

**TROTSKY**

**THE**

**TRAITOR**

**BY ALEX BITTELMAN**



## CONTENTS

### CHAPTER I

Incredible but True ..... 1

### CHAPTER II

A Path of Treachery ..... 11

### CHAPTER III

Confessions and Objective Evidence ..... 18

### CHAPTER IV

Soviet Democracy Vindicated ..... 23

### CHAPTER V

A Menace to Progressive Mankind ..... 26

Published by Workers Library Publishers,  
February, 1937

Reprinted 2019 by:  
Red Star Publishers  
[www.RedStarPublishers](http://www.RedStarPublishers)



## CHAPTER I

### Incredible but True

Lenin called Trotsky Judas—and cautioned the people repeatedly to beware of him. Today Trotsky and his agents stand exposed before the whole world. They stand exposed and branded as the worst Judases the world has ever known. Worse than our own Benedict Arnold who betrayed his countrymen at a time of great stress and crisis.

Naturally there are some who are still in doubt. And, naturally again, Trotskyite agents seek to exploit these doubts to confuse some people and, under cover of confusion, to promote Trotsky's horrible conspiracies.

It is incredible, some people say, that Trotsky and his agents should have gone so far. Conspiring with Hitler and Japan to dismember the Soviet Union, to destroy its socialist system, to restore capitalism, to carry on espionage for the fascist powers, to engage in wrecking activities which cost the lives of many workers, to plan assassination of Soviet leaders, actually to help the fascist aggressors, especially Hitler Germany and military-fascist Japan, to begin the world war for which these powers are openly and brazenly preparing.

Incredible, say the doubters. Yet most of these same people cannot help but agree that it is true none the less, Trotsky and his agents have been actually proven guilty of all these unspeakable crimes. Proven guilty in open court, the highest court of the Soviet Union, in the presence of numerous foreign diplomats and correspondents.

The thing is not incredible at all for those who are familiar with the development of Trotsky and Trotskyism. And it will cease to appear incredible to all sincere persons once they learn something of these developments. We shall come to these later on.

For the moment suffice it to say that just as the American revolution had its Benedict Arnold and Aaron Burr, and just as our period of the Civil War had John Wilkes Booth, the assassin of Lincoln, so the Soviet Union is having its Trotsky, Zinoviev, Piatakov and the others. The Soviet Union has all these traitors as we had ours, but with a difference. And the difference is this: The socialist revolution, which gave birth to the

Soviet Union, goes much deeper than our revolution did. It builds for the establishment of a classless society. Hence it affects the interests of both friend and enemy much more vitally. Hence its defeated enemies carry on their resistance longer and resort to more horrible means. Hence its traitors are more horrible and detestable and the consequences of their treason reach out far beyond the confines of the Soviet Union.

The actions of the Trotsky traitors are therefore a menace to all of us, to all progressive mankind.

Read the proceedings of the January trial: the confessions of the accused, the testimony of witnesses, the letters of Trotsky, other documents, the examination of accused and witnesses, and the summary speech by the prosecutor. The truth is there. And it is this truth that exposes and condemns the Trotskyites as agents and partners of fascism, as enemies of the people.

The conspiratorial machine shapes up like this: Piatakov, Serebriakov, Radek and Sokolnikov functioned as a secret leading committee known as the Trotskyite "Parallel Center". This committee worked side by side with the "United Trotsky-Zinoviev" terrorist center, tried and condemned in August, 1936. Under this "Parallel Center" of Piatakov and Co. worked another group of old-time and well-known Trotskyites: Muralov, Boguslavsky, Drobnis and Livshitz. And with them operated a group of spies and agents of the fascist intelligence Services: Rataichak, Stroilov, Grasche.

When asked by the prosecutor: "Were the members of your organization connected with foreign intelligence services?" Piatakov answered: "Yes, they were. It is necessary to return to the line of Trotsky in order to make it clearer."

In the course of the examination, that line became very clear. It called for acts of wreckage and terrorism. It called for treason to the Soviet Union and to socialism.

Speaking of Trotsky's instructions to the "Parallel Center", given in the middle of 1934, Piatakov admitted:

"I must state that the instructions with regard to wrecking met with rather serious resistance among the followers of Trotsky, arousing perplexity and dissatisfaction. We informed Trotsky of the existence of

such sentiments. But Trotsky replied that the instructions regarding wrecking were an essential and integral part of his policy and were his line."

In December, 1935, Piatakov met Trotsky near Oslo, Norway. Trotsky was agitated and greatly dissatisfied with the slow manner in which his agents were operating, especially in the matter of wrecking. He reproached Piatakov in these words: "You cannot tear yourselves away from the Stalinist navel cord; you take the Stalinist construction for socialist construction." Bitterly and sarcastically Trotsky hammered at Piatakov: "Socialism cannot be built in one country"; "the collapse of the Stalinist state is absolutely inevitable."

And Trotsky had his way. The "Parallel Center" proceeded to organize acts of wrecking and assassination. Drobnis, Muralov, Boguslavsky and Livshitz went forth as the "field organizers" to do the job: in the Kuzbas, the Kemerovo mines, in the Ukraine, on the railroads, in the chemical industry. By order of Piatakov, Drobnis was shifted from Central Asia to Western Siberia to concentrate on wrecking, especially to injure the defense capacities of the country. Not by accident did the Trotskyite plotters pay so much attention to Western Siberia. As is seen from their collaboration with the agents of the Japanese intelligence service, the Trotskyites were planfully aiding the war preparations of the Japanese military-fascist clique.

