

WORKERS' FREE PRESS

Nos. 5-6. JANUARY—FEBRUARY, 1938. One Penny,

NOT GUILTY!

As opponents of all dictatorship over the workers, we have on another page to express severe criticism of Leon Trotsky. Never-the-less, we are glad to publish a summary of the report of the Commission of Inquiry, presided over by Dr John Dewey, Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Columbia, which declares Trotsky and his son Sedov Not Guilty of the charges of terrorism, sabotage and Fascist conspiracy made against them during the recent Moscow trials.

The report was made to a mass meeting at the Hotel Center, New York.

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

On the basis of all the evidence, they

found that while the confessions required most serious consideration, these confessions themselves contained such inherent improbabilities as to convince the commission that they did not represent the truth, irrespective of any means used to obtain them.

...that Trotsky never gave Smirnov any terrorist instructions through Sedov or anybody else.

...Trotsky never gave Dreitzer terrorist instructions either through Sedov or anybody else.

...Holtzman never acted as go-between for Smirnov or Sedov for the purposes of any terrorist conspiracy.

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

...Olberg never went to Russia with terrorist instructions from Trotsky or Sedov.

...Berman-Yurin never received terror-

(Continued on page 19.)

BOLSHEVISM, STALINISM OR HITLERISM?

In his book "Dictatorship vs Democracy" (Terrorism and Communism), written in 1920, published in America two years later, Leon Trotsky writes the following:—" , , , the principle of compulsory labor service has just so radically and permanently replaced the principle of free hiring as the socialization of the means of production has replaced capitalist property." (137)

THE MILITARIZATION OF LABOUR

"The foundations of the militarization of labor are those forms of State compulsion without which the replacement of capitalist economy by the Socialist will forever remain an empty sound. (p.141) " , , , We can have no way to Socialism, except by the authoritative regulation of the economic forces and resources of the country, and the centralized distribution of labor power in harmony with the general State plan. The Labor State considers itself empowered to send every worker to the place where his work is necessary. And not one serious Socialist will begin to deny to the Labor State the right to lay its hand upon the worker who refuses to execute his labor duty." (142) "the young Socialist State requires trade unions, not for a struggle for better conditions of labor—that is the task of the social and State organizations as a whole—but to organise the working class for the needs of production, to educate, discipline , , , in a word, hand in hand with the State exercise their authority in order to lead the workers into the framework of a single economic plan. (p.143) , , , We still retain, and for a long time will retain, the system of wages. The further we go, the more will its importance become simply to guarantee to all members of society all the necessities of life; and thereby it will cease to be a system of wages. But at present we are not sufficiently rich for this. Our main problem is to raise the quantity of products turned out, and to this problem all the remainder must be subordinated. In the present difficult

period the system of wages is for us, first and foremost not a method for guaranteeing the personal existence of any separate worker, but a method of estimating what that individual worker brings by his labor to the Labor Republic. Consequently, wages, in the form of money and of goods, must be brought into the closest possible touch with the productivity of individual labor. . . . Under Socialist production, piece-work, bonuses, etc., gave as their problem to increase the volume of social product, and consequently to raise the general well-being. Those workers who do more for the general interest than others receive the right to a greater quantity of the social product than the lazy, the careless, and the disorganizers." p.149).

LETTER FROM JULIA LANDAU.

While in a Spanish prison comrade Julia (Katja) Landau, wife of Kurt Landau who is reported murdered, sent a letter to "Independent News," from which we give extracts:

Dear Friend—I write to you quite briefly because the opportunity offers to explain a question or two. Our action (hunger strike) is at an end; it was worth while and perhaps may have an unexpected success and unforeseen consequences. If there are comrades abroad who think I have acted like a desperate woman they are wrong. At every moment I have acted—well or ill—as a conscious member of the party and my personal attitude has not compromised the party—on the contrary. I hope a comrade will be found who will give you faithful details of all that. As for me, I am not in condition to do so at present . . .

I am the only woman of Barcelona complicated in the trial of the C. E. The woman's prison has received notice of it. And you know, I hope, that above all I am accused of "estas complicada directa o indirectamente en la desaparicion de Nin." That is the text of the accusation. To us all this is absurd, of course. . .

