

***the* ASSASSINATION
of LEON TROTSKY**

the Proofs of Stalin's Guilt

***by* ALBERT GOLDMAN**

15c

THE ASSASSINATION
of
LEON TROTSKY

A NOTE ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Albert Goldman was for a number of years (until 1933) nationally prominent as attorney for the International Labor Defense, achieving an illustrious reputation for his militant handling of numerous labor cases. In 1932 he brilliantly effected the absolute acquittal of thirteen working-class prisoners facing serious sentence on a riot charge; in 1934 he defended Local 574 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters in its conduct of the famous Minneapolis truck drivers' strike; the following year he served as counsel for Norman Mini in the famous Sacramento criminal syndicalism cases.

In 1936, Mr. Goldman served as counsel to Leon Trotsky in the Mexican hearings on the Moscow Trials and continued to act as legal adviser to the exiled revolutionary until Trotsky's death.

Following the assassination, Mr. Goldman, as counsel for Trotsky's widow, Natalia Sedov, participated in the examination of the assassin. The accompanying pamphlet is an analysis of the evidence gathered in the investigation following the assassination.

Introductory Note

On August 20, 1940, in the late afternoon, an obscure individual sank a pick-axe into the brain of Leon Trotsky.

On trial before the public opinion of the world is not the insignificant person who dealt the blow, but the despot who, behind the walls of the Kremlin, rules with an iron hand over the whole of the Soviet Union; whose secret police, at his command, imprison and murder hundreds of thousands of workers and peasants struggling for liberation within the Soviet Union and whose hand reaches out beyond the borders of the Soviet Union to destroy his enemies.

Stalin and his GPU are the criminals charged before the bar of mankind with the murder of Leon Trotsky.

World public opinion has instinctively accepted the proposition that Stalin is responsible for the murder of Trotsky. With the exception of the servants, friends and defenders of the GPU, every informed person has already found Stalin guilty of that murder. This is quite natural, for the world has for a long time been acquainted with the implacable hostility which Stalin, the destroyer of the Russian Revolution, had against Trotsky who, with Lenin, organized and led that revolution. Intelligent people, acquainted with the unbelievable calumnies hurled against Trotsky during the Moscow Trials, and knowing that Stalin had gotten rid of every individual who took a leading part in the Russian Revolution, understood that this monster behind the walls of the Kremlin would not rest until the man whom he feared most was put out of the way.

But in concluding that Stalin is the real murderer of Trotsky we do not depend simply on the generally accepted fact that he was anxious to get rid of Trotsky. We contend that an objective examination of every available bit of evidence can lead to no other conclusion on the part of individuals capable of thinking independently. The verdict of

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

guilty is supported by evidence which is irrefutable and by argument which is unanswerable.

It is true that in this case we are confronted by a situation where we have in our possession only circumstantial evidence; we do not have at our disposal the archives of Stalin and the GPU. In all probability, before he dies or is overthrown by the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union, Stalin will destroy these archives. But circumstantial evidence is no weaker than other evidence. A criminal need not be caught in the very act of committing a crime before he is convicted. If he denies his guilt or succeeds in escaping the evidence that he leaves behind him is just as strong, and just as convincing. In this case, all of the circumstances of the crime permit of only one conclusion—the one that has already been instinctively accepted by world public opinion.

In the following pages I shall prove beyond any possible doubt that the assassin Jacson's story with reference to his origin, to his mission in Mexico, to his reasons for killing Trotsky, are absolutely false; that Jacson's falsifications can lead to the one conclusion—that he is concealing those who are really responsible for the murder and that his whole story was concocted for that very purpose; that the real criminal can be only Stalin, who directed the GPU to murder Trotsky; that Jacson was an agent of the GPU and through the GPU of Stalin himself; that Jacson's falsifications can be explained only on the basis that Stalin is guilty of the murder of Trotsky.

Jacson's Confession

Let us first listen to the story of the individual who wielded the pick-axe. Who does he claim he is and what are the reasons he gives for committing this horrible murder?

In one of his pockets, at the time of his arrest, was found a 'confession' in the form of a letter he prepared, so he claims, just before leaving for Coyoacan with the intention of killing Trotsky. As will be seen later, this "confession" is an exceedingly important piece of evidence and it is necessary therefore to print it in full. The following is a translation from the French original, with the exception of the last two paragraphs, which were translated from a Spanish translation:

"Gentlemen:

"In writing this letter I have no other object, in the event an accident comes to me, than to explain to public opinion the motives which induce me to execute the act of justice which I propose.

"I am of an old Belgian family. In Paris where I made my studies of journalism I made the acquaintance with youth of my age who fought in different left organizations and little by little they won me to their ideas. I was content to have found in journalism a means of livelihood, since this permitted me to struggle more effectively against the present system of social injustice. It was then that I began to meet the Trotskyites who convinced me of the justice of their ideology and wholeheartedly I joined their organization. From then on I carried into the revolutionary cause all my energy and all my faith. I was a devoted disciple of L. T. and I would have given the last drop of my blood for the needs of the cause. I began to study all that had been written on the different revolutionary movements in order to better instruct myself and develop myself, and in this way to be more useful to the cause.

"At this time I became acquainted with a member of the Bureau of the Fourth International, who, after various conversations, proposed that I make a trip to Mexico in order

JACSON'S CONFESSION

to meet L. Trotsky. As is natural, this trip filled me with enthusiasm, since it was a thing for which I had not even dreamed, and I accepted with all my heart. This comrade supplied me with all the means, expenses of the trip, papers, etc. It must not be forgotten that with my own papers, it would have been impossible for me to go because of mobilization.

"Before going, with the many conversations which I had with this comrade, he made me understand very well that they expected from me something more than a simple militant of the party, but he did not make anything precise to me. I made the trip, first to the United States, and then to Mexico.

"Recently arrived here, they told me that I must remain some distance from the house in Coyoacan in order to call no attention upon me and only some months afterwards did I begin to visit the said house more or less on the indication of Leon Trotsky, who commenced to give me, little by little, some indications of what was expected of me.

"For me it was a great disillusionment since in place of finding myself face to face with a political chief who was directing the struggle for the liberation of the working class, I found myself before a man who desired nothing more than to satisfy his needs and desires of vengeance and of hate and who did not utilize the workers' struggle for anything more than a means of hiding his own paltriness and despicable calculations.

"From that moment I remained chilled by his skill in sowing discord in our own party, setting some against others, the leaders of yesterday against those of today, which brought into our own ranks a tangle and confusion, so that the majority of the members lost their time in discussing among themselves questions of a personal and secondary order relegating to a secondary plane all the problems of the working class, which ended by disanimating many of the members who, like me, had come to the movement in order to consecrate themselves entirely to the cause.

"After various conversations it was at last plain to me what they expected of me. It was then that there was sown in me the most profound disillusionment, and the greatest

JACSON'S CONFESSION

contempt for this man in whom I had had confidence and in whom I had formerly believed.

"It was proposed to me that I go to Russia in order to organize there a series of attempts against different persons and in the first place against Stalin. This was against all the principles of a struggle which until then I had considered open and loyal, and contrary to all my principles. Nevertheless I did nothing to prevent full clarity since I wished to know to what limits the baseness and hate of this man would go.

"I began to ask, among other things, the means to employ in order to be able to enter Russia. I was answered that I did not have to be disturbed since any means would be good in order to arrive at a result; he expected to count not only on the support of a great nation but also on the support of a certain foreign parliamentary committee.

"This, for me, was the drop of water which filled the glass too full and from this moment no doubt existed in my mind that Trotsky had no other object in his life than to utilize his followers in order to satisfy his personal ends and paltriness. Above all, I remained afflicted by the wide contacts which he had with certain leaders of capitalist countries and I came to the conclusion that perhaps the Stalinists were not so far from the truth when they accused Trotsky with preoccupying himself with the working class as if it were a dirty sock.

