

HEAR  
JOHN DEWEY  
MAY 9!

# NEWS BULLETIN

LET THE  
TRUTH  
BE KNOWN!

## AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR THE DEFENSE OF LEON TROTSKY

22 East 17th Street, Room 1435, New York City

Telephone: GRamercy 7-6011-2

Louis Adamic  
Devere Allen  
Ernest Sutherland Bates  
David P. Berenberg  
Franz Boas  
Anita Brenner  
Paul F. Brissenden  
Lewis Browne  
James Burnham  
Witter Bynner  
V. F. Calverton  
James Casey  
John Chamberlain  
Eleanor Clark  
Sarah N. Cleghorn  
Travers Clements  
John Dewey

Emmett E. Dorsey  
Vincent R. Dunne  
Max Eastman  
Justus Ebert  
Abraham Epstein  
James T. Farrell  
Harvey Ferguson  
Harold J. Gibbons  
Aaron Glanz  
Alexander Goldenweiser  
Martha Gruening  
Louis M. Hacker  
Abram L. Harris  
Charles Yale Harrison

Sidney Hook  
Roy Temple House  
Harold R. Isaacs  
Edward L. Israel  
Oscar Jaszi  
Horace M. Kallen  
Dorothy Kenyon  
William H. Kilpatrick  
Antoinette F. Konikow  
Joseph Wood Krutch  
Harry W. Laidler  
Layle Lane  
William Ellery Leonard  
Ludwig Lore  
Ferdinand Lundberg

GEORGE NOVACK, Secretary

Charles Malamuth  
Mary McCarthy  
Dwight Macdonald  
Margaret Marshall  
Ernest L. Meyer  
Felix Morrow  
Gorham Munson  
Reinhold Niebuhr  
Max Nomad  
M. C. Otto  
John Dos Passos  
Selig Perlman  
Lorine Pruette  
Burton Rascoe

Winifred Raushenbush  
James Rorty  
Edward Alsworth Ross  
Dagobert Runes  
Gaetano Salvemini  
Meyer Schapiro  
Evelyn Scott  
Margaret De Silver  
John Sloan  
Herbert Solow  
Clara Gruening Stillman  
Benjamin Stolberg  
Lillian Symes  
Norman Thomas

Tom Tippet  
Frank Trager  
Carlo Tresca  
Lionel Trilling  
August Tyler  
Dorothy Van Doren  
B. Charney Vladeck  
Adelaide Walker  
John Brooks Wheelwright  
Richard Babb Whitten  
B. J. Widick  
Edmund Wilson  
Charles Erskine Scott Wood  
Helen Woodward  
W. E. Woodward  
and others

*This Committee Exists (1) To Safeguard Trotsky's Right to Asylum and (2) to further the Organization of an Impartial Commission of Inquiry.*

Bulletin No. 6

MAY 3, 1937



One Cent

# Trotsky's Defense Presented At Mexican Hearings

By GEORGE NOVACK

THE hearings recently conducted in Mexico City by the Preliminary Commission of Inquiry, headed by John Dewey, at which Leon Trotsky testified in his own defense constituted an unprecedented historical event. Whenever before has a group of distinguished foreigners had to journey three thousand miles to afford a hearing to a political exile, a man without a country, charged with the gravest crimes, who had no other means of presenting his case to the world? President Cardenas, on his part, sent a warm telegram to the chairman opening the doors of Mexico to the commission. Such a genuine example of internationalism and democracy is rare in our day!

The unique character of the occasion, arising out of Trotsky's extraordinary situation, has created some confusion in the public mind, which has been craftily exploited by those who have opposed this attempt to throw all possible light on the Moscow trials. For those whose interest in the Mexican hearings was by no means satisfied by the fragmentary and distorted press reports, it would perhaps be useful to emphasize the essential facts in the case as we survey the scene of the hearings.

