity of mind. This will serve to refute by facts all fables and absurd counter-revolutionary tales.

Hypnotism is suggested. But I conducted my own defence in Court from the legal standpoint, too, orientated myself on the spot, argued with the State Procurator; and anybody, even a man who has little experience in this branch of medicine, must admit that hypnotism of this kind is altogether impossible.

This repentance is often attributed to the Dostoyevsky mind, to the specific properties of the soul ("L'ame slave," as it is called), and this can be said of types like Alyosha Karamazov, the heroes of the "Idiot" and other Dostoyevsky characters, who are prepared to stand up in the public square and cry: "Beat me, Orthodox Christians, I am a villain!"

But that is not the case here at all. "L'ame slave" and the psychology of Dostoyevsky characters are a thing of the remote past in our country, the pluperfect tense. Such types do not exist in our country, or exist perhaps only on the outskirts of small provincial towns, if they do even there. On the contrary, such a psychology is to be found in Western Europe.

I happened by chance to get Feuchtwanger's book from the prison library. There he refers to the trials of the Trotskyites. It produced a profound impression on me; but I must say that Feuchtwanger did not get at the core of the matter. He stopped half way, not everything was clear to him; when, as a matter of fact, everything is clear. World history is a world court of judgment: A number of groups of Trotskyite leaders went bankrupt and have been cast into the pit. That is true. But you cannot do what Feuchtwanger does in relation to Trotsky in particular, when he places him on the same plane as Stalin. Here his arguments are absolutely false. For in reality the whole country stands behind Stalin; he is the hope of the world; he is a creator. Napoleon once said that fate is politics. The fate of Trotsky is counter-revolutionary politics.

I am about to finish. I am perhaps speaking for the last time in my life.

LADY PAGET—"PHILANTHROPIST."

Vyshinsky: Under what circumstances were your connections resumed?

Rakovsky: In the summer of 1934, after I returned from exile, my connections were resumed. An acquaintance of mine came to Moscow, an Englishwoman, who reminded me that contact with the Intelligence Service ought to be resumed.

Vyshinsky: Why did this question interest the Englishwoman?

Rakovsky: I had known her in London. It can be affirmed that she herself was connected with the Intelligence Service.

Vyshinsky: In other words, a British woman spy?

Rakovsky: Yes.

Vyshinsky: What is her name?

Rakovsky: Lady Paget.

Vyshinsky: Lady Paget. What is her position in society?

Rakovsky: She is a well-known philanthropist; during the war she had a hospital in Kiev.

Vyshinsky: That is how you regarded her—a philanthropist?

Rakovsky: As a sideline.

Vyshinsky: Just as you are a philanthropist as a sideline?

Rakovsky: (No reply.)

Vyshinsky: And then, as they say, you laid down your arms.

Rakovsky: I will tell you what prompted me—

Vyshinsky: I have no objection if you will deal briefly with this, without long historical digressions. No objections, on my part.

Rakovsky: Very briefly. As I said, it was only in the eighth month that I began to make a clean breast of my main activities.

Vyshinsky: Criminal activities.

Rakovsky: My criminal activities, of course. But before this the thought frequently arose in my mind: was I doing right in denying? Nobody will deny that imprisonment, solitude in general, makes people undertake a revaluation of values. But I remember, and will never forget as long as I live, the circumstances which finally impelled me to give evidence. During one of the examina-

tions, this was in the summer, I learnt, in the first place, that Japanese aggression had begun against China, against the Chinese people. I learnt of Germany's and Italy's undisguised aggression against the Spanish people

I learnt of the feverish preparations which all the fascist States were making to unleash a world war. What a reader usually absorbs every day in small doses in telegrams, I received at once in a big dose. This had a stunning effect on me. All my past rose before me. Of course, this past may be reduced to naught and will be obliterated by my disgraceful actions, but as an inner motive, nothing and nobody can do anything against it. All my past arose before me, my responsibilities, and it became clear to me that I myself was a party to this, that I was responsible, that I myself had helped the aggressors with my treasonable activities. I know that I was not alone, that I was harboring illusions about them. Former heads of the government, former People's Commissars, former Assistant People's Commissars, former Ambassadors had become entangled in this web. And then I became a judge over myself, I sat in judgment over myself. This is a court which no one will reproach with being biased. I sat in judgment over myself. I had given myself to the Labor movement from my youth, and where had I got? I had reached a stage when I facilitated the vilest work with my actions, I had facilitated the fascist aggressors' preparations to destroy culture, civilisation, all the achievements of democracy, all the achievements of the working class.

That is what induced me to speak, that is what overcame my obstinacy, my false shame born of vanity, fear for my own fate, which was not worthy of a man who had once taken part in the revolutionary movement. My rancour, which all of us harbored, some to a greater and some to a lesser extent, rancour against the leadership, rancour against particular individuals, had played a great part. Rancour and ambition fell from me. I considered that from now on my duty was to help in this struggle against the aggressor, that I would go and expose myself fully and entirely, and I told the investigator that on the following day I would begin to give complete, exhaustive testimony. I must say that the testimony which I gave here is absolutely complete, sincere and exhaustive.

The President: Adjournment for twenty minutes.

MURDER OF MAXIM GORKY.

Dr. Levin: Then he (Yagoda) went on to tell me that widespread dissatisfaction was growing and strengthening in the Party against the Party leadership, that a change of government was inevitable, predetermined and unavoidable, that the movement was headed by Rykov, Bukharin and Yeunkidze. And since this was inevitable, since it would happen all the same, then the sooner it took place the better. In order to speed it up, in order to facilitate this process, we had to remove certain members of the Political

Bureau and Alexei Maximovich Gorky from the political scene. This was a historical necessity. But you stopped me, Citizen Procurator, when I wanted to tell you what I lived through in connection with this. I shall, therefore, not speak of this at all, I shall only relate the bare facts in accordance with your wish. Then, after a while, he said: "There is no reason for you to be so upset, you should understand that this is inevitable, that this is a historical moment, that it is a historical necessity, a stage of the revolution through which we must pass, and you will pass through it with us, you will be witness of it, and you must help us with the means which you have at your disposal. Instead of becoming upset, tell me whom you can take upon yourself besides Alexei Maximovich Gorky." I again omit the rest and will only say that I had no further conversation with him on that day. Within a few days, I again visited Yagoda and told him that I was compelled to fulfil these instructions of his as well. In the course of this conversation Yagoda added: "Alexei Maximovich is a man who is very close to the highest Party leadership, a man very much devoted to the policy which is now being carried out in the country, very devoted personally to Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, a man who will never betray, who will never tread our road. Then again, you know what authority Gorky's words have both in our country and far beyond its borders, you are aware of the influence he enjoys and of how much harm he can cause our movement by his words. You must agree to undertake this," he said, "and you will reap the fruits of it when the new government comes to power."