"After my conversations with him, I was astonished to see with what contempt he spoke of the Mexican Revolution and of everything that was Mexican. Naturally all his sympathies are in favor of Almazan, but aside from him and some of his followers he threw everything into the same sack, criticizing the politics of Cardenas, the Mexican police, who he said were completely corrupted; and I will not say anything about what he said about Lombardo Toledano and Avila Camacho, who he expected would be very soon assassinated, in order to leave a free field to Almazan. (And in such a way that I am sure there was under way some plot in this sense, that otherwise he would not have spoken thus, since he liked very much to give himself the importance of a prophet.' It would not be prudent to confide thus.)

JACSON'S CONFESSION

"This is not astonishing when one recalls that he has the same hate towards the members of his party who are not absolutely in accord with him. It is for this that when he is speaking of the Minority of the party, he insinuates the possibility of a struggle of another order than political. When he says that the Minorityites wish to attack him one of these days, this means that he is going to begin among them a bloody war.

"One day, speaking of the fortress, which his house had become, he said: It is not only to defend myself against the Stalinists, but also against the Minorityites which meant that he desired the expulsion of various members of the party. Precisely in connection with this house, which he said very well had been converted into a fortress, I asked myself very often, from where had come the money for such work, since in reality the party is very poor and in many countries does not have the possibility of bringing out a daily paper, an indispensable means for the struggle. From where came this money? Perhaps the consul of a great foreign nation who often visited him could answer this question for us.

"In order to demonstrate the slight interest which he has for everything not connected with himself, I add that I was promised to a certain young girl whom I love with all my soul, because she is good and loyal. When I told him that I could not go to Russia because I wished to get married first, and I would not go without my wife, he became very nervous, and told me that I had to finish with her. I could not marry such a person as she, who seconded the Minority rabble. It is probable that after my act she may not wish to know me any more, nevertheless it was also for her sake that I decided to sacrifice myself entirely, removing the chief of the workers' movement who did not do more than prejudice it, and I am sure that later, not only the party, but also the entire history will know how to see me in the right light, when they will see that the bloody enemy of the working class is gone.

"In case anything unfortunate occurs to me, I ask the publication of this letter."

JAC.

August 20, 1940.

(signed in pencil)

Jacson's Statements to the Police

After Jacson was in the hands of the police, he made statements of which the following is a resume:

"My name is Jacques Mornard Vandendreschd." (Note: the last name is either his mother's maiden name or a name indicating a title. It is the custom in Mexico to add the mother's maiden name.) "My father was a Belgian who dedicated himself to literature, diplomacy and writing. It was while he was ambassador to Persia that I was born, in the year 1904.

"My parents returned to Belgium when I was two years old. My father retired from the diplomatic corps and amassed a fortune of four million Belgian francs. He died in the year 1926, leaving his entire fortune to my mother, consisting mostly of real estate, which my mother has to this date.

"At the outbreak of the World War, my mother moved to Paris where I was placed in a grammar school. In the year 1919 my mother and I returned to Brussels, where I attended the college of St. Ignaz de Loyola, from which I was graduated in the year 1920.

"My father, against my will, placed me in a military school; afterwards I studied for two years in the Royal Academy of Dixmunde, and since I was an anti-militarist, I left this military school in 1924.

"Later I went to Paris and entered the school of journalism in the Sorbonne. After studying there for some time, I became assistant to the well-known journalist Paul de Lacourt, who was a sports writer for 'Le Soir.' In 1936 I became his secretary, but my monetary needs were very demanding and my mother had to send me an allowance in order to live.

"I have one older brother named Robert, 40 years old, married and following the career of my father—diplomacy. For many years I have not had any news from him.

"In 1934 I married a Belgian girl, but we could not get along and separated. In 1939 I obtained a divorce. When

STATEMENTS TO THE POLICE

I separated from my wife, she went to her father, who was a person in the Royal Court.

"While I was in Paris I met an American girl named Gertrude. One day she told me that a friend of hers, Ruby Weil, was hunting for an apartment, and as I was leaving mine, I let her have it. I met Sylvia Ageloff through Ruby's sister. The two of them came from London. While in Paris, I accompanied them to museums, took them for automobile rides. A little later Ruby's sister left, and Sylvia remained, and we became lovers.

"I continued to attend the school of journalism in the Sorbonne. In frequent conversations, Sylvia taught me what was Marxism, Stalinism, Trotskyism and other 'isms.' Little by little I commenced to become interested in these things, principally after a trip which we made together to Brussels.

"Through militant Trotskyites I became acquainted with a member of the Fourth International, whose name I do not know. I met this person at another time in the streets of Paris, and after a very short period of talking, he said to me abruptly, 'Mornard, how would you like to go to Mexico? Leon Trotsky needs an expert like you.' I immediately accepted the proposition, which he made, since I was very anxious to know new countries, and above all, to meet Trotsky.

"I told him that the only difficulty was that I lacked passports and documents and he answered, 'Don't worry about that.' Two days later I received a passport with the name of Frank Jacson, of Canadian origin, with my photograph, and I also received \$200 for the expenses of the trip, and a note which said that I would be provided with money when I needed it.

"I wrote to my mother and told her that I wished to go to America, and she sent me \$5,000 in the form of a check on a Brussels bank, which I cashed into American currency. I took first-class passage on the Ile de France. Upon arriving in New York, I met Sylvia, who had left Paris before. I explained to her that in order to evade the horrors and problems of the war, I came to the U. S. under a false passport, and that I was going to continue towards Mexico where I had some business to attend to. This was in accordance with the instructions of the agent of the Fourth International who

STATEMENTS TO THE POLICE

in addition indicated that I was to go to the Mexican Consulate in order to obtain a tourist card. This I did.

"I did not try to meet Trotsky because the member of the Fourth International, from whom I received instructions, told me that the interview with Trotsky must be casual, not forced. In a short time Sylvia came to Mexico and stayed with me for a while. It was at this time that I met the Rosmer couple, and this couple presented me to the Russian leader, recommending me to him as an active sympathizer. I was permitted free access to the house of Trotsky since the month of June.

"I was disillusioned with Trotsky because he was a great egoist, to such a degree that nothing interested him except his own affairs and his own interests. He abused the working class and also he abused me greatly and gravely. He shattered my life. It was Trotsky who destroyed my nature, future and all my affections. He converted me into a man without name, without country, into an instrument of Trotsky. I was in a blind alley, and then I thought I would kill him and commit suicide.

"On a certain occasion, Trotsky was going to send me to Russia with the object of organizing a new state of things in the U.S.S.R. He told me that I must go to Shanghai, on the China clipper where I would meet other agents in some ships, and together we would cross Manchukuo and arrive in Russia. Our mission was to bring demoralization to the Red Army, commit different acts of sabotage in armaments plants and other factories. He spoke to me of his plan only in generalities, and when I asked him if I could take Sylvia with me, he told me in a firm tone: 'It is not possible, because Sylvia is with the Minority!'

(Here Jacson is referring to a section of the Socialist Workers Party in the U. S. which split away from the Socialist Workers Party because of a difference of opinion on the question of the attitude that the Fourth International should take toward the Soviet Union during its conflict with Finland. The Majority, supported by Trotsky, contended that, although Stalin was to be condemned for his invasion of Finland, the struggle was one between the Soviet Union, based upon nationalized property relations, and Finland, part of the capitalist world, and consequently all Marxists must

STATEMENTS TO THE POLICE

work for the victory of the Soviet Union. The Minority advocated working for the defeat of the Red Army. The Minority refused to abide by the decision of a convention called to settle the question, and split from the Fourth International. Sylvia Ageloff was a member of the Minority. Jackson supported the Majority.)

"For me this was total destruction. Trotsky crushed me in his hands as if I had been paper. It was then that there was born in my brain the idea to kill him. I thought for a week, and came to the conclusion that no other remedy remained than to kill him and then commit suicide. I hoped that if I could come to him and give him one blow, I would have time to escape, and that is why I took the alpine stock. I bought a pistol from an individual who deals in those things, and paid about 160 or 170 pesos for it, and in addition gave him a typewriter on Saturday, the 17th of the present month. On the 20th of August I wrote a letter on this machine. (This letter was found on him at the time of the attack.)