Boguslavsky too was operating in Western Siberia, being a member of the Novosibirsk Trotskyite center. Muralov inspired and directed Boguslavsky, who was engaged in spoiling locomotives and sabotaging important railway construction. From Muralov, Boguslavsky knew that several Trotskyite groups were operating in the Kuzbas to organize the assassination of visiting representatives of the national government, and that such attempts were actually organized against V. M. Molotov, chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, and L. M. Kaganovich, People's Commissar of Railways.

Another carrier of the "Trotsky line" was Livshitz, an old Trotskyite and formerly Vice-Commissar of Railroads. He had been doing his best to wreck the railway system. And in

addition—espionage work for the Japanese intelligence service. He turned over information of great military value to the Japanese agents through Kniazev, another of the accused on trial. And Kniazev was the active link between the Trotskyites and the Japanese intelligence service. Kniazev confirmed that for a similar job the Japanese turned over to Turck, another accused, 35,000 rubles.

The victims of the acts of wrecking and sabotage of the Trotskyite gangs were many dead and injured workers. It was in their name also that the prosecutor pressed his charges. Addressing the court in his closing speech, Vyshinsky said:

“Not I alone am accusing. Alongside me, comrades and judges, I feel that here stand the victims of these crimes and of these criminals—on crutches, crippled, half-alive and possibly utterly disabled—like the woman switchman Comrade Nagovitsina at the Shustovo station... who lost both legs at the age of twenty in preventing the collision organized by these very people.”

What was Trotsky and his gang trying to accomplish? We will let Radek relate what Trotsky wrote to him. Radek said in Court: “I had three letters from Trotsky: April, 1934; December, 1935; and January, 1936. In the 1934 letter, Trotsky raised the question in this way.”

And then Radek goes on:

“The advent of fascism to power in Germany basically changes the whole situation. It means the near prospect of war. War is inevitable, all the more so because the situation in the Far East is becoming strained. Trotsky did not doubt that this war would cause the defeat of the Soviet Union. He wrote that this defeat would create real conditions for the bloc to come to power, and he drew the conclusion from this that the bloc was interested in sharpening the conflict.”

Thus we have it from the mouth of Radek, and on the basis of a letter by Trotsky, that this counter-revolutionary gang, calling itself “a bloc”, was not only speculating on the defeat



of the Soviet Union and the victory of fascism, but was consciously working towards these ends.

“The bloc”, wrote Trotsky, “was interested in sharpening the conflict.” Let the meaning of this be fully understood: Trotsky said he was interested in *hastening* the coming of war and he was further interested in the defeat of the Soviet Union resulting from this war.

This gave Trotsky the basis for negotiation and collaboration with the representatives of Hitler and Japan, since both of these fascist aggressors are interested in hastening war and defeating the Soviet Union. It is therefore not surprising to hear Radek relate further:

“Trotsky mentioned in the letter that he had established contacts with a certain Far Eastern country and a certain middle European country and had openly told semi-official circles of these countries that the bloc took the line of bargaining with them and was prepared to agree to considerable concessions, both economic and territorial.”

Like “practical politicians”, which Radek claimed they were, Trotsky discussed this matter more specifically with Piatakov in December, 1935, near Oslo, Norway. This was what Piatakov related in Court:

“Trotsky told me he had negotiated with Rudolph Hess, deputy chairman of the German National-Socialist Party. Naturally I cannot say whether there exists a written contract or simply an agreement, but Trotsky told me all this was in an existing agreement which, of course, still required official formulation through several other personas of whom I will speak in the secret session of the Court. It amounts to the following;

“Firstly, German fascists promise the Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc a favorable attitude and their support if the bloc achieves power, both during the war and before the war.”

Did Hess promise Trotsky this support for nothing? No, of course not. And Piatakov continues:

"But the fascists receive the following compensation for this. A generally favorable attitude by the bloc to German interests and the German government in all question of international policy.

"Certain territorial concessions. This was called 'non-resistance to Ukrainian national bourgeois forces in the case of their attempt at self determination'. This means, in concealed form, what Radek spoke of here when he said 'If the Germans set up their Ukrainian government, which, of course, they would not control through a German governor-general but perhaps through a Hetman, but in any case Germans would self-determine the Ukraine' and the Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc would in any case not oppose this. In essence this meant the dismemberment of the U.S.S.R.

"The next point in the agreement dealt with the form in which German capital would get a chance to exploit the resources and raw materials of the U.S.S.R. It required especially gold mines, oil, manganese, lumber, apatite, etc.

"The last point was: in case of military attack, it would be necessary to coordinate the disruptive forces of the Trotskyite organization acting within the country with external forces acting under the leadership of German fascism."

For these unspeakable treacheries against the progressive forces of the world, Trotsky had "justifying" arguments. Of course. And the argument that must have been most convincing to Piatakov & Co. was probably this.

Trotsky argues with Piatakov:

"If we intended to come to power at all, then the real forces in the international situation were primarily the fascists and we must establish contact with these forces, one way or another."

"Practical politicians", they called themselves. If you must get power in the Soviet Union, and Trotsky still thinks he must, and you cannot get it by yourself, then you must have somebody to help you. According to Trotsky, the fas-

cists could help. But —

“Trotsky immediately pointed out that this favorable attitude would not be the result of any special love on the part of these governments for the Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc. It would proceed simply from the practical interests of the fascist governments and from what we promise to do for them if we received power.”

Thus Piatakov related his interview with Trotsky near Oslo. Sure, there is little love lost between Hitler and Trotsky. We did not need Goering to tell us that Hitler does not love Trotsky. It was, as Trotsky explained to Piatakov, a “practical” proposition of give and take.