The President: The accused Levin will make his last plea.

Levin: Citizens Judges! In my last plea I want to reaffirm my guilt once more.

The State Procurator has disclosed my entire guilt with exhaustive comprehensiveness and objectivity and has drawn a vivid picture of the gravity of the crimes I committed. I have always realised the gravity of these crimes, even during the years when they were being committed under the irresistible, as it seemed to me, pressure of the cruel threats and criminal instructions of Yagoda, and thereafter right up to recent days.

Sitting here in the dock, listening to all the frightful stories which have been told here by human beings, listening to stories of General Seeckt and such like, Trotsky, the Japanese, Germans, British, Poles, who were supplied with secret information, to whom our richest regions and Republics were being sold in exchange for some future services; listening to the frightful stories of glass in butter, the destruction of cattle, the destruction of food-stuffs constituting prime necessities for the population, the preparation of defeat in the forthcoming war which they themselves were provoking, listening to all this horror and imagining all this to

myself as a sort of satanic orgy, I only here realised into what an abyss the evil Yagoda had precipitated me, what forces he had made me serve, for what and with what end he had pushed me from the straight and honest path of labor which I had been treading for forty years, and in my sixty-eighth year put me in this disgraceful dock, together with him.

And, finally, the last case, the putting to death of Alexei Maximovich Gorky. By this time he was already a very sick man. His lungs were in a bad state, they were in a threatening condition after the attacks of tuberculosis which, as I have already stated, frequently afflicted him. In addition, the changes in the lungs had a terrible effect on the activity of the heart, so that he was in an extremely poor condition as regards both his lungs and his heart simultaneously.

Now, in the winter of 1935, he was in the Crimea, and there I spoke to Kryuchkov, who constantly travelled to the Crimea and was generally in charge of everything in Gorky's house. We came to an understanding as to measures harmful to Gorky; I told him that Gorky was very fond of hiking. He ought not to have indulged in long walks, they tired him out. He always used to say that he was suffering because he had to spend all the time sitting and lead a sedentary mode of life. I said that he should take walks. Gorky was very fond of manual work, of chopping down branches and breaking pieces of rock in the park, in the garden. He was allowed to do all this to the detriment of his health. This tired him out very much. He would sit a whole day in his study, then go for a walk and in the course of an hour and a half, while on his walk, would do this work. This used to make him very tired. His second passion was for fire. Gorky loved fire, flames, and we made use of this. A bonfire would be lit up for him. Just when Gorky would feel the fatigue after his work, all the chopped branches were gathered together, and a flame kindled. Gorky would stand near this bonfire, it was hot there, and all this had a harmful effect on his health.

Again, it was agreed that a suitable moment should be selected for Gorky's arrival in Moscow when he could contract the grippé.* He was very susceptible to the grippé, which was frequently complicated by bronchitis or pneumonia. When Yagoda learnt that someone was suffering from the grippé in Maxim Gorky's house (the children were sick at that time with it) he sent word to the Crimea, and Kryuchkov organised Maxim Gorky's return to Moscow at that very time. And, in fact, on the second or third day after his arrival in this grippé-infected house, Gorky fell sick with the grippé. This was soon complicated by croupous pneumonia and immediately took a serious turn. Nonetheless, Professor Pletnev and I considered that the plan we had drawn up must be carried through, and that for this purpose use must be made of medicines which would be harmful to him.

*Grippé—a severe influenza.

"NOT A SPY."

Vyshinsky: Second—that you plead guilty to having been one of the leaders of the underground "bloc of Rights and Trotskyites."

Yagoda: Yes, I do.

Vyshinsky: Third—that, together with this bloc, you pursued the aim of overthrowing the Soviet Government and of restoring capitalism in the U.S.S.R.

Yagoda: Yes, I do. We set ourselves the task of seizing the Kremlin.

Vyshinsky: That for the purpose of overthrowing the Government you chose the method of an insurrection timed primarily for the outbreak of war. Is that so?

Yagoda: No, it is not so. An armed insurrection—that was nonsense. Only these babblers here could think of that.

Vyshinsky: Well, what were you thinking of?

Yagoda: Of a "palace coup."

Vyshinsky: That is to say, of a violent coup, carried through by a small group of plotters?

Yagoda: Yes, the same as they did.

Vyshinsky: Timing it preferably for a military onslaught on the U.S.S.R. by foreign powers, or did you have various plans?

Yagoda: There was one plan, namely, to seize the Kremlin. The time was of no importance.

Vyshinsky: Was it your point of view that it was expedient in case of war to prepare and secure the defeat of the U.S.S.R.?

Yagoda: That was the point of view of the bloc, and therefore it was mine, too.

Vyshinsky: Do you also admit being guilty of espionage work?

Yagoda: No, I do not admit being guilty of this activity.

Vyshinsky: But you yourself have said that several spies were at work under your direct leadership.

Yagoda: Yes, I admit that.

Vyshinsky: Did you know they were spies?

Yagoda: Yes, I did.

Vyshinsky: Did you know they were fulfilling espionage duties?

Yagoda: Yes, I did.

Vyshinsky: So you helped them?

Yagoda: I am just as responsible for these spies as

Vyshinsky: Was Volovich a spy?

Yagoda: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Are you responsible for Volovich?

Yagoda: Just as Rykov is for Sharangovich.

Vyshinsky: We shall deal with them separately. Now I am speaking about you. Do you admit that a number of Intelligence Service agents, German and Polish spies, were under your wing? Is that so, or not?

Yagoda: It is.

Vyshinsky: Did you know of their espionage activity and did you shield this espionage activity?

Yagoda: Yes.

Vyshinsky: I consider that since you shielded this espionage activity, you helped them, assisted them.

Yagoda: No, I do not admit being guilty of that. Had I been a spy, I assure you that dozens of States would have been compelled to disband their intelligence services.

Vyshinsky: That would have been the affair of these States. Was Volovich a spy?

Yagoda: I said he was.

Vyshinsky: Did you know of that?

Yagoda: I did.

Vyshinsky: You neither arrested nor shot him?

Yagoda: No.

Vyshinsky: Were you in duty bound to arrest and shoot spies you had discovered?

Yagoda: Obviously.

Vyshinsky: So then you did not do that, that is to say, in other words, you helped spies to act as spies.

Yagoda: I shielded them.

Vyshinsky: Did you help them?

Yagoda: I would have helped if I gathered materials together and passed them on to them.

Vyshinsky: But were you aware that they passed materials on?

Yagoda: Not always.

Vyshinsky: But sometimes you were?

Yagoda: I was.

Vyshinsky: So they passed on materials to foreign intelligence services with your knowledge?

Yagoda: No.

Vyshinsky: Were you informed that they passed on materials to foreign intelligence services?

Yagoda: Undoubtedly.