"I used the alpine stock because I had made excursions in the Switzerland mountains on various occasions, and there discovered that I had a rare ability to use it. Because of this I thought that one blow would be enough to kill Trotsky, and if this did not occur, I imagined that I would have time to shoot myself. For this reason I decided to carry the pistol and as a precaution also a dagger, which I had bought in LaGunilla, and which I sewed into the pocket of my overcoat. Had I succeeded in leaving the Trotsky house, I would have gone to the National Park with the object of taking my life.

"On Tuesday morning I was with Sylvia, and about noon we, by chance, met Otto Schussler and his wife. I invited them to supper. I went to borrow the typewriter which I had given to Bartolo Perez. I returned to Sylvia and together we went to take an aperitif. Then I left the hotel. I went to the house of Trotsky in Coyoacan, and in order to justify my visit, I asked if Sylvia had already arrived, although I knew that this could not be possible, since I had left her at the hotel.

"The door was opened for me and I found Trotsky in the yard, feeding hay to the rabbits. I told Trotsky that I had

STATEMENTS TO THE POLICE

brought an article with some very interesting statistical data on France, and he invited me to his study, just as I had figured he would. We entered the study, and Trotsky sat down in the chair at the center of the table.

"I was standing on his left side. I put my gabardine coat on the table with the object of being able to take the alpine stock which was in the pocket. I resolved not to lose this brilliant opportunity which was presented to me, and at the precise moment in which Trotsky commenced to read my article which served me as a pretext, I took the alpine stock from the gabardine coat, grabbed it tightly and dealt him a tremendous blow on the head. Trotsky cried out and threw himself upon me and bit my hand. We struggled, and people entered the room and beat me. I prayed that day to Trotsky's secretaries that they kill me, but they did not wish to do so."

In a subsequent statement he made the following additional remarks:

"I bought the pick-axe or alpine stock in Switzerland, and sent it with a collection of arms to New York."

"I knew Bob Harte, but not very well; I talked to him for not more than five minutes."

"I was not an actual member of the Fourth International; I was solely a follower of Trotsky."

"Trotsky always made a joke of the government of Mexico; one time when he spoke of the Mexican Revolution, he said: 'If this is a revolution, I am a shoe maker.'"

Testimony of Witnesses

The following is a summary of statements made in court by Sylvia Ageloff, by the secretaries and guards of Trotsky and also of statements made by people in the United States who met Jacson on different occasions:

Jacson, under the name of Jacques Mornard, was introduced to Sylvia Ageloff in Paris in the early part of July 1938 by Ruby Weil, an acquaintance of Sylvia. At the time when Sylvia Ageloff and Ruby Weil left New York for Paris, the latter was working for the *People's Press*, a paper edited by Frank Palmer, considered by some to be a secret Stalinist. Ruby Weil was given Jacson's address in Paris by her sister, Gertrude. There is another sister in the Weil family, Marianne, who is married to Frank Howe. Both Howe and his wife are strong Stalinist sympathizers.

Jacson became interested in Sylvia Ageloff, and paid a good deal of attention to her, taking both her and her friends out to night-clubs and theatres and spending money quite lavishly. Several friends of Sylvia met him at that time, and all of them agree that he claimed to be of a noble Belgian family and that his father was a well-known diplomat. He also claimed to have been educated in Paris, and that he was studying journalism at the Sorbonne.

In the latter part of July 1938, he informed Sylvia that his parents had been in an automobile accident and that he must leave for Brussels immediately. Sylvia went to Prague and on the way back to Paris, stopped off at Brussels, intending to meet Mornard there. Instead, a woman met her at the place where she was supposed to meet Mornard, and told her that Mornard had been suddenly called away to England. Sylvia came back to Paris without seeing Mornard, and while in Paris she received letters from him. He returned to Paris some time in September 1938 and told Sylvia that he had been in Brussels all the time, but was under military arrest because of his failure to serve in the army.

When Sylvia told him that she could not remain in

TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES

France without working, he arranged to have her write articles on psychology, which he claimed he sold to an Argus Publishing Co., a company that sold articles on various subjects to different magazines. He gave her 3,000 francs a month for the articles that she wrote, but refused to put her in touch with the Argus Publishing Co. and refused also to show her any magazines where her articles were published, claiming that such was the rule of the company.

Sylvia Ageloff left Paris for New York in February 1939. According to word received from Jacson, he was supposed to come to New York in March 1939, claiming that he had obtained a position as an American correspondent for a Belgian newspaper. However, he sent a cable to Sylvia announcing that he could not come, and later, by letter, informed her that the reason for his inability to come was that he could not get an American visa.

He Arrives in America

Jacson arrived in New York in the early part of September 1939 on the Ile de France, and told some members of the Ageloff family that in order to leave Europe he had to obtain a false passport, because of mobilization, and that he had bought a Canadian passport from some passport service in France for the sum of \$3,500. He claimed to have obtained \$10,000 from his mother. He also told them that he had a position working for a broker operating in Mexico and purchasing different materials for England and France.

He left New York for Mexico about October 1st 1939. He corresponded with Sylvia, while in Mexico, mentioning the fact that he was waiting for his "boss." Sylvia Ageloff made a trip to Mexico early in January 1940. It was then that Jacson became acquainted with Alfred and Marguerite Rosmer, friends of Sylvia. The Rosmer couple had brought Trotsky's grandson from Paris to Mexico in the summer of 1939 and were living in the Trotsky house. On various occasions they were invited by Sylvia to have dinner with her and Jacson, and to take long drives with them in Jacson's car. At that time Jacson also met one or two of Trotsky's guards. He did not, however, at any time press for an invitation to the Trotsky household.

TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES

On different occasions Sylvia Ageloff asked Jacson where his office was and he told her it was in Room 820 of the Ermita Building. One day Sylvia's sister went to look for him in that building, and found that there was no such room. Jacson explained that he had made a mistake in the room number, and that it was Room 620 instead of 820. Sylvia became suspicious about the nature of his work, and asked Marguerite Rosmer to find out whether Jacson actually had an office in Room 620. Marguerite Rosmer went to the building and actually found an office boy in this room who told her that it was Jacson's office. (Later it turned out that this room was used by David Alfaro Siqueiros, organizer of the May 24th assault on Trotsky).

Neither Sylvia Ageloff nor Marguerite Rosmer then had any suspicion that he was a GPU agent. They thought that he was involved in work which was not strictly legal and that he consequently refused to divulge its nature.

Sylvia Ageloff left Mexico in the early part of March 1940, returning to New York. The Rosmers continued to see Jacson now and then, and while Alfred Rosmer was in the hospital in Mexico City, Jacson showed a willingness to serve the Rosmers in different ways. When he found out that the Rosmers intended to go by boat from Vera Cruz to New York, he offered to take them to Vera Cruz in his car, claiming that he had business there, and that he went there about once a week or so. The Rosmers accepted the offer.

On May 28th when the Rosmers were scheduled to leave Mexico City for Vera Cruz, Jacson appeared at the Trotsky house early in the morning. He was admitted into the yard, and then, for the first time, he met Trotsky. He was invited to have breakfast. The Rosmers, Natalia, Jacson and a woman secretary of Trotsky, all went to Vera Cruz. Thereafter, the records kept by Trotsky's guards of the persons entering the yard show that Jacson came to the Trotsky household altogether ten times. Although none of the guards liked him, they had no suspicions about him and readily admitted him whenever he came to the household. About June 13th he left Mexico for New York, claiming that he was to meet his "boss" there and arrange some business matters. While in New York, he saw some of the Ageloffs and also the

TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES

Rosmers, and on or about July 1st he left New York for Mexico City. He first went to New Orleans, then to San Antonio, from where he called Sylvia Ageloff by phone, telling her that he would take a plane to Mexico City.

Sylvia Ageloff did not hear from him for about three weeks, and after wiring two or three times, she received a wire from him towards the end of July saying that he had been very ill in a small village near Puebla. In a telephone conversation between Jacson and Sylvia Ageloff, he told her to come to Mexico City. Sylvia came to Mexico City in the early part of August 1940 where, she testified, she found Jacson's physical condition apparently exceedingly bad—that he had lost a great deal of weight, was very nervous and spent a great deal of time in bed. He appeared to be under a very great strain.