I am at present in the hospital with two "guardes" all to myself. If they were not nice and discreet they would even accompany me to the W.C. To return or not to return, is for me a purely personal question. In

spite of having acquired a political conscience, a great sense of responsibility towards the party, I believe I have right to dispose of my own person. I shall come back to France with Kurt if we find him. And I shall never come back to France if what I have been told about him is true and what the Minister of Justice personally has told me. I don't wish to believe it and I cannot believe it. Up till to-day I have no proof, and perhaps I live upon this lack of proof. Do not concern yourself about what will become of me. They are bothering here a great deal over my health after 11 days of hunger-strike, but I don't care. I am not at all dying and I always have the physical strength I need. As if it were a matter of that I am, in spite of everything, attached to the party, and my whole attitude will be determined by that. The rest concerns only me . . .

Some think that I underestimate your activity. I believe in advance that you are doing a great deal and everything you can do. As to the commissions which have not come: with our strike we have obtained what they would have sought.

If you ask me whether you ought to continue for Kurt I don't know what to say. Exactly because I don't know what you have done up till the present. (Besides it is necessary to direct all the interventions, etc. directly to IRUJO, Minister of Justice, who, personally has taken a great interest in the affair.) . . .

KATJA.

EDITOR JAILED FOR CONTEMPT. OF COURT.

On 23rd December, 1937, Wm. McDougall, was sent to Barlinnie prison for five days, for refusing to take the oath or affirm, in a case of alleged theft of printing blocks, being tried by Sheriff M'Diarmid. The Sheriff gave the editor ten minutes to reconsider his attitude. He persisted, however, in refusing to be a party to a prosecution by the Crown against a fellow-worker, and was thereupon committed for Contempt of Court.

FRANCO EXPOSED BY HENCHMAN

In a book "I Bear Witness," Senior Antonio Ruiz Villaplana, a Magistrate in Burgos for the first year of the present Spanish struggle, tells of the barbarities of the Fascists. It fell to him to officiate at inquests on "sudden deaths."

As a barrister, Secretary of the Examining Magistrature of Burgos, Senior President of the Judicial Secretaries Association of Spain and legal adviser to the Commission for the Attachments of Property under the Industrial tribunal of Burgos, he saw Fascism from the inside.

He writes (p.35) "On the day following the establishment of martial law by the Rebels, all the heads of labour organisations in Burgos and the surrounding towns were arrested and shot. Not even the least important escaped. A mere accusation or suspicion expressed by an officer is enough to send a man to his death without trial. Armed men visit the home of an accused person, who is then torn from his family amid their tears and protests. He is taken to a lonely spot in the country. . . . Next morning we, or similar representatives of the judicial authority, recover the bodies. Inevitably they all bear the same marks—six or seven Mauser bullet wounds, including two or three

SHOTS FIRED THROUGH THE EYES
or temples. (p.38).

"The Mayor of a neighbouring town, who used often to visit the Judicial Office, was found dead on a lonely road, together with his two sons, aged 12 and 15 . . . a tragic group. The boys, mere children, clinging tightly to each other, showed evident signs of having been beaten to death. A short distance away lay the father, horribly mutilated and torn by blows from a machete (a kind of hatchet).

"From the position of the bodies, it was clear that the father had been forced to witness the torturing of his children before he was submitted to his own." (p.40).

When Vilaplana and other Magistrates complained after about 600 of such cases had been reported, a well-known personality in the movement made the sur-

prising reply:—"We are cleaning up our rearward, you know. Of course, mistakes and excesses cannot be prevented at times, but what you tell me is too much. We can't let this go on. It must be stopped. I will see that things are done in a different fashion in future and, above all—Caramba!—let them bury them always. We must put a stop to this finding of "unidentified bodies." (p.48).

Another grim quotation:—

"THOSE CONDEMNED TO DEATH ARE FORCED
TO DIG DITCHES,

in which the bullet-riddled bodies of their fellow-prisoners are laid, while waiting their own turn to face the firing squad. All this happens in a region where no fighting has ever taken place, of which the army took possession from the very start, without a struggle. The people are persecuted because they are Liberals, not even Socialists or Communists."