### The Setting

Since the Mexican Communist Party had issued statements threatening direct action against Trotsky if he dared appear in public, the Commission decided to hold the sessions in the red and blue villa of Diego Rivera at Coyoacan, where Trotsky has found refuge. A cordon of police guarded the double entrance to the courtyard of the house; the windows of the "courtroom" were boarded up and barricaded with adobe bricks; everyone who entered, commissioners included, were searched for concealed weapons.

At a small table on the left sat Leon Trotsky, leader with Lenin of the October Revolution, organizer of the Red Army, today the world's most famous exile. He was flanked by two secretaries, who were kept busy hunting citations, tracking down references, and singling out documents from the mass of material in front of them. Facing them on the opposite side of the room was Albert Goldman of Chicago, Trotsky's attorney.

Trotsky is the principal accused in the Moscow trials. He has been "convicted" *in absentia* of the most monstrous crimes against the Soviet state. The most prominent of his old colleagues in Lenin's Central Committee, having "confessed" to these crimes, have been shot. Nevertheless, he has declared his absolute innocence of all the charges against him and branded the trials "the greatest frameup in history." Again and again he has sought an impartial official court in which to present his case. In Norway and Mexico he challenged the Soviet government to request his extradition; they refused to do so. (When Commissioner Beals, on the first day of the hearings, cast doubts on his good faith in this matter because of the lack of diplomatic relations between Mexico and the U.S.S.R., he immediately offered to go to any country where he can stand trial on extradition proceedings.)

### His First Opportunity

Finally he had been forced to call for an international commission of inquiry, composed of authoritative and impartial individuals, which would give him his day in court. "If this commission decides that I am guilty in the slightest degree of the crimes which Stalin imputes to me," he had declared in his Hippodrome speech, "I pledge in advance to place myself voluntarily in the

hands of the executioners of the GPU." Now, before this preliminary commission, he was given his first opportunity to present his case before the bar of world opinion.

The commissioners were seated around a long green-cloth covered table at the front of the room. The Chairman was John Dewey, America's great philosopher and educator, an old and staunch friend of the Soviet Union. The secretary, Suzanne La Follette, former editor of "The New Freeman," Benjamin Stolberg, the noted labor journalist, Otto Ruhle, the former German Socialist deputy and biographer of Karl Marx, and, for the first five days, Carleton Beals, the well-known writer on Latin America, comprised the rest of the commission. John Finerty, Tom Mooney's lawyer, served as counsel to the commission.

Separated by wooden railings from the participants in the hearings and crowded together at two tables stretching from wall to wall were the representatives of the press. In addition to the regular Mexican and American newspaper men, there were special correspondents from the Norwegian, French, English, North and South American papers, a weighty index to the importance attributed to the hearings.

### Unions Represented

Behind them sat an audience of thirty-five or forty invited guests of the commission. Among them were official envoys of six Mexican labor organizations with translators by their sides, an observer from the League of Nations, members of the American Committee, etc. Telegrams of support for the work of the commission were received from many Mexican and American labor organizations as well as from the Socialist Party of the United States.

In New York the Commission had invited the Soviet government through Ambassador Troyanovsky, the American Communist Party, and Joseph Brodsky, noted Communist lawyer, to be present at the hearings with full power to cross-examine Trotsky. In Mexico City they extended similar invitations to the Mexican Communist Party and to Lombardo Toledano, the labor leader, who is the most vociferous opponent of Trotsky's asylum in Mexico. None accepted. The Communists instead contrived to introduce observers into the audience by means of false credentials.

### Dewey's Opening

"I HAVE given my life to the work of education which I have conceived to be that of public enlightenment in the interests of society. If I finally accepted the responsible post I now occupy, it was because I realized that to act otherwise would be to be false to my life work."

With these impressive words John Dewey as chairman opened the sessions. He had stated that the Commission had no illusions concerning the extraordinarily difficult nature of its task and was aware that every stage of its investigation would be beset by bitter controversy.