Jacson continued to meet the people of the Trotsky household and to visit the house in Coyoacan. At that time there was a great deal of discussion on the political question which was the cause of the split in the American party, and while Sylvia supported the ideas of the Minority that split away from the Socialist Workers Party, Jacson claimed to support the Majority. In conversations with members of the Trotsky household, he claimed that he was always arguing with Sylvia about this question. Sylvia later absolutely denied that he ever discussed the subject with her.

Everyone who knew Jacson testified that he never uttered a single word which could be construed in any way as indicating that he was "disillusioned" with Trotsky. On the contrary, he always spoke of Trotsky with the greatest admiration and, as has already been indicated, unreservedly supported Trotsky and the Majority in the controversy with the Minority.

The Murder

On August 20th he came to Trotsky's house, driving up in his Buick and, unlike his usual custom, turned his car completely around so that it faced in the direction he would have to take when he left. He was admitted into the yard, and there met Trotsky whom he asked to read an article

TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES

that he had written. Trotsky invited him to go into his study.

When cries were heard, Harold Robins and Joe Hansen rushed into the study, Robins attacking Jacson and Hansen taking care of Trotsky. While Robins was pummeling Jacson, demanding that Jacson say why he attacked Trotsky, the answer was: "They made me do it, they made me do it." When Hansen came into the room a second time to help Robins keep Jacson under control, Jacson said: "They have imprisoned my mother—they have imprisoned my mother." However, shortly after he made these statements, he became very cautious and began to think before he answered. It was then that he volunteered the information that he was not a member of the GPU. The police came in soon afterward, and placed Jacson under arrest.

Cross Examination

One of the most effective methods of showing up the weaknesses of testimony given by a lying witness is through cross-examination. There is no guaranty that the best cross-examination in the world can succeed in breaking down a clever liar, but under certain circumstances it is certainly an effective weapon. Especially is this true if a witness makes statements which are in the main general conclusions. Such a witness has to think fast and hard if the cross-examiner begins to pin him down to details. It is then that the absurdity of the witness's story may become apparent.

In the Moscow Trials, for instance, the defendants and witnesses were permitted to tell their stories, mainly in the form of general conclusions, without being subjected to cross-examination. They saw Trotsky or his son on a certain day in some city or other where they had arrived by plane, or some other method of transportation; they were given general instructions to commit sabotage or assassination, etc., etc.

These defendants and witnesses would have had a hard time on cross-examination to furnish the details of the meetings with Trotsky or his son and the details of the instructions. They would have been pinned down to specific things which would then be easily disproved.

If a witness says he met a certain person, without giving any date and if he is compelled to furnish a date then, if he is testifying falsely, the person whom he is supposed to have met might be able to furnish convincing proof that on the day in question he was in a city far away from that claimed by the false witness. Even without cross-examination it was proved* that the witnesses testified falsely in the Moscow

* See the two volumes issued by the Commission of Inquiry into the Charges Made against Leon Trotsky in the Moscow Trials (John Dewey, Chairman): **THE CASE OF LEON TROTSKY** (Harpers, 1937) and **NOT GUILTY** (Harpers, 1938).

CROSS EXAMINATION

trials. Far more could have been done to disprove their testimony had they been subjected to cross-examination.

There was no cross-examination of Jacson such as we are acquainted with in the United States. Under the Mexican law, there is no cross-examination in our sense of the term. However, I was given an opportunity by Judge Raul Carranca Trujillo, who was investigating the case, to ask Jacson some questions. Since it was impossible for me to cross-examine him at length, I had to confine myself to two or three important aspects of his story. My purpose primarily was to try to get him to be more specific on dates, conversations, persons,—knowing that it was impossible for him to do so, because if he were to attempt to become more specific, he would inevitably slip, no matter how careful he might be, and contradict himself.

The following is a resume of his answers to the questions I asked him:

“Yes, I burned my passport and all other important documents before I went to attack Trotsky. The only thing that I left was the letter which was found on me by the police. Yes, I am telling the truth now, and my passport and other documents would have corroborated my story in every detail.”

I then put the following question to him: “Why, then, if your story could have been corroborated by your passport and your other personal documents, did you destroy them?” The answer was: “I wanted to get rid of all that material and I did not see any use in keeping it.”

I examined him closely with reference to his statement that a member of the Bureau of the Fourth International in Paris had instructed him to go to Mexico to see Trotsky. The following questions and answers are part of the record:

Q: Approximately when did you meet the member of the Bureau of the Fourth International, who asked you to go to Mexico to see Trotsky?

A: In the latter part of July or the beginning of August 1939.

Q: Who introduced you to him?

A: I answered that before; I think they were two Greek members of the Fourth International.

CROSS EXAMINATION

- Q: Did they introduce you by name?
A: Yes.
Q: Did they introduce this member of the Bureau by name?
A: No.
Q: Well, how did they introduce him?
A: They just introduced him as a member of the Bureau of the Fourth International.
Q: Were you a member of the French section of the Fourth International?
A: No, I was only a sympathizer.
Q: Did you know that the Bureau is the highest body of the Fourth International?
A: Yes.
Q: Did you know that not even members of the organization know the persons who are members of the Bureau?
A: Yes.
Q: And you still claim that these two Greek persons introduced him to you, not by name, but as a member of the Bureau of the Fourth International?
A: Yes.
Q: What language did you speak to him?
A: French.
Q: Can you give us an idea of his nationality?
A: I think he was a Rumanian, or from some other Balkan country.
Q: How many times did you see this man?
A: About 15 or 20 times.
Q: When was the last time you saw him?
A: I don't remember.
Q: You said you received \$5,000 from your mother about August 24th and that was after he instructed you to go to Mexico, is that right?
A: Yes.
Q: So that the last time you saw him must have been before August 24th? Is that right?
A: Yes.
Q: How soon after you wrote to your mother, did you get the \$5,000?
A: I don't remember.
Q: What was the nature of your conversation with this man on your first meeting?
A: Oh, a general conversation.
Q: How many days after your first meeting did you meet him the second time?

CROSS EXAMINATION

A: Two or three days.

Q: How did you happen to meet him the second time?

A: He made an appointment with me when I first met him.

Q: What was the subject of your second conversation?

A: I don't remember.

Q: How long after the second meeting with him did you meet him for the third time?

From then on, his answers to questions with reference to the time of meeting the alleged member of the Bureau and subjects of conversation were invariably: "I don't remember."

Q: How much money did you receive from this member of the Bureau?

A: \$200.

Q: Was it in French or American money?

A: I don't remember.

Q: Did you ask him whether \$200 would be sufficient to cover all the expenses for a trip to Mexico?

A: No, I did not.

Q: Did you know how much it would cost to go to Mexico?

A: No.

Q: Did you then not discuss the question of expenses with him?

A: No.

Q: You said that this member of the Bureau instructed you to wait in Mexico and not to see Trotsky immediately?

A: Yes.

Q: He also instructed you to pretend that you were engaged in some business in Mexico. You knew all this would take some time, didn't you?

A: Yes.

Q: And it did take from September 1939 to the latter part of May 1940?

A: Yes.

Q: Well, did it not occur to you that \$200 would not be enough?

A: Money with me is a secondary question.

Q: You mean to say that you were not interested in the question of money?

A: Je ne suis pas un Americain! (I am not an American.)

Q: You mean to say that Belgians can go without food and lodging? (Here he protested to the Judge that I was sarcastic.)

Q: You said in your statement that you received \$5,000 from your mother?