After stating that sometimes "trials" had taken place after the executions (p.164), and that a year of this sort of thing sickened him, Senior Vilaplana writes:—"No social or political theories could justify

THE SECRET AND SAVAGE SACRIFICE

of so many unfortunate workers, of the hundreds of poor, uneducated peasants, whose bodies I myself examined. In spite of everything I might have carried on—with an effort of will and tolerance—pretending to see in the crimes committed by the military rebellion in its latest stages an accidental phase of passion and struggle which would disappear once the regime was established. But the foreign invasion—brazen, cynical and infamous—finally shook the inertia from my spirit. During my waking hours, during those long and sleepless nights, I was tortured by one constant and fixed obsession—to get away from Nationalist Spain." (p.249).

Commenting on above startling excerpts, Denis Weaver, in the "News Chronicle" 2/12/37, concludes:—"Here, I think, is a fair answer to assertions that, because no risings have occurred, no hostility exists in regions conquered by the rebels.

Of William the Conqueror . . . it was said that he "made a desolation and called it peace."

FREE SPEECH IN WAR TIME.

By ALEX. S. KNOX.



During the last "War for Democracy" Ralph Chaplin was sentenced to 20 years in the Federal Penitentiary, not as a punishment for any act of violence against person, or property but solely for the expression of his opinions. Chaplin, together with a number of fellow workers, who were sentenced at the same time, was accused of taking part in a conspiracy to obstruct the prosecution of the war. To be sure, the government did not produce a single witness to show that the war had been obstructed, but it was argued that the agitation which they had carried on by means of speeches, articles, pamphlets, and meetings would necessarily hamper the country in its war work. In re-

9 ——— The WORKERS' FREE PRESS ——— 9
ality, they were sent to jail because they held, and expressed certain beliefs.

As a member of the "Industrial Workers of the World," Ralph Chaplin did his part to make the organisation a success. He wrote songs, poems, made speeches, and edited the official paper "Solidarity." He looked about him; saw poverty, wretchedness and suffering among the workers, and contrasted it with the riches of those who owned the land and the machinery of production. He studied the problem of distribution, and decided that it was possible, through the organisation of the producers, to establish a more scientific, just, and humane system of society. All this he felt keenly.

With him and his co-workers, the task of freeing humanity from economic bondage took on the aspect of a faith—a religion. They had heard the call to duty: they were giving their lives to a cause—the emancipation of the human race.

Ralph Chaplin wrote the following poems, whilst rotting in jail for daring to speak!

Mourn not the dead that in the cool earth lie—

Dust unto dust;

The calm sweet earth that mothers all who die—
as all men must.

Mourn not your captive comrades who must dwell—
Too strong to strive—

Within each steel-bound coffin of a cell—
Buried alive;

But rather mourn the apathetic throng—
the cowed and the meek.

Who see the world's great anguish and its wrong—
AND DARE NOT SPEAK!

They say we are revolvers—that we stirred

The workers of all nations to rebel—

And that we would not compromise with HELL,

But damned it with our every deed and word.

They feared us as we faced them undeterred,

And gave us each a coffin of a cell.

In this steel cage where living corpses dwell—

Hate-throttled here that we might not be heard.

We are those fools too stubborn willed to bend

Our necks to wrong, and parley and discuss.

STALINISM AND BOLSHEVISM.

Reviewing Trotsky's pamphlet "Stalinism and Bolshevism," in which the author expresses the fear that the workers, in identifying Stalinism with Bolshevism, may come to reject both, the December "International Council correspondence" makes a slashing attack, from which we cull the following excerpts.

"If we may not judge Bolshevism by Stalinism, let us judge Bolshevism by Bolshevism. As soon as the Bolsheviks were in power they found themselves in opposition to the soviets, still organising the industries in their way, and thus **compelling** the 'vanguard' to pass a series of decrees devitalising the soviets, not where backward but where they were advanced. The 1st decree was directed against the expropriation of the **factories** by the soviets, for the Bolsheviks were disposed to co-operate with the capitalist owners in the process of building—Socialism. The Bolshevik expropriation went only as far as the nationalisation of the key industries and banks. The later appearing nationalisation of all industries was forced upon the Bolsheviks by the continuation of

EXPROPRIATION ON THE PART OF THE WORKERS.