The campaign to discredit the Commission had been launched even before its arrival. Hostile correspondents, echoing the Communist press, had written that the Commission was coming to "whitewash" Trotsky. Kluckhohn of the N. Y. Times had invented statements by Trotsky's attorney purporting to prove that the Commissioners had been "fixed" in advance. Dr. Dewey refuted this calumny by explaining that the preliminary commission was neither a court nor a jury. Its function was simply

(Continued on page 3)

# Forward to the Full Commission of Inquiry

AN EDITORIAL

THE first part of the work of the Commission of Inquiry has been accomplished. These columns offer a brief description of the Mexican hearings. John Dewey and the other commissioners will report to a mass meeting at Mecca Temple, New York, on Sunday, May 9. Most important of all, the full stenographic record of the hearings is being rushed into print by the Commission. It alone will adequately indicate what was accomplished in Mexico. Under Dr. Dewey's brilliant chairmanship, the commission probed every conceivable question bearing on the Moscow trials. Trotsky's defense is embodied in the record which is to be submitted to the full Commission of Inquiry in the near future. In short, we are on the road to completing the task which we were organized to carry through.

Nevertheless, a note of warning must be sounded for the members of the Committee, for its host of friends and sympathizers. Our enemies are numerous and powerful. Having failed to destroy our work by their direct efforts, they are now concentrating on indirect attacks upon the inquiry and all those connected with it. They know that the Committee is organizing the necessary mass support for the activities of the Commission; that the Committee is raising the funds needed to finance the work of the Commission; that the Committee's information service prevents misrepresentation from going unchallenged; that the American Committee is the leader of the international movement to support the Commission and to throw all possible light upon the Moscow trials. Our enemies would therefore seek to undermine the Commission by destroying its chief organizational support, the American Committee.

The most important tasks still lie ahead of us. Support must be marshalled for hearings to be held in Europe to

supplement those already held in Mexico. The European depositions submitted by Trotsky have to be verified by direct examination of Leon Sedov, Trotsky's son, and other witnesses. Publication of the Mexican record must be rushed and the Commission will have to receive whole-hearted support to publish and distribute thousands of copies of this cardinal document. The full Commission must sit as soon as possible. We must spur our sister committees abroad and help them defray the cost of securing international representation on the Commission. News bulletins will have to be issued to counter the campaign of misrepresentations and lies directed by our opponents. Mass meetings have to be organized throughout the country.

Moreover, Trotsky's right of asylum is still in danger. The forthcoming session of the Mexican Congress will witness an effort, inspired by the Communist Party, to get Trotsky deported from Mexico. During the recent hearings the Mexican Communist Party openly campaigned for the expulsion of Trotsky. The need to intervene to safeguard his right of asylum there may arise at any moment.

Once again members of the Committee are being pressed to resign or advocate dissolution of the Committee, on the specious pretext that its work is completed. Our brief outline here of the tasks that lie ahead is itself sufficient to expose the falsity of this argument. We repeat: the most important part of our work lies ahead and we appeal to all our members and friends to oppose and resist any efforts to halt our work midway. Our Committee is the chief guarantee that the task of the Commission of Inquiry shall be successfully fulfilled. We are well up the hill. On to the top and over!

## The Case of Ex-Commissioner Beals

At the close of the sixth day of hearings, Mr. Beals charged Trotsky with having sent Borodin to foment a revolution in Mexico in 1919. Beals asserted that he had received this information from Borodin (now an editor in Moscow). Subsequently Beals amplified this charge: "Borodin said that he was an emissary of Trotsky. The Soviets expected at that time that England, France and United States would declare a war. The mission of Borodin consisted in fomenting revolutionary disturbances in order to oblige the American government to intervene there" ("El Universal," April 22).

This accusation could have only one consequence—jeopardize Trotsky's asylum in Mexico or any future visit to the United States. "When I heard Beals' provocative question," said one listener, an anti-fascist exile from Germany, "my blood ran cold. Only an exile could feel what Trotsky must have felt. Here was an attempt to take the ground out from under him and leave him without any asylum in the world." Trotsky's own denial of having sent Borodin is objectively verified by historical documentation that Trotsky was in 1919 completely preoccupied with Red Army work.