Vyshinsky: Since you were informed of it, then it was with your knowledge?

Yagoda: With my connivance.

Vyshinsky: Very well, with your connivance in what they were doing, and of what you were aware. Is that established?

Yagoda: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Do you also admit being guilty of having placed State funds at Trotsky's disposal on the instructions of the bloc?

Yagoda: Yes.

Vyshinsky: And do you admit being guilty of organising and effecting terrorist acts: first—the murder of Comrade Kirov on the orders and instructions of the bloc?

Yagoda: I admit being guilty of complicity in the murder.

Vyshinsky: Do you admit being guilty of complicity in the murder or in causing the death of Menzhinsky?

Yagoda: I do.

Vyshinsky: Do you admit being guilty of organising the murder of Kuibyshev?

Yagoda: I do.

Vyshinsky: Do you admit being guilty of the murder of Alexei Maximovich Gorky?

Yagoda: I do.

KRESTINSKY PLEADS "NOT GUILTY."

The President: Accused Krestinsky, do you plead guilty to the charges brought against you?

Krestinsky: I plead not guilty. I am not a Trotskyite. I was never a member of the bloc of Rights and Trotskyites, of whose existence I was not aware. Nor have I committed any of the crimes with which I personally am charged, in particular I plead not guilty to the charge of having had connections with the German intelligence service.

The President: Do you corroborate the confession you made at the preliminary investigation?

Krestinsky: Yes, at the preliminary investigation I confessed, but I have never been a Trotskyite.

The President: I repeat the question, do you plead guilty?

Krestinsky: Before my arrest I was a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) and I remain one now.

The President: Do you plead guilty to the charge of participating in espionage activities and of participating in terrorist activities?

Krestinsky: I have never been a Trotskyite, I have never belonged to the bloc of Rights and Trotskyites and have not committed a single crime.

The President: Accused Rakovsky, do you plead guilty to the charges brought against you?

Rakovsky: Yes, I do.

Vyshinsky: So you think that you are obliged to him for this? Permit me to ask the accused Krestinsky.

Accused Krestinsky, did you really travel to Kissingen in 1933, in August or September?

Krestinsky: In the beginning of September.

Vyshinsky: Do you confirm this fact?

Krestinsky: I do.

Vyshinsky: Did you see Bessonov?

Krestinsky: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Did you talk to him?

Krestinsky: Yes.

Vyshinsky: What about? The weather?

Krestinsky: He was a counsellor to the Embassy in Berlin. At that time he was acting as Charge d'Affaires. He informed me about the political situation in Germany, about the frame of mind of the fascist party, which at that time was in power, and about their programme and attitude towards the U.S.S.R.

Vyshinsky: And about Trotskyite affairs?

Krestinsky: We did not talk about them. I was not a Trotskyite.

Vyshinsky: You never talked about them?

Krestinsky: Never.

Vyshinsky: That means that Bessonov is not telling the truth, and that you are telling the truth. Do you always tell the truth?

Krestinsky: No.

Vyshinsky: Not always. Accused Krestinsky, you and I will have to examine serious matters and there is no need to get excited. Consequently, Bessonov is not telling the truth?

Krestinsky: No.

Vyshinsky: But you, too, do not always tell the truth. Is that not so?

Krestinsky: I did not always tell the truth during the investigation.

Vyshinsky: But at other times you always tell the truth?

Krestinsky: The truth.

Vyshinsky: Why this lack of respect for the investigation, why during the investigation did you tell untruths? Explain.

Krestinsky: (No reply.)

Vyshinsky (to Krestinsky): You have heard the detailed explanation Rakovsky has given of your so-called departure from Trotskyism. Do you consider Rakovsky's explanation correct?

Krestinsky: What he says is right.

The President: You confirm what Rakovsky said?

Krestinsky: Yes, I do.

Vyshinsky: If what Rakovsky said is true, will you continue to deceive the Court and to deny that the testimony you gave in the preliminary investigation was true?

Krestinsky: I fully confirm the testimony I gave in the preliminary investigation.

Vyshinsky: I have no questions to ask Rakovsky.

I have one question to ask Krestinsky: What, then, is the meaning of the statement you made yesterday, which cannot be regarded otherwise than a piece of Trotskyite provocation in court?

Krestinsky: Yesterday, under the influence of a momentary keen feeling of false shame, evoked by the atmosphere of the dock and the painful impression created by the public reading of the indictment, which was aggravated by my poor health, I could not bring myself to tell the truth; I could not bring myself to say that I was guilty. And instead of saying, "Yes, I am guilty," I almost mechanically answered, "No, I am not guilty."

Vyshinsky: Mechanically?

Krestinsky: In the face of world public opinion, I had not the strength to admit the truth that I had been conducting a Trotskyite struggle all along. I request the Court to register my statement that I fully and completely admit that I am guilty of all the

gravest charges brought against me personally, and that I admit my complete responsibility for the treason and treachery I have committed.

Vyshinsky: I have nothing more to ask the accused Krestinsky for the present.

The President: Accused Krestinsky, be seated.

TROTSKY AND GENERAL VON SEECKT.

Krestinsky: I began my illegal Trotskyite activities at the end of 1921, when on Trotsky's suggestion I consented to the formation of an illegal Trotskyite organisation and to my joining its centre, which was to be made up of Trotsky, Pyatakov, Serebryakov, Preobrazhensky and myself, Krestinsky. Trotsky made this proposal to me immediately after the Tenth Congress.

A year later I committed a crime—I refer to the one I spoke about during the examination of the accused Rosengoltz—the agreement I concluded on Trotsky's instructions with General Seeckt, with the Reichswehr in his person, about financing the Trotskyite organisation in exchange for services of an espionage nature which we undertook in this connection to render the Reichswehr. When Trotsky gave me these instructions my attitude towards them was mainly of great apprehension, but apprehension not out of fear, but, so to speak, out of some inner shuddering, and I pointed out that this means espionage and treason to the fatherland. But Trotsky argued that our line in foreign policy coincided with that of Germany at that period, that Germany was in a state of ruin after the war, and that in any event, in view of the existence of revenge sentiments in Germany with regard to France, England and Poland, a clash between Germany and the Soviet Union, or Soviet Russia at that time, in the near future was out of the question, and that therefore we could agree to this deal without actually committing a grave crisis. Blinded by my factional bitterness, I permitted myself to be convinced by these unsound, childish arguments. The agreement was concluded.

Vyshinsky: These arguments were treasonable rather than childish.

Krestinsky: Childish on account of their not being convincing, on account of their emptiness and on account of the ease with which even a child could parry them.

Vyshinsky: But you are not a child.

Krestinsky: That is why I say that, although these were arguments which would not be convincing even for a youngster, for a child, still I permitted myself to be convinced by these arguments.

Vyshinsky: Why did you permit yourself to be convinced?