Becoming stronger, the party took all power from the soviets and transferred it to the trade unions, which, as a centralised body, they could more easily control. Later, robbing the trade unions of all influence, the party concentrated power into the State. Not under Stalin, but under Lenin and Trotsky, did a group of delegates representing more than 25 important industries, issue on March 20, 1918, the following protest in Novaia Zhizn:

"The workers have supported the new government, which calls itself the government of the workers and peasants, and promises to do our will and work for our welfare. All our organisations stood back of it, and our sons and brothers shed their blood for it. We bear patiently both want and famine. . . . Four months have passed and we find ourselves without faith and without hope. The government which calls itself a Soviet of Work-

ers and Peasants has done everything to oppose the will of the workers. It has blocked every attempt to hold elections to new soviets. It has threatened to use machine-guns against workers, and it has broken up meetings and demonstrations."

"Of the slaughter at Kronstadt, Trotsky has only a few words. 'The revolutionary government naturally could not 'present' to the insurrectionary sailors the fortress which protected the capital, only because the reactionary peasant-soldier rebellion was joined by a few doubtful anarchists."

"But Trotsky forgets to mention that not only the large peasant masses, but the workers of Petrograd also were in a state of rebellion; that the atmosphere was charged with protest against the new state's dictatorship over the workers and peasants. Trotsky says: 'A concrete historical analysis of the events leaves not the slightest room for the legends, built up on ignorance and sentimentality concerning Kronstadt, Makhno, and other episodes of the Revolution.' But Trotsky doesn't go into such an analysis, beyond making that empty statement. He doesn't even take up the incident of Kronstadt. Let us recall it briefly for him.

The Kronstadt Revolutionary Committee consisted of nine sailors, four workers, one school director, and one doctor. As soon as they were attacked by the armies of Tuchatschewski, under orders from Trotsky, they telegraphed this message to the workers of the world:

"The first shot has been fired. The world must know; wading to his hips in blood, Field-Marshal Trotsky opens fire on revolutionary Kronstadt, which opposes the communist government, in order to restore real soviet power. We will either win, or die under the ruins of Kronstadt in the struggle for the cause of the workers. Long live the Soviets! Long live the World Revolution!"

"Against these workers Trotsky instructed Tuchatschewski to 'spare no ammunition,' to 'shoot down the sailors of Kronstadt like pheasants.' And he did as he was instructed, bombing from the air and killing combatants and non-combatants alike.

The Kronstadt massacre was symptomatic of a general struggle between the soviets and the party.

MORE PHILOSOPHICAL MUSINGS ON ANTI-PARLIAMENTARISM.

A REPLY TO WM. M'GURN by T. L. ANDERSON.

Comrade McGum's article, most commonly clever and only negatively helpful, represents the tragedy of yet another genuine Socialist politically incapacitated by doctrinarian blindness. His reply to Comrade Doran is a devastating answer in the terms of pure logic. An excellent illustration that logic, and even science, can become so pure as to be metaphysical.

Here is the first example. McGum quotes Doran:

"It (the A.P.C.F.) died after a short period of seeming vitality" because "it was unable to fit itself into reality—the struggle for bread and kindred things which, unfortunately, are of paramount importance in the daily lives of the millions whose minds are not preoccupied with contemplation of the ultimate truth and logic of anti-parliamentary philosophy"; and replies:

"Quite so! A.P.C.F. members are not interested in the daily struggle for bread; they are a class apart from the rest of the workers!—yet somehow or another they find their way with monotonous regularity to the Bureau and the Parish too, and still mingle with the millions, etc."

Now, Doran does not say that the individual member of the A.P.C.F. does not react to the bread and butter needs of life like any other worker. What he does say is that the philosophy of the A.P.C.F. eschewed all participation in that daily struggle to which its members, as individuals, had to surrender.

So that we had the paradoxical position of the anti-parliamentarian as worker demanding all he could get from "Parish" and "Bureau," and the worker as anti-parliamentarian arguing with the irrefutable logic of his philosophy that such demands were just a delusion.