### Relevancy Not Proved

But, quite apart from the truth or falsity of the charge, it had nothing to do with the Moscow trials. Mr. Beals has failed to prove the relevancy of the Borodin question; even the "New Masses" could not make out a case for his asking it; and no one else has been able to defend it. One must stigmatize Beals' question as having no other purpose than to compromise Trotsky's stay in Mexico. Let him explain away this dastardly act.

Throughout the hearings Beals had asked many irrelevant questions with perfect freedom. The Borodin question, however, led the counsel to the Commission to inform Beals that the question was improper and irrelevant and to propose an evening meeting of

the Commission to discuss the matter. Instead of appearing at the meeting, Beals sent a letter of resignation the next morning.

In that letter and in subsequent press statements Beals made four principal accusations: (1) he did not have full freedom to question Trotsky, (2) he was not consulted concerning the procedure, (3) neither the investigation nor the Commission was serious and (4) all the other members were definitely "Trotskyites." But these are the facts:

### Here Are the Facts

(1) Mr. Beals has cited no questions he was prevented from asking. The published record will show that Mr. Beals had full opportunity to question and took advantage of it. Furthermore, the close cooperation of Beals with the unfriendly correspondent of the "New York Times," Kluckhohn, and with the "disguised" correspondent of the "New Masses"—they constantly passed written questions to him, which he then put to Trotsky—was obvious to all at the hearings.

(2) Dr. John Dewey and the other commissioners have stated that all matters of procedure were decided by mutual consent and that Mr. Beals maintained no differences in any of their executive meetings. They have objective proof: written minutes of executive meetings. After Dr. Dewey's opening statement—Beals was in the city but had refused to give his address and did not come to the meeting at which the statement was approved—Beals had ample opportunity to record his differences: both at hearings and at executive meetings.

(3) Only a light-minded person, unable to discern the gravity of the issues, or a malevolent individual who wished to conceal them, could question the fundamental seriousness of the enterprise and the chief participants in it. Indeed, when one considers the colossal historical importance of the investiga-

tion, the many lives and personal and political reputations involved, and the grave issues at stake, it is difficult not to express indignation at such an incredibly light-minded or deliberately deceitful accusation. Presumably the "proof" of this accusation is:

(4) "That the Commission was extremely Trotskyite, including the President, Dr. John Dewey, ex-sympathizer of the Socialist Party, to whose left-wing the North American Trotskyites have affiliated" (Beals to "El Universal," April 22). Here Mr. Beals drops all "technical" objections and gets down to the same accusation which has been levelled by the Communist press throughout.

In a statement to the press Attorney Finerty said he was neither Trotskyist nor Stalinist; his interest was solely in defense of civil liberties, which he was ready to defend for either party. In fact, he had already done so. In October, a few months before becoming counsel to the Commission, he had appeared on behalf of the Communist presidential candidate, Earl Browder, before the United States Supreme Court, to defend the right of the Communist Party on the Illinois ballot.

The records of the other members of the Commission are equally well-known. Like Mr. Finerty, none is a Trotskyite but all have been prominent and active in the great labor defense cases of our time—Sacco-Vanzetti, Mooney, etc. They are not unfamiliar with the cry, invariably raised by the reactionary press, that whoever aids the right of a radical to a fair trial shares, of necessity, the political views of the accused. Mr. Beals himself has admitted that he was requested to join the Commission because of his freedom from partisan commitments. The same is true of the other commission members.

The final quietus to Mr. Beals will be given by the publication of the stenographic record. It will reveal Mr. Beals' role. More important, it will demonstrate the profound significance of the Mexican hearings.

# JOHN DEWEY REPORTS

(Continued from page 1)

to take Trotsky's testimony, to cross-examine him, and to present the results to the full International Commission, which alone had the power to pronounce a verdict of innocent or guilty. "The impartiality of any investigating body," he declared, "can only be judged by the way in which it conducts its affairs. From this test the Commission neither can or wishes to be exempt."