CROSS EXAMINATION

- A: Yes.
- Q: In the letter which was found on you, you claim that you were a very loyal defender of the organizations, is that right? In view of the fact that you received \$5,000 from your mother, why did you not return the \$200 to the organization?
- A: I had given more than \$200 at various times.
- Q: Did you receive a letter of introduction to Trotsky from this alleged member of the Bureau?
- A: No.
- Q: How did you expect to see Trotsky without a letter of introduction, and convince him that you were to be trusted?
- A: That was not my problem—that was the problem of the people who sent me.
- Q: What did you expect to do for Trotsky?
- A: To act as secretary or translator.
- Q: Did you not think it was peculiar that you should be sent without a letter of introduction?
- A: No.
- Q: What did you do all these months between the time you arrived in the United States and the time you succeeded in seeing Trotsky?
- A: Nothing.
- Q: Were you in any business?
- A: No.
- Q: Did you tell different people that you were in business?
- A: Yes.
- Q: Why did you do so?
- A: Those were my instructions.
- Q: Did you know any of the secretaries of Trotsky?
- A: Yes.
- Q: Did you ever ask any of them whether they received the same instructions—to wait, before meeting Trotsky?
- A: No.

I examined him closely on the question of the passport, and the following is a summary of his answers to these questions:

“I remember nothing of the contents of the passport except the name—Frank Jacson. I looked at the passport when I first received it from the man who gave it to me in Paris, but I did not examine the contents. I used the passport several times in crossing the frontiers, but I just gave the pass-

CROSS EXAMINATION

port to the officials without looking into the contents. I had occasion to use the passport in Mexico at the American Consulate. I don't remember whether I looked at the contents. All I remember is that I gave it to the person in charge at the Consulate and he returned it to me and I put it in my pocket. I never paid any attention whatever to the contents of the passport."

Q: You knew it was a false passport, didn't you?

A: Yes.

Q: And you mean to say that you never looked at the contents to familiarize yourself with them?

A: I never had any interest to look at it.

Q: Were you not afraid that you might be asked some questions about it at the border?

A: I never had any fear about that.

I don't know whether, according to the passport, Frank Jacson was born in Canada. I don't know if Frank Jacson, according to the passport, was supposed to live in Canada.

Q: Do you want us to believe that you received a false passport in Europe and never looked at the contents?

A: I don't care what you believe.

Here I asked him a pointed question—how it was that he remembered in such minute detail all the contents of his two valises and could not remember the contents of such an important document as a false passport. He called that a tendentious question and refused to answer.

Q: Did you have anything to do with the passport, either before or after receiving it?

A: No.

Q: Do you mean to say that when you received the passport, it was complete in every respect and that you did not have to do anything at all with reference to it?

A: Yes.

I examined him quite closely on the question of his meetings with Trotsky and his conversations with him. By that time he became excessively cautious and the best I could get out of him was, "I don't remember." The following is a sample:

Q: When was the time you first met Trotsky?

A: I don't remember.

CROSS EXAMINATION

Q: Was it the day when you came to the Trotsky household to take the Rosmers to Vera Cruz?

A: I don't remember.

Q: Did you offer to take the Rosmers to Vera Cruz or did they ask you to take them?

A: I don't remember.

Q: Did you tell the Rosmers that you had business in Vera Cruz and that you had to go there about once a week?

A: I don't remember.

Q: Have you any business in Vera Cruz?

A: No.

Q: Did you ever meet Trotsky before you came to pick up the Rosmers?

A: I don't remember.

Q: Do you remember the month when you first met Trotsky?

A: No.

Q: Was it before or after the May 24th assault on Trotsky?

A: It was after—at the end of May.

Q: Who first introduced you to Trotsky?

A: Alfred Rosmer.

Q: Did you have any conversation with Trotsky in the presence of Rosmer?

A: I don't remember.

Q: What was the subject of the first conversation you had with Trotsky?

A: I don't remember.

Q: Do you remember when you had your second conversation with Trotsky?

A: No.

Q: How long after the first conversation was this second conversation with Trotsky?

A: I don't remember.

Q: What was the subject of the second conversation?

A: I don't remember.

Q: Do you remember the approximate date?

A: I don't remember.

And thus I kept on asking about all the various conversations, the dates, places, what people if any were present, etc. His answer was, without the least change: "I don't remember."

Q: During which one of the conversations did you become disillusioned?

A: I don't remember.

Q: Did you tell anyone that you were disillusioned?

CROSS EXAMINATION

- A: I don't remember.
- Q: Did you not tell Sylvia, your most intimate friend, about your disillusionment?
- A: I don't know.
- Q: Do you remember the subject of any one of the conversations that you had with Trotsky?
- A: I remember the results of these conversations but not the subjects nor the chronology.
- Q: Do you remember the results of each conversation in particular or simply of all the conversations put together?
- A: Of all the conversations put together.
- Q: How many results of all these conversations do you remember?
- A: This pertains to what I have already answered and I refuse to answer again.

From then on Jacson took refuge in the statement that he had answered all the questions in previous statements and would not repeat his answers. The fact is that he did not, in any of the statements, answer most of the questions I asked him. His testimony consisted of nothing but general conclusions. Here is another example:

- Q: Can you tell us one result of these conversations?
- A: I remember the results of these conversations was my disillusionment with Trotsky.
- Q: Then you mean to say that you do not remember the subjects of the various conversations but you only remember that you were disillusioned?
- A: I remember the subject and the disillusionment.
- Q: What subject?
- A: I remember the dishonest proposition which Trotsky made to me that I go to the Soviet Union and carry out acts of sabotage, et cetera, et cetera, as I have declared and written in the letter which was found on me.
- Q: Was it during that conversation with Trotsky that he proposed that you assassinate Stalin?
- A: Trotsky did not exactly propose that I assassinate Stalin.
- Q: What precisely did Trotsky propose?
- A: I don't remember.
- Q: Then your disillusionment came as a result of his proposal that you commit acts of sabotage?
- A: Yes.

CROSS EXAMINATION

- Q: Did Trotsky tell you exactly what acts of sabotage to commit in Russia?
- A: I have already answered this question in my previous declaration.
- Q: Will you repeat your answer?
- A: No.
- Q: Will you answer yes or no—whether Trotsky proposed that you assassinate Stalin?
- A: I have already answered all the questions in my previous declaration.
- Q: What language did you speak with Trotsky?
- A: French.
- Q: Did Trotsky have any reason to believe that you spoke Russian?
- A: I don't speak Russian—I never spoke with Trotsky in any other language than French.
- Q: How many conversations did you have with Trotsky after he proposed that you commit acts of sabotage in Russia?
- A: I don't remember.
- Q: Do you remember what you said in your letter that was found on you with reference to Trotsky's proposal that you assassinate Stalin and other leaders of the Soviet Union?
- A: I don't remember.
- Q: When were you supposed to go to Russia to commit these acts of sabotage?
- A: I don't know.
- Q: Were you supposed to use the false passport with the name of Frank Jacson?
- A: I don't know.
- Q: What was the first thing you were supposed to do after arriving in Russia?
- A: I don't know. I have already described all the details about the proposition which Trotsky made me, and it is useless to repeat them.
- Q: Will you answer these questions I ask you if I show you that they were not answered before?
- A: I will not answer because you want to make me fall into contradictions.
- Remark by the Judge: "If you are answering truthfully, then you should not fear that you will fall into contradictions."
- A: If I don't give you any details, it is not because I fear

ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE

knows nothing about the murder of Trotsky. The first name, Jacques, is omitted in the dispatch, but that is of no importance, because foreign correspondents usually omit the first names of persons who are obviously the subject matter of the dispatch. Foreign correspondents use what is called "cablese" and omit every word that can possibly be omitted without changing the nature of the story.

Everyone who knows French well is of the opinion that Jacson does not speak French like a native. He speaks French fluently but with an accent, indicating that it is not his native tongue. The Secretary of the Belgian Consulate in Mexico conversed with Jacson, and on the basis of his conversation, stated that in his opinion Mornard or Jacson was not of Belgian nationality. His reasons were the following:

1. Jacson claims that his father was Belgian ambassador to Persia from 1904 to 1908. A check-up shows that this is not the truth.
2. Jacson professes ignorance of any other diplomatic post that his father might have held other than the one in Persia.
3. Jacson claims that he studied in the military school in Dixmude, a small city in Flanders. There is no military school in Dixmude.
4. Jacson claims to have studied in a Jesuit college in Brussels—St. Ignacius of Loyola, situated on the Waterloo Highway. There is no such college and all the Jesuit colleges are on a different road.
5. The number of the house in which he claims his mother lived, is the number of a main store situated in the heart of Brussels. He claims that his family lived in a suburb of Brussels.
6. Claiming to have studied in the Flemish part of Brussels, he should have had at least an elementary knowledge of the Flemish language, but he does not understand a word of Flemish.