Krestinsky: I have said already: blinded by my factional bitterness, by my desire to fight the leadership.

Vyshinsky: Perhaps it was not particularly necessary to try to convince you?

Krestinsky: I have said already that my first objections I raised from tradition, from an inner impulse independent of reason.

It was a feeling of repulsion, unconscious, but I subjected it to reason—

Vyshinsky: To Trotskyite reason?

Krestinsky: Yes, to Trotskyite reason, which permitted me to be persuaded by these Trotskyite treasonable arguments. Since 1923 the agreement with Seeckt was carried out mainly in Moscow, and sometimes in Berlin.

UNEARTHING A PROVOCATEUR 27 YEARS AFTER.

Zelensky: First of all I must dwell on my gravest crime—my work in the Tsarist Okhrana (secret police). I was an agent of the Samara branch of the Okhrana from 1911 until 1913. The circumstances under which I was recruited were as follows: in the summer of 1911 my home was searched, and a number of documents were found there incriminating me as a member of the Social-Democratic organisation. I was taken to the gendarmerie headquarters, and examined by Colonel Betipazh, who told me that either they would stage a trial and send me to penal servitude or I would have to become an informer for the Okhrana. I knew several cases where the Samara Okhrana had engineered trials of this kind. My courage failed me, and instead of refusing I agreed to become an informer, yielded to persuasion, and committed treason and treachery to the cause of the revolution.

I have no mitigating circumstances to plead. I cannot plead youth, since I was twenty-one years of age; I cannot plead inexperience, since I had been taking part in the revolutionary movement since 1906. Twice before the incident in Samara I had been arrested, exiled, and so had had my "baptism of fire." This makes my crime all the more grave.

When I was recruited I was given the pseudonym "Ochkasty." I was instructed to give reports on the work of the local Social-Democratic Bolshevik group and its struggle against the liquidators. Subsequently, I regularly received money for this treacherous work, 25, 40, 50 and even 100 rubles. This went on until February, 1912.

Vyshinsky: I think we had better finish first with this period of your work in the Okhrana.

Zelensky: Just as you like.

Vyshinsky: About your work as an informer, as an Okhrana agent, as agent of the Samara Gendarmerie Headquarters, have you said everything already, or do you wish to add anything?

Zelensky: I think that is all.

Vyshinsky (to the Court): Then allow me to put a few questions.

The President: You may.

Vyshinsky: In what month were you recruited?

Zelensky: It was in the summer—I think in June or July.

Vyshinsky: June or July of what year?

Zelensky: 1911.

Vyshinsky: Do you know whether the gendarmerie headquarters took any interest in you when you were under arrest in 1912?

Zelensky: I do not understand—

Vyshinsky: You were arrested in 1912?

Zelensky: Yes, I was. I have already mentioned this.

Vyshinsky: Do you not know whether the gendarmerie headquarters took an interest in you personally when you were under arrest in 1912? Didn't they inquire from other Okhrana branches about the reasons for your arrest, what had happened to you, and so forth?

Zelensky: I do not know. They probably did make inquiries, but I know nothing about it.

Vyshinsky: You do not know?

Zelensky: I think that since I was arraigned in other places they would probably make inquiries.

Vyshinsky: In August, 1911, or in the spring of 1911—I have no exact information—you were searched?

Zelensky: That was the very search after which I was taken to the gendarmerie headquarters where I was recruited.

Vyshinsky: And you were recruited?

Zelensky: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Before this occasion you had no connections at all with the Okhrana?

Zelensky: No.

Vyshinsky: Then how do you explain that on August 11, 1911, the chief of the Saratov Provincial Gendarmerie Headquarters sent a letter of inquiry through the district under his supervision, in which he wrote that, "from letters received through our agents it seems that the Zelensky you have arrested was apparently searched by you in the spring or summer of this year. Seeing that no reports have been forthcoming from you concerning this matter, please notify us whether this is the case, and, if so, what was the reason for his being searched, and also the results of the search." So it appears that the chief of the Saratov Gendarmerie specially inquired about your case on August 11, 1911. How do you explain this?

Zelensky: I myself am a native of Saratov; in Saratov I was brought up for charges, then again I was connected with certain Saratov Party men, was in correspondence with them, and it is very possible that to the extent that my correspondence with these people was under surveillance this might have interested the gendarmes.

Vyshinsky: Irrespective of the fact that you were an agent of the Okhrana?

Zelensky: Irrespective.

Vyshinsky: And perhaps in this connection too?

Zelensky: I do not know.

Vyshinsky: Were you aware that on September 4, 1911, the chief of the Orenburg Provincial Gendarmerie Headquarters in-

quired: "Please notify me what could have happened to Zelensky recently." The chief of the Samara Provincial Gendarmerie Headquarters did the same thing. So it seems that three gendarmerie headquarters were taking an interest in you: the Samara gendarmerie, where you were recruited in July, 1911, then the Saratov gendarmerie—on August 11, 1911, and lastly the Orenburg Gendarmerie Headquarters in the month of September.

Zelensky: Yes.

Vyshinsky: It seems to be a rather wide periphery.

Zelensky: That was the periphery where I worked.

Vyshinsky: "What could have happened to Zelensky recently"—what does this mean?

Zelensky: I cannot give any explanations on the matter.

Vyshinsky: You cannot? You yourself cannot give an explanation for it? I have an explanation, but I would like to hear you explain it.

Zelensky: I explain it in the following way: I worked in Orenburg, I was arrested in Orenburg. In Orenburg I also had connections and people with whom I was in contact. I think that in so far as at the time of my arrest and prior to my arrest my work in Saratov and in Orenburg was known to the authorities, the gendarmerie headquarters in these places, having received notification of my arrest, would naturally be interested to know if there was evidence in the possession of the Saratov Gendarmerie Headquarters which could incriminate or expose anyone in Orenburg or Saratov corresponding or otherwise connected with me.

Vyshinsky: But look at the formulation. "Please notify me what could have happened to Zelensky recently." This formulation is very definite: it seems to say—Zelensky is our man, and you arrest him. What is the matter? What has happened to him? That is the only way to understand it. Or perhaps it could be understood differently?

Zelensky: I can say the following—

Vyshinsky: Can it be understood in this way?

Zelensky: Yes, it can, but it can also be understood in another way.

Vyshinsky: In 1912, where were you imprisoned?

Zelensky: In Samara.

Vyshinsky: You did not make any application to his honor the chief?

Zelensky: I made an application asking to be summoned for examination.

Vyshinsky: For examination?

Zelensky: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Not to elucidate certain questions?

Zelensky: I have already said I asked to be summoned—

Vyshinsky: For examination?

Zelensky: Yes. That was written in my petition. I intended to find out the reasons for my arrest.

Vyshinsky: For a revolutionary the reason for his arrest is quite naturally his revolutionary activity. And you thought they would tell you who had given you away?