## Statement by Defense

In accordance with American judicial procedure, the hearings began with a statement by the defense lawyer of the points the defense proposed to prove. "All that is required of us," said Goldman, "is to raise a reasonable doubt in the minds of men for us to be justified in asking a verdict of 'not guilty,' but we shall willingly assume a burden greater than that. We intend to prove that Leon Trotsky is absolutely innocent of all the charges made against him at the Moscow trials." He then proceeded to examine Trotsky, the chief witness.

For convenience of exposition, Goldman divided his examination of Trotsky into separate sections; each category covered one significant aspect of the charges made against him at the Moscow trials. The first morning's session, for example, was taken up with Trotsky's biography to provide the necessary vital framework of reference for the testimony to come. Trotsky's account of his forty years in the revolutionary Marxist movement was followed by a detailed analysis of his relations with Lenin and the Bolshevik Party and with the defendants, especially with the principal defendants in the two trials, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Piatakov, and Radek.

Trotsky testified that all four of these old Bolshevik leaders had at one time or another in the past joined forces with him in the struggle against the Stalinist bureaucracy, but that all had capitulated to Stalin many years before and had become his bitterest and most perfidious enemies. He declared that there had not been a single genuine Trotskyist among the confessors, although there were thousands in Stalin's prisons and concentration camps.

## Relations With Radek

Through the presentation of numerous documents, letters, and articles written over the past decade, he indicated the impassible gulf between the true Oppositionists and the capitulators. Even in exile and in the prisons, he asserted, the Trotskyists refused to have either personal or political relations with the capitulators.

This was especially the case with Radek, whom the prosecutor Vyshinsky represented as "one of the most outstanding, and, to do him justice, one of the most able and persistent Trotskyites." The documents showed that Trotsky had previously dealt his hardest blows at Radek, as a person who had completely lost his moral equilibrium after his surrender to Stalin. Radek alone, he said, among the former opposition chiefs, had succeeded in ingratiating himself again with the ruling clique and had given himself up body and soul to the service of Stalin.

When in 1929 Blumkin, an old Red Army hero and a high official in the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs confided to Radek that he had visited Trotsky in Constantinople, Radek immediately betrayed Blumkin to the GPU, who seized and shot him without trial. From then on, said Trotsky, Radek became the most odious figure to the Opposition; he was not only a capitulator but a traitor. Radek's whole character and history, Trotsky averred, made him a perfectly pliable instrument in the hands of the GPU when they required a central figure for their second grand production in Moscow.

## Three Crucial Questions

In subsequent sessions, Trotsky submitted impressive evidence concerning the three alleged meetings between him and the supposed plotters. This evidence was all in documentary form. Depositions were submitted proving Leon Sedov's presence in Berlin in November, 1932. A photostat of his passport was offered, and official French government telegrams which admitted him to France to see his family on their way back to Turkey from Copenhagen. Detailed depositions by dozens of people who were in Copenhagen when Trotsky was there were also offered in evidence.

Thus the alleged meeting of Leon Sedov with Holtzman in the vestibule of the Hotel Bristol in Copenhagen in November, 1932—a crucial link in the trials—was challenged at its foundations. The evidence about Sedov, verifiable from official documents at every point, showed that he could not have met Holtzman at the time and place indicated in the Moscow testimony. Previously, moreover, Friedrich Adler, secretary of the Labor and Socialist International, had published the fact that the Hotel Bristol was torn down in 1917. Six months later the Communist press belatedly substituted a confectionary shop called the Bristol in Copenhagen. Meanwhile, the English edition of the official trial record, edited by D. N. Pritt, the "impartial" British lawyer,

quietly dropped all mention of the name "Bristol." Trotsky was able to show in his testimony how this afterthought confirmed the extreme fragility of the original evidence.

Official statements by Norwegian authorities blasting Piatakov's tale of his airplane flight to Oslo in December, 1935, when no plane at all landed at the Oslo airport, were read into the record.