Trotsky did not overlook Japan either. In his second letter to Radek, December, 1935, Trotsky outlined the nature of the “concessions” that the Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc would make to Japan. These included; the ceding to Japan of the Soviet Maritime provinces, the Amur region, and a guarantee supply of Soviet oil to Japan in case of a Japanese-American war.

Upon instructions from Trotsky, Radek and Sokolnikov conferred in Moscow with diplomatic representatives of Germany and Japan, confirming Trotsky’s “promises” to these powers and assuming responsibility for them.

Thus unfolded itself at the trial the Trotsky program, and the criminal Trotskyite deeds, in their plot to become the rulers, to secure power, in the Land of Soviets.

Why did they want power? What kind of power and what sort of government were they looking for? And what sort of economic system would they establish?

And always remember that, according to Trotsky, the present Soviet government is not a workers’ government, that the social system is not socialism, and that in general socialism is impossible in one country. Plotting the overthrow of the Soviet government and the seizure of power, Trotsky was also outlining to his confederates the system which he was going to establish. What was it? Listen to Radek testifying in Court:

“Trotsky considered that the result of defeat would be inevitable territorial concessions, and he

definitely mentioned the Ukraine. Secondly, the question was raised of partitioning the U.S.S.R. Thirdly, from the economic viewpoint, he envisaged the following results of defeat: not only giving out as concessions the industrial plants important for the imperialist states, but also handing over, selling to capitalist elements, as private property important economic objects which they would indicate.

“Trotsky foresaw the floating of joint stock concerns, namely, admitting foreign capital into operation of factories which formerly were in the hands of the Soviet State.

“In the sphere of agrarian policy, Trotsky clearly raised the question that it was necessary to dissolve the collective farms and advanced the idea of providing tractors and other complicated machinery to individual farmers and of restoring a new kulak strata.

“Finally, the question was openly raised about the necessity of restoring private capital in the towns. It was clear that the question at issue was the restoration of capitalism.”

Thus in a letter of Trotsky to Radek in December, 1935.

*Trotsky sought power to restore capitalism.* Incredible? Not at all. We shall show later how this was the inevitable result of the entire course of the development of Trotskyism. But, even without that, every unprejudiced person should be able to see that, in plotting the overthrow of the Soviet government, Trotsky couldn't seek anything else but the restoration of capitalism.

Consider: in his own writings and speeches he slanderously maintains that the system built in the Soviet Union is not socialism. He further maintains, openly and publicly, that socialism in the Soviet Union alone is impossible. This is a fundamental tenet of Trotskyism. This being the case, it takes little reasoning to understand that Trotsky's plotting for power in the Soviet Union could not be for the purposes of building or maintaining socialism. And if it is not socialism, because this is excluded by Trotsky's theory itself, what can it be? The restoration of capitalism. This and nothing else. And

this was exactly what the January trial disclosed and proved.

Trotsky does not call it by that name. Radek, for example, speaks of it as the “inevitable leveling of the socialist system of the U.S.S.R. with that of the victorious fascist countries”. But the meaning of it is plain: the restoration of capitalism.

This being the aim of the conspiracy, Trotsky also had to provide a “suitable” form of government to put through the scheme. And what was that? Radek relates this angle as follows:

“In the political sphere, a new feature of this letter (December, 1935), was how the question of power was to be raised. Trotsky said in the letter:

“There cannot be any question about any democracy. The working class has lived through eighteen years of the revolution, and has a tremendous appetite, but it is necessary to bring the workers back, in part, to private factories, partly to government factories, which will probably be in condition of severest competition with private capital. This means that a sharp worsening of the conditions of the working class will take place. In the villages, the struggle of the poor and middle peasants will begin again. And then to hold power, *a strong government will be needed*, independently of what forms it will have.”

This must have been strong medicine even to a Trotskyite like Radek. So, to sweeten the pill, Trotsky explained to Radek further:

“If you want historical analogies, said Trotsky, take that of Napoleon I. Napoleon’s government was not restoration; the restoration came later. But this government was an attempt to preserve the chief gains of the revolution, to preserve everything possible from the revolution.”

Incredible? Hard to believe that Trotsky would think of himself as another Napoleon, plotting with fascism “to preserve everything possible from the revolution”? Not at all. Ten years, or so, ago, Trotsky declared that he was preparing himself for the role of Clemenceau (war premier of France), to

save the Soviet Union when the enemy was at the gates of Moscow. And for this he had to overthrow the "Stalin government" which, according to himself, was leading the country to defeat.

The present Napoleon scheme of Trotsky is a development and variation of the old Clemenceau scheme.

## CHAPTER II

### A Path of Treachery

Trotsky, Zinoviev, Piatakov and Co. are "Old Bolsheviks", some people say. They are the "fathers" of the Russian revolution, it is claimed. On this false basis, the question is asked: How is it possible for these "founders" of the Soviet system to try to betray it, and to join for this purpose with the worst enemies of socialism?

Those who genuinely ask such questions apparently do not know that this gang of counter-revolutionary bandits have had a long history, that their transformation into allies of fascism is no sudden or overnight affair. They were moving in that direction for a long time.

State Prosecutor Vyshinsky, in his summing up speech, stated the thing very clearly:

"Like a moving picture film operated backwards, this trial has called to our memory and has shown us again all the basic stages of the historic path of the Trotskyites and of Trotskyism which spent more than thirty years to prepare at last this final transformation into the storm troops of fascism."

This historic path of Trotskyism was a path of struggle against Lenin and Bolshevism, a path of double-dealing and treachery. It is worse than ridiculous therefore to speak of Trotsky, whom Lenin branded as a Judas, and of his agents, as "Old Bolsheviks".