Zelensky: No, not who had given me away.

Vyshinsky: What did you want?

Zelensky: I made an application requesting to be summoned for examination.

Vyshinsky: But I think that was not what you wrote. Allow me to read out your statement, you can dispute it afterwards.

Zelensky: Pardon me, allow me to say, perhaps it is not worth your wasting time.

Vyshinsky: Allow me to waste time and read it out.

"To His Honour, Chief of the Samara Gendarmerie Headquarters. Petition. I have the honor to request you humbly to summon me to headquarters, or to come to the Samara Province prison, to clear up the questions connected with my arrest, and also to allow me to see my brother, Yakov Abramovich Zelensky." Was not your brother an agent of the Gendarmerie Headquarters?

Zelensky: No, not this one, but another brother.

Vyshinsky: What was his name?

Zelensky: Alexander.

Vyshinsky: He was also an agent of the Gendarmerie Headquarters?

Zelensky: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Which one?

Zelensky: Also of Samara.

Vyshinsky: Also of Samara?

Zelensky: Also of Samara.

Vyshinsky: So you started a family business?

Zelensky: (No reply.)

MORE ON TROTSKY AND THE GERMAN GENERAL STAFF.

Vyshinsky: And in 1923 you supplied General Seeckt with espionage information on Trotsky's instructions?

Rosengoltz: Yes, yes.

Vyshinsky: Do you know whether there was anybody else who transmitted to Seeckt similar information at that time?

Rosengoltz: I knew that Krestinsky had some kind of an illegal connection with the Reichswehr.

Vyshinsky: When did you know about it?

Rosengoltz: Approximately during that same period and somewhat later. I cannot say exactly; but I did not know what was the nature of this connection.

Vyshinsky: Accused Krestinsky, what was the connection with the Reichswehr to which Rosengoltz is referring?

Krestinsky: In 1921 Trotsky told me to take advantage of a meeting with Seeckt during official negotiations to propose to him, to Seeckt, that he grant Trotsky a regular subsidy for the development of illegal Trotskyite activities; at the same time he told me that, if Seeckt will put up a counter-demand that we render him

services in the sphere of espionage, we should and may accept it. I shall speak later about the conversation I had with Trotsky when he gave me these instructions. I put the question before Seeckt and named the sum of 250,000 gold marks, that is 60,000 dollars, a year. General Seeckt, after consulting his assistant, the chief of staff, agreed in principle and put up the counter-demand that certain confidential and important information of a military nature should be transmitted to him, even if not regularly, by Trotsky in Moscow or through me. In addition he was to receive assistance in obtaining visas for some persons whom they needed and whom they would send to the Soviet Union as spies. This counter-demand of General Seeckt was accepted and in 1923 this agreement had been put into effect.

Vyshinsky: Did you transmit espionage information?

Krestinsky: I would say, not I, but we, the Russian Trotskyites. But there were cases when I personally gave this information to General Seeckt.

Vyshinsky: You gave it personally?

Krestinsky: Yes. I also received money on several occasions.

Vyshinsky: From whom did you receive money?

Krestinsky: From General Seeckt.

Vyshinsky: Where.

Krestinsky: In his office. I handed over the money to Trotsky personally during my visits to Moscow.

Vyshinsky: Personally?

Krestinsky: Yes, without resorting to anybody's services.

Vyshinsky: In what year did the negotiations with Seeckt begin?

Krestinsky: It was in the spring and summer of 1922. In the indictment it says 1921. This is of no great consequence, but this first meeting of an official nature, which Trotsky suggested that I take advantage of, occurred in the winter of 1921-22.

TRAITOR GENERALS.

Vyshinsky: Tell me, what was the main object of the group of plotters in this sphere?

Bukharin: Even at that period the main object was the overthrow of the Soviet Government by force.

Vyshinsky: Well, tell us then how you were preparing for the overthrow of the Soviet Government by force.

Bukharin: At that period we were already discussing the question of the overthrow of the Soviet Government by force, with the aid of a group of military participants in the plot.

Vyshinsky: A group?

Bukharin: Yes.

Vyshinsky: A group of participants in your plot?

Bukharin: Absolutely correct.

Vyshinsky: In the persons of Tukhachevsky, Primakov and some others?

Bukharin: There was the Yenukidze group as well.

Vyshinsky: To when does this refer?

Rykov: This plan aimed to arrest the members of the Government in connection with a violent coup carried out by the conspiratorial organisation with the aid of a special organisation created for the purpose of bringing about this coup. As far as I remember, this idea arose among the Rights in 1933-34, when it began to assume a more or less definite shape. But, as in the case of terrorism, when utterances in favor of terrorism were heard before terrorism had been adopted by the centre of the Right organisation, so on the question of the "palace coup," individual members of the Right organisation expressed themselves in favor of this method of conspiratorial activity before the Right centre definitely shaped this idea and tried to carry it out. This applies in particular to me, when in 1930 one of the members of the Right organisation came to me with a fully worked out plan for a "palace coup," with a plan to arrest the Government with the aid of a small specially prepared armed force. At that time I had not yet discussed this either with Tomsy or with Bukharin. This question arose in 1933. The mainstay of this counter-revolutionary plan was Yenukidze, who had become an active member of the Right organisation in 1933. An important role was played by Yagoda, who was at the head of the G.P.U. These were the starting points that enabled us to proceed with the organisation of the coup. To be more precise, subsequently the Right centre, together with Yenukidze and Tomsy, from time to time informed me about the progress of the preparations and execution of this plan. What month this was is not important; I remember that the first piece of information I received was about the group of Kremlin officials, and the principal figures here were Yagoda, Peterson, Gorbachov and Yegorov; I have in mind not the Chief of the General Staff—I don't know what he is doing now—but Yegorov, the chief of the Kremlin military school. These three names played a great role in the life of the Kremlin and were in command of the school and of the entire administrative routine in the Kremlin. Several times Tomsy informed me about the enlistment through these persons—Yenukidze and Yegorov—of a group of military officials, headed by Tukhachevsky, who also prepared to accept this plan and were working in this direction. He mentioned the names of Ubovich and Kork. This is the basis of the relationships which afforded the possibility of carrying out, or at all events of attempting to carry out, the plan from the point of view of inflicting real damage, internal damage, apart from connections with abroad. We did not

succeed in making a real attempt, but it might have inflicted a very serious wound upon Socialist liberty.

I cannot speak of the details of this work because it was kept very secret. A group was formed including very influential people—a military group. This group, from the underground viewpoint, worked independently of the other underground groups and it was the only one.

The question arose of how to co-ordinate the forces of the counter-revolution for the purpose of carrying out the "palace coup." For this purpose a centre was formed including the Trotskyites and Zinovievites: Kamenev, Pyatakov, Yenukidze, and also myself, Bukharin and Tomsy. Our task was to weld all the forces around this centre. With this centre were connected Tukhachevsky's military group and Yagoda's group.