Finally, a thick dossier was offered to prove that Trotsky could not have met Vladimir Romm in Paris, in July 1933. By means of innumerable documents, photostats of hotel records, and sworn testimony of scores of people, Trotsky accounted for every movement he made from the time he landed at Marseille on July 24 until the following January when he visited Paris for the first time.

Having thus concretely challenged all specific references to times and places at which he was charged with contacts with the supposed plotters, Trotsky then accepted head-on the prosecutor Vyshinsky's argument that not only specific evidence but also Trotsky's political history and theories were relevant to the charges.

The examination then covered the record of Trotsky's political and organizational activities and their dissonance with the charges that he had allied himself with Fascists; his position on the defense of the Soviet Union, on terrorism and on his view of how the Soviet State is to be rid of the bureaucracy which he denounces as injurious to the interests of the Russian workers.

## Thorough Questioning

Both on direct examination by attorney Goldman and on cross-examination by chairman Dewey and attorney Finerty, there was a long and painstaking analysis of Trotsky's assertion of the absolute incompatibility between mass struggle for the revival of soviet democracy and the alleged acts of individual assassination, industrial sabotage and connivance with Nazis and Japanese. Through many hours of cross-examination Trotsky argued that the political, mass action to which he is committed today as he was forty years ago, can have nothing in common with the acts which he is charged with sponsoring.

The questioning, which lasted four days, was extremely thorough and painstaking. The examination canvassed all the main points in the trials and many subordinate aspects. It would be impossible here to describe even a hundredth part of the enormous mass of evidence presented by the defense, or to anticipate the work of the full commission by evaluating its juridical weight.

One important phase of the hearings must be underlined. The necessarily meager and unnecessarily distorted reports of the day's sessions which appeared in the American press, featuring only a few sensational highlights of the hearings, gave a completely inadequate and frequently false picture of the actual proceedings. The most impressive, although not the most strikingly dramatic, feature of the examination of Trotsky and of his secretary, Jan Frankl, was the patient and painstaking development of the case for the defense. Virtually every claim was substantiated by material and documentary evidence which was so conspicuously absent from the trials at Moscow. Trotsky submitted published articles, private letters, dozens of affidavits authenticating this point and that, from witnesses scattered throughout the world, not a few among them implacable political adversaries of Trotsky. All this will appear in the full record—and only by a careful study of the legal transcript can one who did not attend all the sessions of the hearings appreciate the extent, the variety, and the weight of Trotsky's testimony in his behalf. This stenographic record is now being prepared and the Commission has stated that it is planning to publish it very shortly.

## The Record Will Show

Much of the hearings were devoted to cross-examination of Trotsky by the members of the Commission and attorney Finerty. The commissioners' questions covered a considerable range of territory, probing into almost every conceivable corner of the Moscow trials. Here again we must refer to the published record; and we leave it to informed and enlightened public opinion to judge how ably the commission carried out its work; how rigorously they examined the witness; and how much light was shed upon the truth or falsity of the charges against Trotsky at these historic hearings.

On Sunday evening, May 9th, at Mecca Temple, those within reaching distance of New York will have the opportunity to hear from the commissioners themselves what happened in Mexico. I need scarcely emphasize what a privilege it will be to listen to the reports of Professor John Dewey and the other commissioners. We want our friends to be there, to demonstrate their solidarity with our work. But, equally, we want all doubters there. Let them hear, from the participants themselves, the facts about the Mexican hearings.

# At Mecca Temple—May 9

## MEXICAN HEARINGS AND THE CAPITALIST PRESS

History was made in the narrow room at Coyoacan, Mexico, where for a week John Dewey and his fellow-commissioners held hearings at which Leon Trotsky testified in his own defense. The record of those hearings will be part of the living tissue of history long after today's newspaper pages will have yellowed into dust. Yet the reaction of the world press is a barometer indicating the pressure of the many historical forces which met and clashed while the hearings went on. An analysis of the press coverage given the hearings should and must be made part of the permanent record. Here only the briefest of sidelights can be noted.