Truly, by this and similar eccentricities, the anti-parliamentarians have maintained themselves as "a class apart from the rest of the workers."

Comrade McGum then asks: "Or does Doran imply

that if the millions' minds were preoccupied with the ultimate truth, etc., the struggle for bare existence would not exist?"

Why does McGum ask such a question? Here he is questioning not Doran's case, but his own. Surely he as an anti-parliamentarian must believe that "the struggle for bare existence would not exist if the millions' minds were preoccupied with the ultimate truth, etc. But Doran does not argue that the fact of the struggle for bare existence would not exist if the millions' minds were preoccupied with the ultimate truth, etc. But Doran does argue that the fact of the struggle for bare existence still continuing precludes such a mental preoccupation.

"And why ultimate truth anyway?" says McGum, and replies: "If Doran's assumption is correct, that our philosophy is at variance with all reality, then it has neither truth, ultimate, or intimate, and is certainly not logical."

But Doran does not say **all** reality. It is McGum who by a "Jesuitical touch" makes him say so.

First, he objects to Doran's qualifying truth as ultimate, and then, in the most arbitrary manner settles the point in his own favour by asking: "Why ultimate truth and logic, anyway?" Why not? Does not McGum realise that he has swept contemptuously over the most important point in Doran's article?

As a matter of fact, what is clearly implied in Doran's statement is that anti-parliamentarism with its present methods is not the reality of to-day. That it is the reality of to-morrow, or ultimately, does not interest the dole-drawing or wage-earning worker.

McGum next takes Doran to task for his statement that anti-parliamentarians are subjectivist in outlook, and says: "Now, I challenge Doran to produce from any responsible A.P.C.F. source, or if he cares, from the 'Herald of Revolt,' 'The Spur,' 'Commune,' or 'Council,' any support of his absurd assumption! On the contrary, we have laid it down as a maxim "that the Class Struggle is primarily a political struggle, which takes place on the industrial field; leads to the Class War, which is a war for power, in which, if the workers succeed, will liberate the forces of production. With these forces at

their command, the workers can then apply themselves to the task of building Socialism."

Now here there should be no danger of either of us lapsing into metaphysics; for this is a question of fact. Certainly, what McGum claims was, and is, taught by the A.P.C.F. But it is also a fact that this strictly theoretical approach does not attract, and consequently does not influence, the workers in their daily struggle. And this is not saying that the act of revolution is not an expression of anti-parliamentarism. It is, and as such is the ultimate reality of the workers' struggle.

Re materialism or Idealism: Doran does not say that to have an ideal makes one an Idealist in the philosophical sense. He does say, however, that to go on worshipping an idea when time has thrown it out of touch with circumstances is to make you an idealist in spite of protestations of materialism.

"In propagating the idea," says McGum, "the A.P.C.F. performs a useful function in the working-class movement." Yes, if that were so. But what are the facts? A handful of anti-parliamentarians meet once a week to proclaim to the workers of the world that they are being misled and their ignorance exploited by careerist parliamentarians. (Talk about the Tooley Street Tailors.) And all this time the proletariat, suffering economic and intellectual exploitation, travels to disaster, because with them, as with Doran and McGum, the materialism of the stomach triumphs over any abstract idea, however ultimately real it may become. That is not propagating an idea, no matter how sincere you may be. To worship ideas and methods as being permanent and immutable is to degenerate into stagnation and incurable futility. The success of our struggle to establish our ideas necessitates, from time to time, a re-orientation in our methods of approach.

Doran is accused of sneering at the idea of calling on the workers to boycott the ballot-box, and McGum sneers back that the workers when they take real action will not only boycott the ballot-box, but also every other capitalist institution, and then set up their own Councils. So McGum would have us believe that the workers will carry through the revolution on the tactic of boycott the ballot-box; which argues a complete intellectual pre-preparedness.

Well, that will be a phenomenon that history has still to show.

As to the form these Councils will take, McGum says, "the workers will determine that question for themselves." "Pace, Comrade McGum," the workers will decide this question for themselves. But are there not amongst the workers the technicians of the revolution? Will there be no organised guiding influence? And what of the workers in determining the form of their struggle at the present time? Should not the anti-parliamentarian influence in both cases, but not dictate?