Vyshinsky (to the Court): If you will permit, I have two questions to ask Krestinsky in connection with the evidence given by the accused Rykov.

Accused Krestinsky, tell us, please, what do you know of the participation of the Tukhachevsky group in the "bloc of Rights and Trotskyites"?

Krestinsky: I know the following about Tukhachevsky's participation. When I met Trotsky in Meran in October, 1933, he pointed out to me that in orientating ourselves on a coup d'etat we should under no circumstances rely for support solely on our Trotskyite forces, because their numbers were not sufficient for this purpose, but that we must come to an agreement both with the Rights and with the military group. He paid particular attention to Tukhachevsky, a man with an adventurous bent, who lays claim to the first place in the army and would probably be ready to take many chances. He asked me to convey this opinion of his to Pyatakov and to talk with Tukhachevsky personally.

Vyshinsky: Did you talk to Tukhachevsky?

Krestinsky: I had a talk with him in the beginning of 1934, after Pyatakov had spoken to him, and I told him of my talk with Trotsky. Tukhachevsky said that in principle he was favorably disposed not only to the joining of forces but also to the fact that such a task was being posed. But the question, he said, requires deliberation, the possibilities have to be established, and after that he would come to an understanding with Pyatakov on this subject. I found out from Pyatakov in February, 1935, that an understanding had been reached, but I did not ask Pyatakov when the understanding was reached and when exactly this centre came into being. Subsequently I spoke to Tukhachevsky several times on this subject. This was in the second half of 1935, in 1936 and in 1937. I carried on such conversations on more than one occasion.

RADEK TORMENTS THE G.P.U.

When I found myself in the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs, the chief examining official realised at once why I would not talk. He said to me: "You are not a baby. Here you have fifteen people testifying against you. You cannot get out of it, and as a sensible man you cannot think of doing so. If you do not want to testify it can only be because you want to gain time and look it over more closely. Very well, study it." For two and a half months I tormented the examining official. The question has been raised here whether we were tormented while under investigation. I must say that it was not I who was tormented, but I who tormented the examining officials and compelled them to perform a lot of useless work. For two and a half months I compelled the examining official, by interrogating me and by confronting me with the testimony of other accused, to open up all the cards to me, so that I could see who had confessed, who had not confessed, and what each had confessed.

Note by the Authors: Radek's statement that he tormented the examining officials, etc., gives an interesting sidelight on the veracity of the capitalist press. Thus, the Sydney "Telegraph" reported that Radek confessed only after he had been tormented by the G.P.U.! Hundreds of other capitalist and Right-wing Labor journals throughout the world deliberately twisted Radek's statement.

Among other innumerable distortions and downright falsehoods was the following: The London "Express" told its readers that "5,000 G.P.U. troops were guarding the building where the trials were conducted." In real fact there was only one single Red Army man inside the building or in its precincts! The foreign journalists who were present at the trials actually commented upon the placid atmosphere in and around the Court. "It was no different," said one, "from the usual appearance of the Old Bailey or the Cook County Criminal Court (Chicago)."

NO SHOUTING MATCH WITH RADEK.

Vyshinsky: Very well, will you confirm the description of your activities you gave when examined in the Procurator's office before January 17, 1937?

Permit me to read vol. V., page 119:

"The new and more far-reaching instructions Trotsky issued in December, 1935, carried his defeatist and restoration policy to extreme limits"

Do you confirm this?

Radek: Yes.

Vyshinsky: ". . . . and the diminution of the prospects of the bloc coming to power converted the Trotskyite organisation into a network of spies and diversionists for the German General Staff"

Radek: Yes, I fully confirm it.

Vyshinsky: And further:

"And therefore it is not surprising that the centre of the bloc grew nervous, I emphasise it, was afraid"

Radek: Yes, yes.

Vyshinsky: of taking responsibility for this platform arrived at by Trotsky himself with Hess and decided to summon a conference of the active members of the organisation. That is, the chief motive was fright?

Radek: Yes.

Vyshinsky: You personally were of the opinion that this position should be rejected.

Radek: Yes.

Vyshinsky: And that you ought to go to the Central Committee in order to lay down your arms? But you did not go?

Radek: I did not.

Vyshinsky: And then you were arrested?

Radek: I was arrested, but I denied everything from beginning to end. Maybe you will ask me why?

Vyshinsky: I know that you will always find an answer. You were arrested and questioned. You gave answers?

Radek: I denied everything from beginning to end.

Vyshinsky: You knew everything, you had the opportunity to go and tell everything?

Radek: I had, but I decided that I would do that in the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs—

Vyshinsky: Comrade President, will you please ask the accused to answer questions and not to make speeches?

President: Accused Radek, you may make your two speeches: one—your speech in defence, and the other—your last plea.

Vyshinsky: I do not propose to engage in a shouting match with accused Radek. I am interrogating you, putting questions to you. Answer the questions, if you please, and do not make speeches. I would ask you not to try to shout me down and not to speak on questions that have nothing to do with the case.

In December, 1935, and in 1936, you no longer accepted Trotsky's position. You were repelled by the treason that now became clear to you in all its immensity. You therefore decided the question for yourself in the negative and wanted to discuss with your accomplices what was to be done next?

Radek: Yes.

Vyshinsky: You further said that you had the desire to go and confess?

Radek: Yes.

Vyshinsky: And that you did not go only because they came for you and arrested you. Am I putting it right?

Radek: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Now I ask you: on September 22 you were interrogated and told that you were arrested on a charge of counter-revolutionary, Trotskyite activities. Before they proceeded to ac-

cuse you on the basis of the evidence in possession of the investigating authorities, you had the opportunity to tell all?

Radek: I did not do so.

Vyshinsky: The investigating official put that question. Did you tell?

Radek: No.

Vyshinsky: After your arrest you were asked during examination whether you had sinned against the Party and the Soviet State. What did you reply?

Radek: I replied that I had not.

Vyshinsky: Were you asked whether you had concealed in secret places or at home any illegal documents? What did you reply?

Radek: I was asked and I replied that I had not concealed anything in secret places.

Vyshinsky: You were asked about that—and did you tell the truth?

Radek: I denied it, and this was the truth.

Vyshinsky: Were you further asked whether you had connections with other persons—with Tivel?

Radek: I was asked.

Vyshinsky: Did you admit it?

Radek: I denied everything from beginning to end.

Vyshinsky: Don't hurry; answer each part. Did you deny connections with Tivel?

Radek: I denied it.

Vyshinsky: Did you deny connections with Friedland?

Radek: I denied it.

Vyshinsky: Were you asked about connections with other members of the terrorist group? What did you reply?

Radek: I denied it.

Vyshinsky: That was on September 22, 1936?