In his statements to the police, he said that his father died in 1926 and left a large estate. But he always let Sylvia Ageloff and her intimate friends understand that he had a

father as well as a mother living. In a letter from Brussels, dated July 26, 1938, he writes as follows:

"Sylvia darling, as I told you, my brother had given me a very bad version of my mother's accident. The thing happened like this: My father and mother were coming from Ostend to spend a day in Brussels. They were in a car driven by a chauffeur and just before getting to Brussels, my father had the car stop to do the necessary and it was then that the car was hit by a ten-ton truck, killing the chauffeur and very seriously injuring my mother. My father, not having been in the car, was unhurt. My mother was operated on again yesterday (the second operation in three days) and the doctors say the greatest danger is past but they cannot be sure for a few days."

He never introduced Sylvia Ageloff to his family, claiming that his father and mother would not countenance her as his prospective wife. Sylvia Ageloff was in Brussels in August 1938, and tried to get in touch with Jacson, but was unable to do so. She succeeded only in meeting a woman who claimed that he was in England.

From the available evidence the conclusion is justified that the individual who wielded the pick-axe is not what he claims to be in origin.

Connection with the Fourth International

In the "confession" found on Jacson, he claims that he joined the Trotskyist organization in France. In his subsequent statements to the police and to the judge, he denied that he was a member and stated that he was a sympathizer. As I shall show later on, he did not memorize well the statements made in his "confession" and therefore there are contradictions between the assertions made in the letter and those made by him subsequently. The testimony of everyone who knew him proves conclusively that he was never a member of the Fourth International. He never claimed to be, except in his "confession." All those who knew him looked upon him simply as a sympathizer.

How did he become a sympathizer? In the "confession" he

states that he was won over to the ideology of the Trotskyists while he was studying journalism in Paris, and made the acquaintance of youth of his age in various leftist groups. He then joined the Trotskyist organization. In his subsequent statements, he declared that Sylvia Ageloff was the one who taught him the difference between Trotskyism and Stalinism and other ideologies, and won him over as a sympathizer to Trotskyism.

All those who knew him agree that his knowledge of the movement was very superficial. Whether Jacson pretended to know very little about the movement or whether that was actually the case, is not certain. It is obvious that it was better for Jacson to play the role of a mere sympathizer than actually to join the Fourth International. He would have had to do a great many things as a member that no one expected him to do as a sympathizer. At the same time, he could just as readily gain entry into the Trotsky household as a sympathizer, and especially as the husband of a member of the organization.

Jacson's Mission to Mexico

It is perfectly natural that members of the Trotskyist organizations throughout the world should have been glad of an opportunity to visit Trotsky, to discuss various political problems with a person who was considered by them as the greatest living Marxist. Not only is this true of members but of sympathizers, and even of people who did not agree with Trotsky's ideas but were simply interested in him as a great political thinker and writer.

Excluding everything else, Jacson's statement in his "confession" that he became acquainted with a member of the Bureau of the Fourth International who, after various conversations, proposed that Jacson make a trip to see Trotsky, does not necessarily sound incredible. It is not only possible but perfectly natural for a member of a Trotskyist organization to suggest to a wealthy sympathizer that he visit Trotsky.

What immediately throws doubt on Jacson's assertion is

his claim that the member of the Bureau supplied him with all the necessary papers (passport) and with all expenses.

This would indicate that Jacson was sent as a representative of the organization to serve Trotsky as a secretary or in some other capacity. Jacson creates that impression when he says in his "confession" that he was given to understand "that they expected from me something more than a simple militant of the party but he did not make anything precise to me."

But why should someone be sent to Mexico from Europe, necessitating a large amount of money for traveling expenses? Those who know of the dire poverty of the Fourth International know how tremendously difficult it was to raise money to send members of the American Trotskyist organization to act as Trotsky's guards or secretaries.

Highly improbable as Jacson's story appears in his "confession," it became utterly unbelievable when he attempted to give details both in his statements to the police and to the court and under cross-examination.

In his statements made subsequent to his "confession" he admitted that he was not a member of the organization, only a sympathizer. Would a mere sympathizer be sent to do important work for Trotsky, and even be furnished with expenses? Every one of the approximately twenty-five people who were sent by the organization to Mexico to serve Trotsky in one capacity or another at different times, were members of the organization, and many of them paid their own expenses.

Jacson claims that the person who sent him to Mexico was a member of the Bureau of the Fourth International. How does he know that? This person was introduced to him as a member of the bureau, so he says. He does not know this person's name and never knew his name.

Who were the persons who introduced this member of the Bureau to him? Let us assume even that they were members of the organization. But exceedingly few, if any, members of the organization know who the members of the Bureau

are—the Bureau being the highest body of the Fourth International.

Even if a member of the organization did know that a certain person was a member of the Bureau, he would never introduce him as such. If he could not introduce him by his right name, he would mention his assumed name. Every member of the organization has some name, even though it is only an assumed name.

It is utterly absurd to think that Jacson could have met this alleged member of the Bureau of the Fourth International 15 or 20 times, as he claims, without knowing him by some name. The truth is that he met no member of the Bureau of the Fourth International who proposed that he go to Mexico.

(It so happens that I was in France from May 19th to September 12th, 1939; most of the time I spent in Paris, and all of the time I was in intimate contact with every member of the Bureau of the Fourth International. *It is impossible that any member of the Bureau would have sent anyone to Trotsky as a translator or as a secretary without my knowledge.* As an attorney in the case, I did not want to testify to that fact, but the records of the *Socialist Appeal* and my own records, and the testimony of dozens of friends of mine can be produced to show that I was in France at the very time that Jacson claims he received a mission from a member of the Bureau of the Fourth International.)

Jacson's Expenses

Jacson's testimony on the question of how he got his expenses for the trip to Mexico can hardly be said to possess even slight plausibility.

In the first place, one should notice the sharp contradiction between his assertions with reference to that question contained in his "confession" and those he made in his subsequent statements. In the "confession" he says that the member of the Bureau supplied him "with all the means, expenses of the trip, papers, etc." In his subsequent statements he as-

serted that he received only \$200 from this alleged member of the Bureau.

Now it is obvious that \$200 could not defray all the expenses of the trip from Paris to Mexico. Especially is this true if one takes into consideration Jacson's claim that he was supposed to remain in Mexico quite a long time in order not to give the impression that he was anxious to meet Trotsky.

Jacson reached quite high in fantastic lying when he claimed that he did not even ask the member of the Bureau how much money would be required to go to Mexico—that such a matter was of no importance to him. To prove that, he said "I am not an American."

How did he get the money necessary for the trip? He simply wrote to his mother telling her about his proposed trip, and without even asking her, he immediately received a check for \$5,000; which he had no trouble whatever in cashing into American dollars. (He forgot that in a previous statement he said that he had asked for the money.)

Since, in his "confession," he claims to be completely devoted to the organization and ready to sacrifice "the last drop of blood" for his ideas, how does it happen that after receiving the \$5,000 from his mother, he did not offer to return the \$200 he received from the organization? But let us not expect too much consistency from a liar.

Jacson and His Passport

The only statement that Jacson made with reference to his passport which contains some plausibility is the one explaining why he had to get a false passport. Since he was supposed to be a Belgian, it would have been difficult for him to get passage from France on a Belgian passport, due to the fact that the Belgian army was being mobilized at that time. It may be, however, that he was unwilling to take a chance and try to get a passport under the name of Mornard. It might have been discovered that his name was actually not Mornard.

In his testimony he claims that the member of the Bureau

ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE

of the Fourth International furnished him with the passport. Sylvia Ageloff and her sister testified that he claimed to have bought the passport for \$3,500 from some passport service in France.

The cross-examination on the question of the passport left him helpless. Fearful lest anything he would state with reference to the passport might give him away, and not knowing that there was very important information in our possession about this passport, he made some of the most absurd statements.