And how can you influence if you never cross the bridge of reform that separates you from, or connects you with—according to your choice—the great mass of workers?

Finally, McGum says: "They (the Councils) will not arise unless there is an upsurge of feelings by the workers." How trite: for according to his own argument the Councils mean the revolution; so there won't be any revolution until there is a revolutionary upsurge of feelings in the workers. But the main question waiting with importunate obstinacy for our answer is: How can we promote that upsurge of feelings in the mass of the workers?

Doran has attempted to answer the question thus: Let us recognise the mind of the worker as what it is, not as we would wish it to be; and proceed to discuss with it in terms that it can easily appreciate, all the time keeping the class-struggle to the forefront and revolution as the goal.

McGum answers: Here is a great principle, logically and scientifically correct; except, and until, the workers understand and embrace this there is no hope for them. All I can do pending the revolutionary upsurge of feeling among the workers is to propagate in such a manner that my great principle remains pure and undefiled. Ne plus ultra.

Of his final paragraph only one intelligent comment suggests itself: It is its own and its author's severest criticism.

ORDER "LIVING MARXISM" NOW!

(6d).—Organ of the International Council Communists.

OPEN LETTER TO LORD PROVOST SIR JOHN STEWART.

the Labour Bailies, Councillors, and officials of the Glasgow Corporation, recalling the human rights of the common people, and of one Edward Windsor, formerly king, forced into abdication and exile by the hypocrisy and snobbery of the Church, the Royal Family, the Tory Party, the Labour Party, and the servile capitalist press. My Lord Provost,

I write of the class struggle in Great Britain, and especially in that portion of it known as Scotland. More particularly, I address myself to the sordid Socialist comedy being enacted at George Square. I write with the directness that characterised William Lloyd Garrison when he demanded abolition in the United States. Only he possessed types and a press. My situation is that of Jean Paul Marat at the outbreak of the French Revolution, before the police of Paris presented him with four royal presses. I do not suppose your lordship would like to present me with a municipal press. Such a gesture might redound more to the credit and renown of the city than the Bellahouston Exhibition. At least, it would be used for literature. At the moment, my Lord Provost, exactly what literature of worth, what purpose of culture, does your municipal printing press serve? To ask the question is to answer it: and the answer betrays the zeal with which the George Square Socialists have sacrificed their Socialism for capitalist interest and mere commercialism of profit administration.

Consider, my Lord Provost, how I would use that press. I would rouse the people to understanding and would impeach your policy as that of consistent and calculated Anti-Socialism. My broadcast indictment of the Bellahouston Exhibition, and its royal opening, would include the following counts:—

(1) The Exhibition will cause the civic transport workers to carry 45,000 more passengers every day. Their inadequate reward is a weekly wage increase of two shillings. **This is George Square "Socialism"!**

(2) The Exhibition mocks the poverty of Glasgow

shamdom with an appearance of prosperity. It sacrifices the housing of the poor to joy advertising of the rich. Last December, the Labour housing convener closed the discussion in George Square, on a proposal to restrict the direct labour method of house building, by unmercifully exposing how the people of Glasgow had suffered at the hands of the private contractor. Some contractors had held up working-class houses in a half-finished condition in order to accept contracts to complete quickly for the Bellahouston Exhibition! Use-value, profit, and the Bellahouston Exhibition! What a study in municipal "Socialism"!

- (3) Bellahouston draws a veil of false prosperity over the actual poverty of the Clyde. There is no evidence that the Exhibition will contribute, even from the capitalist viewpoint, to the amelioration of the poverty existent in Scotland. How many of the 271,271 acknowledged unemployed will be absorbed? The rural depopulation of Scotland and the English building of motor buses for the Glasgow Corporation are facts. The Exhibition will not change these facts. But the workers will hope so falsely.
- (4) On Sunday, May 1, Glasgow will witness the annual Labour demonstration, organised by the Glasgow Trades and Labour Council. The George Square Socialists will mix red flags with Union Jacks. Two days later, they will furl the red flags, and bear Union Jacks only. They will parade their loyalty to George and Elizabeth. Will the parliamentary Socialists dare to say that there is no conflict of interests here? Will they say that the king and queen have no class prejudices, but are on the side of the poor against the rich?