Radek: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Were you confronted with Sokolnikov?

Radek: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Did Sokolnikov expose you?

Radek: Yes.

Vyshinsky: And you?

Radek: I denied everything from beginning to end.

Vyshinsky: That was on September 22. Were you confronted with Tivel?

Radek: I was.

Vyshinsky: What did he say?

Radek: He said partly what was true and partly what was not true, but I denied everything.

Vyshinsky: Both what was true and what was not true?

Radek: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Were you on November 4 questioned about various facts concerning your activity?

Radek: Yes. I was questioned until December 4, and I denied everything.

Vyshinsky: For how many months did you deny everything?

Radek: About three months.

Vyshinsky: The fact remains that you, who wanted to tell everything, only could not make up your mind, as you say, to surrender your pride to justice, when you yourself fell into the hands of justice categorically denied everything. Is that a fact?

Radek: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Does that not cast doubt on what you said about your vacillations and misgivings?

Radek: Yes, if you ignore the fact that you learned about the programme and about Trotsky's instructions only from me, of course, it does cast doubt on what I have said.

Vyshinsky: The important thing for me is to establish the fact. Has the fact been established?

Radek: It has.

Vyshinsky: How can it be proved that after receiving the letter from Trotsky in December, 1935, and after the conversation with Pyatakov you did not accept the line which you had fully and unreservedly accepted until then? Have you such facts?

Radek: No.

Vyshinsky: And you do not intend to try to prove it?

Radek: No.

Vyshinsky: I have no more questions.

HANDING OVER RUSSIA TO THE FASCISTS.

Vyshinsky: So if we briefly sum up the contents of this letter (from Trotsky), what are the main points?

Radek: We continued to maintain our stand of 1934 that defeat was inevitable.

Vyshinsky: And what was the conclusion you drew from this?

Radek: The conclusion to be drawn from this inevitable defeat was that now the problem of restoring capitalism was openly set before us.

Vyshinsky: That is to say, this restoration of capitalism, which Trotsky called bringing the social structure of the U.S.S.R. into line with the capitalist countries, was conceived as an inevitable result of an agreement with foreign States?

Radek: As an inevitable result of the defeat of the U.S.S.R., of the social consequences of this defeat and of an agreement on the basis of this defeat.

Vyshinsky: Further?

Radek: The third condition was the most novel of all for us—that of replacing the Soviet power by what he called a Bonapartist Government. And it was clear to us that this meant fascism without its own finance capital, serving foreign finance capital.

Vyshinsky: The fourth condition?

Radek: The fourth was the partition of the country. It was planned to surrender the Ukraine to Germany and the Maritime Province and the Amur region to Japan.

Vyshinsky: Was there any talk at that time about any other economic concessions?

Radek: Yes, those decisions about which I have already spoken were further amplified. The payment of indemnities in the form of supplies of food, raw materials and fats extending over a long period of years. Then—at first he said this without giving figures but afterwards in more definite form—a certain percentage of participation in Soviet imports to be guaranteed to all the victorious countries. All this together meant the complete enslavement of the country.

Vyshinsky: Was there talk about Sakhalin oil?

Radek: As regards Japan, we were told she must not only be given Sakhalin oil but be guaranteed oil in the event of a war with the U.S.A. It was stated that no obstacles must be raised to the conquest of China by Japanese imperialism.

Vyshinsky: And as regards the Danube countries?

Radek: As regards the Danube and Balkan countries, Trotsky said in his letter that German fascism was expanding and we should do nothing to prevent this. The point was, of course, to sever any of our relations with Czechoslovakia which would have contributed to the defence of that country.

Vyshinsky: Did these six conditions cover the whole contents of this letter of 1935?

Radek: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Did you also tell them about the contents of Trotsky's letter?

Radek: I spoke very distinctly about the contents of Trotsky's letter.

Vyshinsky: What questions were raised in it?

Radek: The victory of fascism in Germany. The growth of Japanese aggression. The inevitability of these countries waging war against the U.S.S.R. The inevitable defeat of the U.S.S.R. The necessity for the bloc, if it came into power, to make concessions.

Vyshinsky: Excuse me, please. Inevitable defeat: how did Trotsky and you picture that? And what was your and Trotsky's attitude towards defeat?

Radek: The attitude towards defeat was entirely positive because it was stated there that this would create the conditions for the accession to power of the bloc, and it even stated more, that it was in our interest to hasten war.

Vyshinsky: Hence you were interested in hastening war and it was to your interest that the U.S.S.R. should be defeated in this war? How was this put in Trotsky's letter?

Radek: Defeat is inevitable and it will create the conditions for our accession to power, therefore we were interested in hastening the war. The conclusion: we are interested in defeat.

Vyshinsky: We are reconstructing the contents of the letter. Radek: Undoubtedly that was the line of thought. It logically followed with indisputable clarity. But since I am giving you, the State Prosecution, evidence, I must draw a clear distinction between the phrase, as I remember it, and the precise phrase that was in the letter. But irrespective of whether it was couched in those terms or not, there is no doubt that this was the line of thought.

Vyshinsky: I ask you to reply to the question about what was your and Trotsky's attitude towards the defeat of the U.S.S.R.

Radek: If you are asking me about Trotsky's attitude, I have answered. If you are asking me about my own, Citizen Procurator, I must say that insofar as it is a matter of establishing juridical facts I must give an answer. Insofar as it is a matter of my feelings and my ethics, which did not affect my action—

Vyshinsky: I am not interested in feelings, but in facts.

Radek: The fact that I gave a visa to Trotsky's mandate—

Vyshinsky: The point is not that you gave your visa to Trotsky's mandate; I am speaking of a fact: the letter which you received from Trotsky in April, 1934—this letter spoke about war, about this war being inevitable, that in this war the U.S.S.R., in Trotsky's opinion, would suffer defeat; that as a result of this war and defeat the bloc would come to power. And now I ask you: In these circumstances were you for the defeat of the U.S.S.R. or for the victory of the U.S.S.R.?

Radek: At that time I considered defeat inevitable and thought that in the circumstances of defeat we would come to power. If you are asking me about what I wished—

Vyshinsky: But were you for the defeat or for the victory of the U.S.S.R.?

Radek: All my actions during these years testify to the fact that I aided defeat.

Vyshinsky: These actions of yours were deliberate?

Radek: Apart from sleeping, I have never in my life committed any undeliberate actions.

Vyshinsky: And this, unfortunately, was not a dream?

Radek: Unfortunately this was not a dream.

Vyshinsky: It was reality?

Radek: It was sad reality.

Vyshinsky: Yes, it was sad reality for you.

TROTSKY NEGOTIATES WITH HESS.

Vyshinsky: So you had two conversations on this subject with Pyatakov and Radek?

Sokolnikov: Yes, within a very short interval.

Vyshinsky: Had you spoken to Pyatakov first or to Radek?