Just a few high lights of this "historic path of Trotskyism":

As far back as 1904, almost 33 years ago, Trotsky started on his historic path. He published four pamphlets entitled: *Our Political Tasks*. In these pamphlets Trotsky challenged Bolshevism. He denounced and slandered the Bolshevik path to victory over tsarism and capitalism outlined by Lenin and accepted by the Bolsheviks. He had the brazenness to attack Lenin as "a leader of the reactionary wing" of the Party.

Between 1904 and 1911, Lenin and Stalin were busy training the future Bolsheviks who led the people to victory over the tsar and capitalism; they were busy organizing the working class and its allies in daily struggle against their exploi-

ters. Thus they have built the Bolshevik Party.

What was Trotsky doing? Fighting Lenin, Stalin and the Bolsheviks, organizing combinations of all sorts of opportunists and servants of capitalism to block the road of proletarian victory.

In 1911-12 Trotsky organized the infamous "August Bloc", the prototype of the latter day "Trotsky-Zinoviev Bloc". The chief aim of the "August Bloc" was to fight Lenin and the Bolshevik policies. And who were the people that went into the making of this "August Bloc"? Mensheviks, agents of capitalism in the labor movement, people thrown out of the ranks of the Bolshevik Party.

Study Lenin's writings and you will see how much time and energy he had to devote to unmasking and combatting Trotsky, the Judas. Twenty years ago Lenin found it necessary to warn the workers against Trotsky in these words:

"The young generation of workers should know well with whom they are dealing."

Recalling these facts of the Trotskyite path of treachery, State Prosecutor Vyshinsky asked:

"Is it an accident that the Trotskyites were finally transformed into a nest and hot-bed of degeneration and thermidorian policy, as Stalin once said? Is it an accident that Trotsky who, after the Revolution made his way into the ranks of our Party, slipped up and adopted a counter-revolutionary Menshevik position and was thrown out beyond the borders of our state, beyond the borders of the Soviet Union?"

By this time, the reader should be in a position to answer this question for himself. And to answer the correct way, the way Vyshinsky did.

"It is *not* an accident because prior to the October Revolution as well, Trotsky and his friends fought against Lenin and Lenin's Party as they fight now against Stalin and the Party of Lenin and Stalin. They come to their shameful end because they have followed this role for many years, have sung the praises



of capitalism and have lacked faith in the success of socialist construction and in the victory of socialism.

“That is why they come finally to develop a program of capitalist restoration. That is why they proceeded to betray and sell our native land.”

Trotsky never believed in the possibility of socialism in the Soviet Union. He always claimed—and that can be found in all his writings—that in a backward agricultural country like old Russia, where the peasantry was predominant and the peasantry could not be won to support the socialist revolution, socialism was impossible. This is the foundation of Trotskyism.

Holding such views, it was not at all surprising to see Trotsky propose in 1922 that the industrial plants of the Soviet Union be mortgaged to private capital in order to secure the much needed credits at the time. In fact, Trotsky quite freely theorized on this question. He declared—and that again is a matter of public record—that the Soviet economy was “more and more fusing with capitalist economy”, that the Soviet Union “would all the time be under the control of world economy”.

Recalling these incidents of the “historic path of Trotskyism”, Vyshinsky recalls the answer which Stalin had given:

“Capitalist control, said Stalin, means political control. It means the destruction of the political independence of our country and the adaptation of the laws of our country to the interests and tastes of international capitalist economy.”

Trotsky was willing to accept that. Not Stalin. Not the Bolsheviks. Stalin made that quite clear at the time. He said:

“If it is a question of such real capitalist control, then I must declare that such control does not exist and never will exist here as long as our proletariat is alive and as long as we have the dictatorship of the proletariat here.”

Some “clever” writers are exhausting their ingenuity in trying to construct a “fight for power” between Stalin and

Trotsky as individuals. It is not that at all. Trotsky defames Stalin and plots against him, organizes terrorist acts against Stalin, "to remove him", using the conspiratorial language of the Trotskyites, because Stalin leads in the building of socialism, because under his daily guidance socialism in the Soviet Union became triumphantly victorious.

Yet, if it will help some people to understand the matter more easily by looking at it as a struggle between two individuals for power, all right, let us grant that for a moment. And having done so, we must ask: And what are these individuals fighting about? What do they want power for and what do they propose to do with it? This is a fair question. And when you try to answer it, where do you get? Exactly where we were a while ago. You discover once more that it is a fight of a group of counter-revolutionists and allies of fascism, led by Trotsky, against the Soviet Union and its socialist system, headed by Stalin. You find out again that "Trotsky fights Stalin" because Trotsky seeks the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union which Stalin opposes, which he has opposed all the time in "his fight against Trotsky" and Trotskyism.

Yes, some people say; but Trotsky and the Trotskyites are Socialists. No, is the answer. They are not. What is true is that *they say* they are Socialists. But so does Hitler. His fascist party calls itself "The National German Socialist Workers' Party". And what does that prove?

The Russian revolution (and not only the Russian) has many examples to show how people calling themselves "socialists" were in reality the worst enemies of socialism.

There were the "Socialist Revolutionaries" who joined with White Guard generals and foreign intervention to defeat the socialist revolution and to dismember Russia. There were the Mensheviks who, in the Ukraine and the Caucasus, called upon the Kaiser's Germany and upon England to come in and help destroy the socialist revolution and to establish there foreign imperialist rule. Trotsky and the Trotskyites are following a similar path.

Once more it is necessary to keep in mind that this latest chain of treason did not come of a sudden. It is the culminating point of the historic path of Trotskyism.