My Lord Provost, your party of parliamentary Socialists have staged another circus. In so doing, you reduce the May Day Labour demonstration to a travesty. You make Socialism itself into a circus.

I believe that the last king you received in Glasgow was Edward VIII. To-day, your welcome reveals the Uriah Heep nature of your soul. Edward did not take kindly to the circus trade. He had some humanity of

outlook and independence as a man. He denounced slums and expressed his horror at war. His words are on record. Their frankness was dangerous. Those who hid their designs behind the splendour of the crown decided he had to go. The United Front of palace, church, and state deposed him. And so, to-day, my Lord Provost, you are to honour his brother—a perfectly safe and conventional monarch.

Ramsay MacDonald, when he was your leader, once eulogised George V. by declaring that the king was a workman. I despised the description, but your lordship and your party applauded. Do you still consider your applause wise or the description apt? Consider. If the king is a worker, and the king strikes, and someone else takes his job, what do we term the person who breaks the strike? On Friday, December 10, 1936, a week's crisis, a week's strike in a palace ended, and Edward went into exile. On May 3, you receive his successor. On May 1, you will celebrate the Labour principle of solidarity. Is the Bellahouston parade of loyalty wise?

Edward was forced into exile. The demand he made was a human one that did him honour. But a narrow-souled primate, allied to court etiquette—which expresses the actual situation mildly; a premier of Tory mind, since ennobled; and a leader of the Labour Opposition, since voted a special salary as a kind of guardian of the Capitalist state: formed an unholy alliance of Church, State, Palace, and Prudery. Had Edward remained firm he would have remained king, or a Republic would have followed. He gave way; and the circus of king-craft continues. I object to that circus and I object to the Bellahouston parade of loyalty not to a principle, nor yet even to a man, but to an institution: to a facade, actually, behind which class-exploitation and war-preparation disport themselves.

Need more be said, my Lord Provost? The facts are there, coldly and mildly recorded. They condemn the Bellahouston Exhibition. And so I call on the Glasgow workers, on May 1, to condemn the Bellahouston Exhibition of May 3.

I have the honour to remain, my Lord Provost,
Your disbrutled fellow-citizen and social
and political enemy in the class struggle,
GUY A. ALDRED.

ist instructions from Trotsky in Copenhagen or saw him in Copenhagen. ...David never received terrorist instructions from Trotsky in Copenhagen or saw him there.

...there is no basis whatever for the attempt to link Moissei Lurye and Nathan Lurye with an alleged Trotsky conspiracy.

...Trotsky never met Vladimir Romm in the Bois de Boulogne or anywhere else; he transmitted no messages through Romm to Radek; Trotsky and Sedov never had any connection with Vladimir.

...Pyatakof did not fly to Oslo in Dec-1935; he did not see Trotsky or receive from Trotsky instructions of any kind; the disproof of Pyatakof's testimony on this crucial point renders his whole confession worthless.

...the disproof of the testimony of Pyatakof invalidates the testimony of the witness Bukhartsev.

...the disproof of Romm's and Pyatakof's testimony completely invalidates the testimony of the defendant Radek.

.....the disproof of the confessions of Smirnov, Pyatakov and Radek completely invalidates the confessions of Shestov and Muralov.

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

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

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

.....Trotsky never instructed any of the accused or witnesses to enter into agreements with foreign powers against the Soviet Union. On the contrary, he has always uncompromisingly advocated the defence of the U.S.S.R. He has also been a forthright ideological opponent of the Fascism represented by the foreign powers with which he is accused of having conspired.

.....Trotsky never recommended, plotted, or attempted the restoration of Capitalism in the U.S.S.R. On the contrary, he has always uncompromisingly opposed the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and its existence anywhere else.

.....the Prosecutor fantastically falsified Trotsky's role before, during and after the October revolution.

The report concludes: "We therefore find the Moscow trials to be a frame-up. We therefore find Trotsky and Sedov NOT GUILTY." The Report is signed by:

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