He claimed that this passport was given to him complete, and that he did not have to do anything with reference to it, either before or after receiving it. He forgot that the least he would have had to do was to furnish a picture for the passport and to sign his name across the picture. As a matter of fact he had testified previously that he had given his picture to the alleged member of the Bureau.

Obviously, anyone receiving a false passport would be interested in memorizing its contents, so as to be prepared in case of any questions, but Jacson, determined to be absolutely safe, continued to assert that he never looked at the contents of the passport, and was not interested in them; that he did not know where Jacson was supposed to have been born, whether in Canada or anywhere else, and that all he did, whenever it was necessary for him to cross the border, was to take it out of his pocket, show it to the officials and take it back again.

Unfortunately for Jacson, he left certain records, by the aid of which the passport could be and was traced. While he was in Mexico in June 1940, he applied to the American Consulate for a transit visa to Montreal, Canada. Since he had a Canadian passport, he could not go back to the United States without a transit visa. It is because of this application that the following information was finally discovered with reference to the passport.

The passport which Jacson used was one issued by the Canadian government in March 1937, to Tony Babich, born

in Lovinac, Yugoslavia, and naturalized as a British subject in Canada. On May 12, 1939, the Franco government of Spain issued a death certificate for Babich.

The exceedingly valuable nature of this information, constituting as it does conclusive proof of Jacson's real connections, will be shown later.

Babich's passport was altered by the insertion of a photograph of Jacson.

Jacson, in his application at the American Consulate for a transit visa to Montreal, gave the date of his birth as June 13, 1905, and the place of birth as Lovinac, Yugoslavia. He certainly must have examined the passport at that time, if not at any other.

It is indeed fortunate for us that on the question of the passport we do not have to rely on the inherent incredibility of his story. We can show by the record of the American Consulate in Mexico that his testimony with reference to the passport is absolutely false.

How Was Jacson to Identify Himself?

Another strange aspect of Jacson's story, throwing additional doubt upon his veracity, is the fact that he received no letter of introduction with which to identify himself when he met Trotsky.

It is quite obvious that Jacson at the time he was in Paris had not yet met Trotsky. It is quite obvious, also, from his own testimony that the alleged member of the Bureau of the Fourth International, who proposed that Jacson go to meet Trotsky, knew that fact. If a stranger were to be sent to Trotsky it would be most natural that at least a letter of introduction would be given to him to be presented to Trotsky.

How would Trotsky, living under circumstances where he had to guard himself day and night, where he was compelled to transform his house into a veritable fortress, be expected to accept a total stranger merely on his word that he was sent by some member of the Bureau whose name this person did not even know? Jacson, however, expects us to be-

lieve that he was sent to Trotsky to serve him in some capacity without any letter of introduction, and what is more, without a letter being sent to Trotsky by this alleged member of the Bureau of the Fourth International to the effect that a certain person was coming to serve him.

Who, except those blinded by loyalty to Stalin or those anxious to defend the real murderers, could possibly believe this aspect of Jacson's story?

The testimony of the guards and secretaries who served Trotsky at the time of the attack, and the statements of everyone who was ever sent to Trotsky to serve him in some capacity, prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that before anyone was sent to Trotsky, a letter was forwarded to someone in the Trotsky household informing him that a certain person was being sent; stating who that person was, the date of his departure and his probable arrival. And in every case where the person sent was not known personally to some member of the Trotsky household, he was given a letter of introduction. To follow any other method would have been equivalent to furnishing those who were interested in the death of Trotsky easy access into his home.

Not only did Jacson not receive any letter of introduction; not only was no letter sent by this alleged member of the Bureau of the Fourth International or by anyone else to Trotsky telling him that a certain person was being sent to serve him—Jacson was stupid enough to claim that he never discussed this matter with the alleged member of the Bureau of the Fourth International, and was not interested in that aspect of the case.

Is it to be believed that a person with the intelligence that Jacson showed in preparing this murder should not ask for some letter or some note identifying him as the person being sent to Trotsky?

Jacson's Long Wait

One of the most fantastic as well as the most significant (its significance will be commented on later) sections of Jac-

son's story is that which attempts to explain the long period of time—nine months—which elapsed between his arrival in Mexico and his first visit to the Trotsky home. Indeed, only those people who believe anything and everything emanating from Moscow are capable of giving the slightest credence to this section of Jacson's story.

Jacson claims that his instructions were to wait in Mexico, not to appear too anxious to get in contact with Trotsky; to make his visit to Trotsky appear to be casual.

It is utterly and completely incomprehensible why a member of the Bureau of the Fourth International, sending someone to act in the capacity of secretary or translator to Trotsky (as Jacson claims) should instruct such a person to wait and make his entry into the Trotsky household appear most casual. What reason could there possibly be for a person who is going to serve Trotsky to do what Jacson claims he was instructed to do? Why should anyone, who has been sent to serve Trotsky in some capacity, wait any time whatever before he makes his appearance in the Trotsky household?

Trotsky's residence in Mexico was perfectly legal; everyone knew who he was and everyone could easily find out the location of his residence. Hundreds of people came to visit Trotsky in the three and a half years that he resided in Mexico. It is impossible, of course, to produce the testimony of all the people who visited him, but it can be taken absolutely for granted that not one person of all those who visited him had to wait any longer than it took to arrange the visit or the interview.

Furthermore the testimony of every one of the secretaries and guards serving Trotsky at the time Jacson attacked him was unanimous to the effect that the longest period that any one of them waited before coming to the Trotsky household was 12 hours.

There is no valid reason whatever that anyone can suggest why a person sent to serve Trotsky should not immediately upon his arrival in Mexico City go to see Trotsky.

Undoubtedly Jacson was instructed to wait; undoubtedly

he was instructed to make his contact with Trotsky appear to be most casual; but as will be seen later, it could not possibly have been a member of the Bureau of the Fourth International who gave him those instructions.

Jacson's explanation for the long period of time that elapsed between his arrival in Mexico and his contact with the Trotsky household must be completely rejected as false from beginning to end.

Pretends to Be in Business

In addition to waiting, Jacson pretended to be occupied in some business. He told everyone he met that he was working for some broker who was purchasing material for France and England. It is very interesting that Jacson pretended to be in this particular kind of business, which to a large extent prevented people from asking him too many questions, for the simple reason that they would expect that he could not reveal all the details about the nature of his work. The fact is that Sylvia Ageloff, his most intimate friend, and many others were prevented from prying into his personal affairs too deeply because they thought the nature of his work was such that he could not answer all questions.

But here we must notice that in his "confession" he did not mention anything to the effect that, among the instructions given to him by the member of the Bureau, was one that he should pretend to be in business. All that he said in his "confession" was that he was instructed to "remain some distance from the house in Coyoacan in order to call no attention upon me."

The mystery then becomes more mysterious. A person allegedly sent to Trotsky not only has to wait for a period of nine months before meeting Trotsky, but during that interval of time must pretend to be engaged in some secret business.

It can readily be seen that Jacson had to pretend to be in some business or other; otherwise the people with whom he was associating would question the source of his income. By this method, he could explain his standard of living, which

was quite high. To some people he stated that he was receiving \$250 a month; to others \$400 a month. His claim to being engaged in the business of selling materials to the Allies also gave him an excellent opportunity to explain his traveling from one country to another.

The evidence shows that at no time did Jacson tell any of Trotsky's friends that he was sent by an alleged member of the Bureau to serve Trotsky in some capacity.

Let us assume for a moment the truth of Jacson's claim that this alleged member instructed him not to say anything about his mission to meet Trotsky. What reason, then, could there possibly be for keeping this fact secret *after* he met Trotsky?

Again, if he was told to pretend to be in business before he met Trotsky, why should he have continued this pretense *after* he met Trotsky?

Again, if we are to accept his claim that he was sent to Trotsky to be a secretary or translator, why did he not become a secretary or translator, after he met Trotsky?

On the basis of his own testimony, he said not one word to anyone including Trotsky about the fact that he had been sent to Mexico to become a secretary or translator. He kept silent about his alleged mission to Mexico; he continued to pretend to be in business until the very moment of the attack, and only after the attack and after his arrest did he come out with this story about his mission to Mexico and the instructions from an alleged member of the Bureau of the Fourth International.