Already more than ten years ago – *ten years* – the Trotsky-Zinoviev combination began to resort to open crimes against the Soviet government, crimes punishable by Soviet criminal law. The so-called “New Opposition”, headed by Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev, and participated in by Piatakov, Radek, Serebriakov, Muralov, Sokolnikov, Drobnis and Boguslavsky, the defendants in the January trial, took the path of struggle against the Soviet government *into the streets*. They tried to organize demonstrations and to involve the masses in the fight. And it was not their fault that they failed. The masses were against them.

It will be recalled that at that time the Soviet government was meeting with a number of difficulties in the construction of socialism. The Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc attempted to exploit these difficulties in order to deliver a blow at the Soviet government.

In 1932, also, the Soviet government was struggling to overcome certain difficulties, and the Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc was on the job again – waiting for difficulties and seizing upon them to fight the Soviet government and the socialist system.

State Prosecutor Vyshinsky summed up on the “socialist past” of these criminals in a very convincing way. He said:

“The question may arise in some minds – how is it that these people who fought for socialism so many years can now be accused of these monstrous crimes? Perhaps these people are accused of something that by the very essence of their whole past socialist revolutionary Bolshevik activity they cannot be accused of?

“I answer this question. We accuse these gentlemen of being traitors to socialism. We motivate this accusation not only by what was committed (this is the subject of the accusation) but we say the history of their downfall began long before they organized the so-called ‘Parallel Center’, this off-shoot of the criminal Trotskyist-Zinovievist united bloc.

“The organic link is here at hand. The historic link is here at hand. From the platform of 1926, from anti-

Soviet street demonstrations, illegal printshops, and the league with White Guard officers which they also accepted then, to destructive work, espionage, terror and betrayal of the fatherland—from 1932 to 1936 is one step. And they took this step.”

They took this step and became the allies of fascism, plotters for the defeat of the Soviet Union and its dismemberment, collaborators with Hitler Germany and military-fascist Japan; terrorists, assassins and wreckers.

Some still maintain that if Trotsky did come to assassination and individual terror as a “method” of struggle against the Soviet government, he must have come to it all of a sudden and at the last minute. But this too is not so. Vyshinsky quoted at the trial from articles in the Trotsky *Opposition Bulletin*, numbers 36 and 37 from October, 1934, such statements as this:

“It would be childish to think that the Stalinist bureaucracy can be removed with the help of the Party or of the Soviet Congress. There are not left any normal constitutional ways for removing the ruling cliques. They can be forced to hand over power to the proletarian vanguard... only by force.”

Never mind the brazen audacity of the Trotskyites calling themselves “the proletarian vanguard”. They called themselves Socialists, also, and Communists. The important thing is the open call to force and violence to compel the Soviet government “to hand over power” to Trotsky so he can restore capitalism; the open call to force “to remove” the Stalinist leadership. The murder of Kirov was the fruit of this appeal. The terroristic conspiracies exposed at the August and January trials are the result and further development of Trotsky’s call in 1934 for force and violence.

Together with Trotsky, Hearst and Lloyd George may deplore the fact that there are in the Soviet Union “no normal constitutional ways” for overthrowing the Soviet government, for restoring capitalism, or for selling out the territories of the Soviet Union to German fascism and to military-fascist Japan. All honest workers and sincere progressives will say:

thank the dictatorship of the proletariat that there are “no normal” and easy ways of attempting to destroy the Soviet Union. Trotsky, Hearst and Hitler will continue to miss these “normal ways”. Progressive and genuinely democratic humanity will applaud this fact in the full realization that the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, embodied in the new Stalinist Constitution, has proven most effective in building socialism, and in creating a powerful fortress for peace and democracy throughout the world.

## CHAPTER III

### Confessions and Objective Evidence

Hearst and Trotsky have been trying hard to invalidate the confessions of the defendants at the January trial. Trotsky and Hearst, and some others who trail behind them, have been talking of "torture" by the "Gay-Pay-Oo", promises of "leniency" to those who confessed, "confession gases", and what not.

The reactionary capitalist press in this country, taking its cue from the Nazi Minister of Propaganda, Goebbels, was using all the tricks of corrupt journalism in its editorials and comments to becloud the trial, to ridicule it, to throw suspicion upon its genuineness.

But to no avail. The correspondents of these papers, who were present at the trial, were telling in their dispatches one thing, while the editorials and comments were telling a different thing. The correspondents, most of them unfriendly to the Soviet Union and highly suspicious of it, could not help but be impressed with the truth. They heard the confessions and testimony of defendants and witnesses, they saw them in Court, they listened (no doubt very critically) to the examination of the prosecutor and to his summing up speech, and the impression they carried away was: it was genuine and real from beginning to end. And this was what they wired to their newspapers.

Very revealing was the reaction of Walter Duranty (Moscow correspondent for *The New York Times*) to the confession of Radek. Duranty wrote:

"It is a sad and dreadful thing to see your friends on trial for their lives. And it is sadder and more dreadful to hear them hang themselves with their own words.... Radek taught me so much and helped me so often—how could I believe him guilty until I heard him say so? Stalin himself had confidence in Radek until the evidence and Radek's own confession made doubt impossible." (*The New York Times*, January 25.)

Of the testimony of Piatakov, Duranty wired that it "car-

ried conviction to the most obdurate hearers". Listening to this testimony, a foreign diplomat told Duranty: "If this is lying, then I have never heard the truth."