Generally speaking the big North American dailies shrugged testily: "A plague on both your houses" was the dominant editorial note. The Moscow trials were regarded primarily as a convenient whip with which to lash the whole idea of Socialism, or the "Soviet experiment." Why bother, then, about Trotsky's guilt or innocence? He is the worst Bolshevik of them all!

The attitude of the reporters on the spot was quite different. The original despatches filed by the correspondents of the Associated Press and United Press were almost uniformly objective. Limited in space by news agency requirements, they nevertheless attempted to record the highlights of the evidence presented. The same despatches, cut to order or mangled in the process of re-writing, frequently appeared in the papers emasculated of almost all sense, or even completely reversed in meaning.

But forces more powerful than the indifference, prejudices and ignorance of copy-readers were present at the hearings to distort their reflection in the world press.

The New York Times, for example, was represented by Frank Kluckhohn, who on the eve of the hearings impugned the integrity of Dr. Dewey, grossly distorted a statement issued by Albert Goldman, Trotsky's lawyer, and declared in advance that the hearings would be a "whitewash." Edwin James, the Times managing editor, protested by wire to Kluckhohn that the despatch was "unfair" even before the Commission's protests reached him.

To the Commission, to non-partisan visitors at the hearings and to his own employers, it was evident throughout the hearings that Kluckhohn had a sharp axe to grind. For two days after James' wire, Kluckhohn confined himself to reporting instead of editorializing. He was then absent for two days and returned only to report Beals' resignation. He entirely omitted the dramatic and crucial arguments presented in the final hearings. Kluckhohn's work received immediate and gratified republication in the Communist Party press everywhere.

At the last press conference, Kluckhohn demanded to know why Beals' provocative question about Borodin (which all the spectators considered obviously intended to jeopardize Trotsky's asylum in Mexico) was regarded as inadmissible whereas many questions relating to Spain had been asked and

answered which, according to Kluckhohn, had nothing to do with the trial. This episode threw a peculiarly interesting light on Kluckhohn's conscious attempts to discredit the Commission. For the questions on Spain had been written out by Kluckhohn and asked by Beals at Kluckhohn's request!

An article on the hearings appeared in the New Masses of April 27 by Marion Hammett and William Smith, who were both present. Miss Hammett, invited to attend freely as a New Masses representative, elaborately denied her New Masses connection and said she was writing for "Common Sense" and was not a "Stalinist." Miss Hammett is sister to Joseph Freeman, New Masses editor. The outright falsifications in the Smith-Hammett article are too numerous to mention here—readers of the article who also read the record to be published will learn a useful lesson in the art of judicio-journalistic falsifying. Let one example suffice: Hammett-Smith reported that no Mexican labor representatives were present. In fact six Mexican labor unions, with a membership of some 50,000 workers, had delegates present, and their names were given to the press.

The Mexican press, with the exception of El Nacional—which is known to have Communist Party members on its staff—reported the hearings extensively and objectively and most of them concluded, with El Universal, that Trotsky had made an impressive defense.

# What Happened At The TROTSKY HEARINGS in MEXICO?

Hear a Full Report by Members of the Preliminary Commission of Inquiry

SPEAKERS

**JOHN DEWEY**

Chairman of the Commission

**JOHN FINERTY**

Counsel to the Commission

Attorney to Mooney, Sacco-Vanzetti

**BENJAMIN STOLBERG**

Noted Labor Journalist

**SUZANNE LA FOLLETTE**

Former Editor, "New Freeman"

CHAIRMAN:

**WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK**

Professor of Education

Teachers College, Columbia University

**SUNDAY, MAY 9, 8:00 P. M.**

at the

**MECCA TEMPLE**

130 West 56th Street

Tickets 50c and 25c on sale at

CALL BOOKSHOP, 21 East 17th Street

LABOR BOOKSHOP, 28 East 12th Street

RAND BOOK STORE, 7 East 15th Street

and at the offices of the

**AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR THE DEFENSE OF LEON TROTSKY**

Room 1435, 22 East 17th Street, New York City

GRamercy 7-6011-12