Sokolnikov: To Pyatakov.

Vyshinsky: You spoke to Pyatakov after he had returned from abroad?

Sokolnikov: Yes. That was in January, 1936. Pyatakov told

me that Trotsky had been negotiating with Hess. In these negotiations Hess was empowered to put forward demands which concerned not only German interests but also the interests of another country. Pyatakov told me that he had understood Trotsky to say that these were negotiations on a number of questions, and that agreement had been reached on them. Of course it was assumed that this draft agreement would be submitted to official circles as well and would not remain merely an agreement between these two persons.

That is to say, the first alternative was designed for the contingency of power passing into the hands of the bloc, irrespective of anything arising before the outbreak of the war. To put it plainly, in such an event the other side undertook to give the Government of the bloc its friendly support. As regards the bloc, it undertook a number of obligations for an economic character which secured economic advantages to the other side.

Vyshinsky: Is it this that Radek and Pyatakov spoke about?

Sokolnikov: Yes. The second alternative envisaged that the bloc would come to power as a result of a war and as a result of the defeat of the Soviet Union. In this event the parties to the agreement pledged themselves to establish relations with the Government of the bloc, thus, strictly speaking, I think, ensuring their advent to power, and hence withholding support from rival groups. The bloc undertook to conclude peace immediately and recognise territorial concessions.

WRECKING AND MURDER.

Vyshinsky: What kind of train was wrecked?

Knyazev: A troop train.

Vyshinsky: Do you remember the number of the train?

Knyazev: No. 506 or 504.

Vyshinsky: Troop train No. 504, according to the findings. Did you draw up these findings?

Knyazev: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Did these findings of yours reflect the real state of affairs?

Knyazev: I gave an incorrect explanation, a false one. I concealed the fact that this train wreck was done by the Trotskyite organisation.

Vyshinsky: What circumstances helped to conceal the real state of affairs?

Knyazev: As far as I remember, I was in Kurgan at the time. I was told there had been a train wreck at Shumikha. I thereupon left for Shumikha by special train, and went straight to look at the scene of the smash. When I arrived there, the assistant station master, Vaganov, came up to me and from the hints he dropped I understood that this was the work of Markevich.

I grasped at once that this was the work of our organisation. It had been organised directly by Kolesnikov, the head switchman on duty at the arrival switches. He had ordered Chudinova, a girl

apprentice on duty at the time, to turn arrival switch No. 14 on to a track that was occupied. Since this apprentice did not understand what the correct position of the switches should have been, she carried out his instructions.

An old skilled switchman who was standing at the switch on the track along which the train should really have arrived was meanwhile sent off by Kolesnikov to clean the glass on the lamps.

Vyshinsky: And who was left at the switch?

Knyazev: There was no one at the switch. The train, travelling at high speed, about 40 or 45 kilometres an hour, sped off down the eighth track, on which a freight train of ore was standing.

Vyshinsky: How many were killed?

Knyazev: Twenty-nine Red Army men, and 29 were also injured.

Vyshinsky: Injured severely or slightly?

Knyazev: I cannot say at the moment.

Vyshinsky: This did not interest you?

Knyazev: I was interested, but I cannot say exactly just now.

Vyshinsky: You, the chief of the line, were not interested how many men were injured and how?

Knyazev: I undoubtedly knew this.

Vyshinsky: You, the chief of the railroad?

Knyazev: Yes.

Vyshinsky: You arrived at the scene of the wreck?

Knyazev: Quite right.

Vyshinsky: Here was a train wreck quite out of the ordinary, involving a large number of victims—Red Army men killed, Red Army men injured—and you, the chief of the railroad, do not know whether the injuries were severe or slight?

Knyazev: At that moment I undoubtedly knew.

Vyshinsky: If you knew, you ought to remember, or was this not the only such train wreck on your line? Don't evade the question.

Knyazev: There were train wrecks, but not such big ones as this.

Vyshinsky: You do not remember if these twenty-nine Red Army men were badly mutilated?

Knyazev: About fifteen were badly mutilated.

Vyshinsky: But what sort of serious injuries were there?

Knyazev: They had arms broken, heads pierced—

Vyshinsky: Heads pierced, arms broken, ribs broken, legs broken?

Knyazev: Yes, that is so.

Vyshinsky: This happened by the grace of you and your accomplices?

Knyazev: Yes.

Vyshinsky (to Rataichak): Consequently, you transmitted to the German intelligence service espionage material which you possessed by virtue of your office?

Rataichak: Yes, I was the Chief of the Central Administration of the Basic Chemical Industry.

Vyshinsky: Were there wrecking activities?

Rataichak: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Were there diverse acts?

Rataichak: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Was there espionage?

Rataichak: Yes.

Vyshinsky: Did you take part in terrorist organisations?

Rataichak: No.

Vyshinsky: Did you know about the terrorist organisation?

Rataichak: I knew about Trotsky's line from Pyatakov.

Vyshinsky: Did Pyatakov tell you that he was a member of the terrorist organisation, did he inform you of Trotsky's directives, including the directive about terrorism?

Rataichak: He did.

Vyshinsky: Terrorism against whom?

Rataichak: Against the leaders of the Party and the Government.

Vyshinsky: That is, you knew that your organisation was making preparations to commit terrorist acts against the leaders of the Party and the leaders of the Government. Did you know it?

Rataichak: I did.

Vyshinsky: And what was your attitude towards terrorism?

Rataichak: I stated that at the preliminary investigation.

Vyshinsky: I am not asking you about what you said at the preliminary investigation. Answer the question. What was your attitude towards terrorism?

Rataichak: I did not agree with it.

Vyshinsky: Why did you not agree with it?

Rataichak: (Remains silent.)

Vyshinsky: What did not please you? Wrecking pleased you, diverse acts pleased you, espionage pleased you? Why did terrorism not please you, why did you not agree with it?

Rataichak: All the things you have enumerated are vile.

Vyshinsky: All are vile. But at anyrate you did not dissociate yourself from the group which was engaged in terrorism, you did not leave it?

Rataichak: No.

Vyshinsky: Did you ever attempt to inform anybody of these abominable things?

Rataichak: No.

On Sale At . . .

THE PIONEER BOOKSHOPS

144 Castlereagh Street
1 Rawson Place
17 Pitt Street
SYDNEY

INTERNATIONAL BOOKSHOP

180 Exhibition Street
MELBOURNE

PEOPLE'S BOOKSHOP

252 George Street
BRISBANE

PEOPLE'S BOOKSHOP

29 Hindley Street
ADELAIDE

PROGRESSIVE BOOKSHOP

45 London Court
PERTH

Wholesale from

CURRENT BOOK DISTRIBUTORS

14 RAWSON CHAMBERS
SYDNEY

Phone: MA 5663

::

Post: Box 44, Haymarket