Perhaps the opinion of Mauritz Hallgren, a leading editorial writer on the *Baltimore Sun* and formerly one of the editors of *The Nation*, who for a while was doubtful and even joined the so-called "American Committee for the Defense of León Trotsky", from which he now resigned — perhaps the opinion of Hallgren should carry even more weight. And this was what he wrote of the testimony of the defendants in his letter of withdrawal from the Trotsky Committee:

"The very unanimity of the defendants, far from proving that this trial is also a 'frame-up', appears to me to prove directly the contrary. For if these men are innocent, then certainly at least one of the three dozen, knowing that he faced death in any case, would have blurted out the truth. It is inconceivable that out of this great number of defendants, all should lie when lies would not do one of them any good. But why look beyond the obvious for the truth, why seek in mysticism or in dark magic for facts that are before one's very nose? Why not accept the plain fact that the men are guilty? And this fact, if accepted with regard to the men now on trial, must also be accepted with regard to the men who were executed after the first trial."\*

Trotsky, sitting in México, shouts "frame-up" through the columns of the Hearst press and other papers. He claims to be in possession of "evidence" that would show him to be innocent. Yet, despite the fact that correspondents of numerous papers are at his service to broadcast far and wide his testimony, he has not yet disclosed any of his "evidence". What is he waiting for?

All fair-minded people expect him to go to Moscow and give his testimony there. The Supreme Court of the Soviet Union is the only competent tribunal to hear and judge Trot-

---

\* *Why I Resigned from the Trotsky Defense Committee*, p. 5, International Publishers, New York.

sky. Why doesn't he go to Moscow and face the Soviet Court?

While failing to disclose anything that would successfully contradict the evidence at the Moscow trial, Trotsky and his agents shout for "objective evidence". The declarations and testimony of the defendants and witnesses are not enough for them.

State Prosecutor Vyshinsky, in his summing up speech, went into the question of objective evidence as follows:

"What proofs have we in our arsenal from the viewpoint of juridical claims? The character of the present case is such that specific proofs possible in the case are determined by its character. We have the plot. We have in front of us a group of people who prepared to carry out a coup d'état. The question can be placed as follows: You speak of the plot, but where are your documents? You speak of the program, but where is this program? Do these people anywhere possess a written program? You say that this is an organization (they call themselves a party), but where are their decisions, and the material proofs of this plotting activity – statutes, protocols, seals, etc.?"

The question of evidence and its possible nature are placed here clearly. And what is the answer? Said Vyshinsky:

"I take the liberty to affirm, in accordance with the primary demands of the science of criminal law, that such claims cannot be made in cases of plotting. In the case of plotting of a coup d'état, it cannot be demanded that the matter be approached from a viewpoint such as: show us your protocols, decisions, membership cards and number of membership cards. Yes, we have a number of documents with regard to this. But even had we not possessed that, we would have all the same considered ourselves in the right to make the charge on the basis of the testimonies and declarations of the accused and witnesses, and, if you wish, on circumstantial evidence."

Is this something unheard of? Is it only the practice of the Soviet Union to indict and convict people, *in cases of treason*



*to the state*, only, or largely, on the basis of the confessions of the accused themselves? That's what Hearst and Trotsky say. The truth is that nearly everywhere, this is the procedure, the only possible procedure in most instances of treasonable plots. And this is what Trotsky and his agents are accused of.

*The Nation*, which certainly cannot be charged with "too much" sympathy for the Soviet Union, and which at first was rather doubtful about many angles of the trial, has this to say:

"Nor is there anything unusual, even outside Russia, in basing a conviction upon confessions. In both English and American law all that is needed to prove treason is two witnesses to the overt act or a confession in open court." (*The Nation*, February 6.)

All that is needed in American law to prove treason is two witnesses or, if there are no witnesses, *a confession in open court*.

Let's remember that. And let's also remember that the Supreme Court of the Soviet Union had before it: confessions in open court, *and* witnesses *and* documents *and* an overwhelming mass of *circumstantial evidence*. And circumstantial evidence, as most Americans know, is in most cases more decisive for proving guilt than is direct evidence. Experts are agreed on that. But the Soviet Court had circumstantial evidence and objective evidence. Said Vyshinsky:

"I spoke of the program and I showed you, comrades and judges, Trotsky's *Bulletin* in which he printed this very program. But identification here will be much easier than that which you carried out identifying certain persons from the German Intelligence Service from photographs. We are basing ourselves on a number of proofs which in our hands can serve to verify the statements of the accused.

"First of all, there are the historic connections, which confirm the thesis of the prosecution, on the basis of the past activities of the Trotskyites."

Recall "the historic path of Trotskyism"—the path of treachery to the people.

“We have in mind further the testimonies of the accused which in themselves are the greatest proof. In the trial, when one of the proofs was the testimony of the accused themselves, we did not restrict ourselves to the Court’s hearing only statements of the accused: we used all the means possible and accessible to us to verify these statements.”

But, if one should still contend that the testimony of the accused is not convincing enough, that would mean that the defendants were accusing each other falsely. And if that were so, one would have to find a reason for it. Why should they have accused each other falsely? What could they gain by it?

It should now be clear to every fair-minded person that, following the execution of the conspirators of the first trial in August, 1936 (Zinoviev, Kamenev & Co.), none of the defendants at the second trial could have had any expectations of securing gain or advantage by falsely accusing the other. The only reason they confessed their crime, and why their testimony agrees on the whole, is because they were guilty.

## CHAPTER IV

### Soviet Democracy Vindicated

If Trotsky, Hearst, Hitler & Co. had any ideas that the extension and development of Soviet democracy would provide them with new loopholes and wedges for successful conspiracy against the Soviet Union, they must be feeling today bitterly and sadly disappointed. In fact, one need not guess about it. They show this bitter disappointment all too plainly.

The new Soviet Constitution—the Stalin Constitution—has been rightly hailed by the toiling masses of the world as a blessing, as a triumph of progress and socialism, as a victory over decaying capitalism which produces and nurtures fascism. But what did that mean? It meant, among many other things, that fascism and the agents of fascism cannot for long live in the Soviet Union. This is so far the only country in the world where fascism cannot thrive. And when some of its agents and Trotskyite collaborators nevertheless do make an attempt to operate, they meet a quick and sure end as soon as they are discovered.

This can only bring joy to the hearts of the workers, all exploited classes, all friends of progress and true enemies of fascism.

How many times have we heard expressions of sincere lamentation over the fact that if only a few decisive measures against the fascist generals in Spain *had been taken in time*, as urged by the Communists, how much blood and suffering could have been spared the Spanish people?

And in Germany: if only Social-Democracy had joined with the Communists in dealing with the Hitler gang courageously and decisively, how much agony would have been spared the German people, and how much of a safer place to live in the world would be today?

Yet some of these same people, who sincerely lament these historic failures, seem to feel a bit uncertain about the justification for the drastic measures taken by the Soviet government against the Trotskyite traitors and collaborators of fascism. To these we must say: Why do you refuse to learn from experience? Why do you persist in repeating the same errors—criminal errors, such costly errors—over and over again?

Certainly, you do not wish to encourage fresh Trotskyite conspiracies in the Soviet Union? Surely, you do not want to embolden Hitler or the Japanese military clique to speculate on disintegration within the Soviet Union resulting from Trotskyite conspiracies? Because to encourage such hopes in the fascist aggressors means to speed them on to more reckless provocations. It means to hasten the outbreak of war which will spare no country. It means to encourage Hitler to try in Czechoslovakia what he is doing in Spain.

Do you want all that? Of course not. That being the case, certain practical conclusions have to be drawn. And one of them is this: *Make Hitler, Japan, and all fascist aggressors understand that conspiracies with Trotsky and the Trotskyites do not work in the Soviet Union.* That was what the Soviet government has done. And for this it deserves the gratitude of the enemies of fascism in all countries.

Make Hitler and the other war aggressors also understand that such and similar conspiracies will not work in other countries either. This is what Hitler and Mussolini ought to be taught in Spain.

And progressive people everywhere understand that. But not so the leader of the Socialist Party of America, Norman Thomas. He too draws conclusions from the Moscow trial. He began to draw them even before the trial was over. And here it is:

"Socialists and workers generally are justified in seeing in this situation the natural outgrowth of the Communist theory which would ruthlessly sacrifice the individual to the alleged interests of the mass, which interest of the mass is interpreted in terms of the revolutionary group able to get and keep power, a group which permits no proper channel of criticism within its governmental organization."

Never mind the mendacity of Thomas trying to speak in the name of all Socialists and even of "workers generally". The American workers have not forgotten, nor will they soon forget, Thomas' campaign to elect Landon on the phoney theory that Landon would inject some iron into the blood of American labor so it will fight better. So, let's overlook this

pontifical gesture of taking everybody under Norman Thomas' fold. But what about the conclusion itself? It is purposely written in very involved terms but it can be easily deciphered. And here is what it means;

1. The building of socialism in the Soviet Union is not in the interests of the masses. It is only an "alleged" interest, not a true one, so says Thomas the "Socialist".

2. The Soviet government is really not the government of the people, says Thomas again. It is only a "revolutionary group able to get and keep power" – a Stalin group.

3. Soviet democracy, which built a socialist society, which is today the strongest bulwark of peace and progress, whom the Spanish people consider the greatest blessing in their hour of need and stress, this Soviet democracy means nothing at all to the "democracy loving" Thomas. No, says Thomas, it is no such thing; it is only a group in power which, *because it won't give the Trotsky-Hitler combination a free hand to operate in the Soviet Union*, "permits no proper channels of criticism within its governmental organization".

This is no mere philosophizing, rotten as it is. It is very actual and has an immediate practical purpose. It is to bolster up the astounding statement that the Trotsky-Hitler conspiracy is "*the natural outgrowth of the Communist theory*". These are Thomas' words. They will be found, in the above context, in the semi-Trotskyite sheet that calls itself *The Socialist Call*, of January 30, 1937. It means: the conspiracy is to be blamed not on the conspirators and their fascist partners. No, says Thomas, blame it on the Communist theory as he, Thomas, interprets it.

This sort of conclusion is obviously needed by Thomas also to justify his toleration of the Trotskyites in the Socialist Party and his membership on the "Committee for the Defense of Trotsky". But fair-minded people and true Socialists will want an answer to this question:

How far is it from considering the Trotsky conspiracy – which includes the murder of Kirov – "*a natural outgrowth of Communist theory*" to *actually justifying* the Trotsky-fascist conspiracy?

It is not very far. One may lead into the other.

## CHAPTER V

### A Menace to Progressive Mankind

Trotskyism is a menace to all progressive mankind. Trotsky's conspiracies with Rudolph Hess—Hitler's deputy—and with the Japanese military-fascist clique are a menace to the peace of the world. Trotsky's conspiracies against the anti-fascist People's Front movements in Spain and in all countries are a menace to progress and peace. They are direct help to fascism. Trotskyite conspiracies within labor organizations are a menace to the much needed unity of labor against the economic royalists.

Labor and all progressives are vitally interested in stamping out Trotskyism wherever it raises its head.

It is well known that Trotsky's agents in Spain are helping the fascists to undermine the People's Front government and to destroy it. In Spain, as in the Soviet Union, Trotskyites are working for the defeat of democracy and for the victory of fascism.

Under cover of revolutionary-sounding phrases, Trotskyism in Spain is in fact an ally of Franco and Hitler. Covering themselves with proposals that sound "more revolutionary" than the programs of the Socialists and Communists, the Trotskyites in Spain seek to break up the unity of labor and of the people. In Spain, as in the Soviet Union, Trotsky is exposed as an ally and collaborator of bloody fascism.

Trotsky in Mexico, where he now resides, is playing the same reactionary and treacherous role. He is becoming the darling of Mexican reaction and fascism. Listen to the voice of Vicente Lombardo Toledano, a progressive leader of Mexican labor, the head of the Mexican Confederation of Labor which went on record as opposed to Trotsky's residence in México. Says Toledano:

"Trotskyism preaches a tactic of struggle opposed to the policy of the People's Front.... Trotskyism in practice is equivalent to the policies of the reactionaries who constantly seek to divide the proletariat, to confuse the people, to place the masses in opposition to the progressive government, in order that they may

prosper from the division among the democratic forces. Quite naturally, therefore, the Mexican Workers' Confederation does not want Trotsky in my country." (*New Masses*, February 2.)

The Mexican workers and progressives do not want Trotsky in México because Trotsky is a traitor and an enemy. But the reactionaries do want Trotsky. Says Toledano:

"Events have already borne out the correctness of our judgment: conservative sectors of opinion, the newspapers of the bourgeoisie, the reactionary intellectuals and students, and those small groups of workers led by treacherous leaders have applauded Trotsky's arrival in my country. Mexico's conservatives have never defended the right of asylum until today; for the first time, they now speak of respect for the sacred right of hospitality, seal of pride in our gentlemanly tradition." (*Ibid.*)

Mexico's reactionaries and fascists are the defenders of Trotsky. Why? Because Trotsky works for their cause.

The same in the United States. Hearst is the outstanding champion of Trotsky. Hearst's press is becoming Trotsky's megaphone to wage war against the peace movements of all countries, against the anti-fascist People's Front, against the Soviet Union.

The American labor movement also has some bitter experiences with the agents of Trotsky. In strikes, Trotskyites invariably attack the unions and seek to disrupt the unity of the workers. Recent examples of such treachery are found in the rubber strike in Akron and in the great victorious strike of the maritime workers. '

They worm their way into the Workers' Alliance—the organization of the unemployed—and carry on there campaigns of disruption and sabotage.

They have entered the Socialist Party and, through their secret groups and conspiratorial actions, are trying to make it a vehicle for their treacherous policies against labor, against progress, against peace. And in many places they have succeeded only too well because of the tolerance of certain lead-

ers of the Socialist Party.

In his speech to the people of New York at Madison Square Garden, Earl Browder drew attention to the fact that:

"It is on the war question, above all, that the horrible nature of the Trotskyite-fascist alliance stands out most clearly."

Browder called to the attention of his hearers the fact that one point in the agreement between Trotsky and the Japanese General Staff was that the Trotskyites, if their plot to overthrow the Soviet government succeeds, would provide the Japanese with oil and other supplies in case of a Japanese war against the United States.

Browder then asked:

"Is there anything in the conduct of the Trotskyites in our country which would tend to contradict this agreement of their leader? No, on the contrary, the American Trotskyites could not have acted differently if they had known of and agreed to this policy. For several years now, the American Trotskyites have been hammering on the coming war between the United States and Japan, in order to demand, first, that all preparations must be made to insure the defeat of the United States in such a war, and second, consequently, that a fight be made against all idea of mutual assistance between the Soviet Union and the United States. Those are exactly the things that would be required by Trotsky of his American followers in order to carry out his agreement with the Japanese General Staff."\* (*New Masses*, February 2.)

As usual, as was the case also in the days of Lenin, Trotskyism carried out deeds of treason to the people under the mask of revolutionary sounding words. "Left" phrases—reactionary deeds—Lenin used to say of Trotskyism. Now, too, the American Trotskyites are preparing to work for the victory of the Japanese fascist-military clique in the event of a

---

\* *Trotskyism Against World Peace*, p. 10, Workers Library Publishers, New York.



Japanese attack upon the United States—all in the name of the "revolutionary class struggle". We have been trying to unmask this fraud all the while. Today, however, even the origin of this fraud has become known. It was plotted out by the Japanese General Staff in collaboration with Trotsky.

Trotskyism, like its ally, fascism, is a menace to the world. It is a menace to its peace, its progress, its democracy. It is a menace to labor and its organizations because Trotskyism is the carrier of disruption and of treason. Where Trotskyism thrives the unity of labor, the unity of the people against fascism and war, are always in danger.

Drive the Trotskyites out of your midst!

## TO COMBAT THE MENACE OF TROTSKYISM

### Read and Distribute These Pamphlets

#### To Defend Assassins Is to Help Fascism

*By Georgi Dimitroff* .....2¢

#### Trotskyism Against World Peace

*By Earl Browder* .....1¢

#### Why I Resigned from the Trotsky Defense Committee

*By Mauritz Hallgren* .....1¢

#### At the Moscow Trial

*By D. N. Pritt, K. C., M. P.*.....5¢

#### Trotskyism and Fascism

*By P. Lang* .....10¢

#### Trotskyism: Counter Revolution in Disguise

*By M. J. Olgin* .....15¢

#### Trotskyism in the Service of Fascism Against Socialism and Peace

*By A. Y. Vyshinsky* .....5¢

#### Traitors Accused

*Indictment of the Piatakov-Radek Trotskyist Group*...5¢

[The majority of these pamphlets are not available from Red Star Publishers. Also, these are the original prices from Workers Library Publishers in 1937]