Who, except the blind followers of Stalin; who except the scoundrels trying to cover up the real murderers, could possibly believe this impossible and utterly incredible story of Jacson?

Jacson's Motives

Let us now proceed to consider the reasons advanced by Jacson for killing Trotsky. Up to now we have analyzed Jacson's claims with reference to objective factors—what he

claimed he did, what he claimed he said; but now we must consider subjective factors: his motives and his intentions.

In determining a person's motives, it is impossible, of course, to penetrate into his mind and lay them bare. Whether or not we believe a person when he says that he was motivated by certain considerations in committing a certain crime depends upon the facts and circumstances surrounding the crime. Even though we are unable to penetrate into his mind, we can find out what he said and did before the crime and whether his statements and acts before the crime are consistent with the motives that he claims he had in committing the crime.

Thus far we have proved to the hilt that every major aspect of Jacson's story, insofar as it pertains to things he claims to have done and statements that he claims to have made, are absolutely incredible. Upon analysis the same will be found true with reference to his motives. Here, too, as in all other aspects of his story, there are fundamental contradictions between what he claims in his "confession" and the assertions that he made in his subsequent statements.

What reasons does he give in his "confession" for killing Trotsky? He says he was "disillusioned" with Trotsky, "who desired nothing more than to satisfy his needs and desires of vengeance and hate, and who did not utilize the workers' struggle for anything more than a means of hiding his own paltriness and despicable calculations."

According to his "confession," one day Trotsky proposed to him that he "go to Russia in order to organize there a series of attempts against different persons and in the first place against Stalin." At this point his "disillusionment" reached a stage of desperation. To quote his own words, "This for me was the drop of water which filled the glass too full." While he does not say so specifically in his "confession," the inference is clear that he decided to kill Trotsky in order to remove "the bloody enemy of the working class." Speaking of the effect which his deed might have upon Sylvia Ageloff, he says, "It is probable that after my act she may not wish to

ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE

know me any more. Nevertheless, it was also for her sake that I decided to sacrifice myself entirely, removing the chief of the workers' movement who did not do more than prejudice it, and I am sure that later not only the party but also the entire history will know how to see me in the right light, when they see that the bloody enemy of the working class is gone."

His subsequent statements do not at all harmonize with the statements he made in this "confession." For instance, under cross-examination he denied that Trotsky proposed that he go and assassinate leaders of the Soviet Union and Stalin in particular, whereas in the "confession" he makes that claim in so many words.

Under cross-examination he insisted that it was Trotsky's proposal that he commit acts of sabotage in the Soviet Union which "disillusioned" him. He does not mention anything about sabotage in his "confession"; there it was Trotsky's "egotism and his hate and desire for vengeance" that caused him to be disillusioned.

In the statements made subsequent to his arrest, he did not say that he killed Trotsky in order to remove "the bloody enemy of the working class," but asserted he murdered him because—"Trotsky shattered my life; it was Trotsky who destroyed my nature, my future and all my affections, who converted me into a man without name or country, into an instrument of Trotsky; I was in a blind alley and then I thought I would kill him and commit suicide."

But let us not at this time consider the contradictions; let us confine ourselves simply to the statements in his "confession," which give the reason for his "disillusionment."

In the first place, was his conduct after he claimed he had been "disillusioned" such as we would expect from a disillusioned person? Secondly, can any credence be given to the reasons that he advances for his "disillusionment"?

One is immediately struck by the obvious fact that none of Trotsky's intimate friends—his guards, his secretaries and his numerous followers who visited him and discussed many questions with him—was ever disillusioned. It is true that

ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE

many political opponents of Trotsky interviewed him and were not convinced by his arguments, but not one of these political opponents has ever claimed to be disillusioned in Trotsky. On the contrary, everyone who discussed political, social and economic questions with Trotsky, friend or opponent, testifies to his tremendous intellectual ability and to his selfless devotion to his ideas.

Of all the people who ever met Trotsky and discussed these subjects with him, Jacson, an obscure and unknown figure, was the only one to have become disillusioned. His claim to that effect is in and of itself highly improbable, and when taken in connection with his subsequent conduct and the reasons which he gives for his alleged disillusionment, it becomes absolutely preposterous.

Nor does disillusionment lead one to commit murder, unless insanity develops as a result of this disillusionment. Jacson's whole course of conduct, every step that he took leading to the murder, everything that he said or did before and after the murder, denies the possibility of insanity.

I was careful to ask him the question whether, during all the time preceding the murder, he considered himself a Marxist and interested in the welfare of the working class. He answered emphatically in the affirmative; in fact, he still claims to be a Marxist.

Now, obviously, a person who considers himself a Marxist and devoted to the interests of the workers, would certainly do one thing, if he should find that a man like Trotsky is not in reality what he pretends to be. He would immediately inform not only his intimate friends but everyone whom he could possibly get hold of, of his disillusionment. Would not a Marxist, devoted to the interests of the working class, proclaim to the world the facts upon which he based his disillusionment? Would he not attempt to expose a person like Trotsky, if he discovered him to be an egotist, a hypocrite and a rascal?

But Jacson never told anybody, including his most intimate friend, Sylvia Ageloff, that he was disillusioned. On

the contrary, his praise and admiration for Trotsky were loudly proclaimed to anyone who was ready to listen. He kept his "disillusionment" to himself and it was found out only after the attack. This fact, in itself, stamps his story about his alleged disillusionment as completely false.

Conversations with Trotsky

Everyone including Jacson agrees that Trotsky was no ordinary personality. To meet Trotsky and to converse with him was not considered as something in the ordinary run of things. There are people who would have given much for such a privilege. There is probably not a single person who met Trotsky as recently as a year or two ago, who could not remember at least the subject, or subjects of the conversation. Most people who have talked with him can repeat many remarks he made during the conversation.

But Jacson claims that he does not remember the subject of his first conversation with Trotsky or the subject of any conversation he had with him.

I examined him carefully on the nature of the conversations that he claimed he had with Trotsky. His answer to almost every question was: "I don't remember," "I don't know."

Jacson could not remember the subjects of the conversations but only the "results." And the only result that he remembered was his "disillusionment." For a moment it looked as if he did not even remember the subject of a single conversation with Trotsky, but finally he caught himself and said that he remembered the conversation when Trotsky was supposed to have told him to go to Russia and commit acts of sabotage in the Soviet Union.

Every lawyer who has had any experience in trying cases knows how conclusively a witness proves himself to be a liar when he claims that he does not remember anything except the result of a conversation. By repeating the one answer, "I don't remember" or "I don't know" Jacson proved that he was not even a clever liar. Obviously he could have given the subjects of the conversations in a general way, but he was so

ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE

afraid that his answers would contradict his previous statements that he took refuge in the one formula—"I don't remember."

The record kept by Trotsky's guards of the names of everyone who came into the house and of the time of their entry and departure, gives us a clue as to how many times Jacson could possibly have seen Trotsky alone in his study.

This record shows that the first time Jacson entered the yard of the Trotsky house was on Tuesday, May 28th, at 7:58 A.M., the day he came to take the Rosmers to Vera Cruz. The record does not show the time of departure of the group that left for Vera Cruz. The testimony of the people who were there indicates that Jacson came in, was introduced to Trotsky, had a cup of coffee with those who were breakfasting, and left for Vera Cruz with the Rosmers, Natalia Trotsky and a girl-secretary. He was in the yard and in the house at most 45 minutes. He had no chance whatever at that time to talk alone with Trotsky.

On Thursday, May 30th, Jacson brought Natalia Trotsky and the secretary back from Vera Cruz. He entered at 3.42 P.M. and the record shows that the girl-secretary and Jacson left at 4:12 P.M. While it would have been possible for Jacson to talk with Trotsky alone at that time, there is evidence that at this particular time Jacson did not see Trotsky, who was resting in his room.

According to the record, Jacson visited the Trotsky home for the third time on Tuesday, June 4th, coming in at 2:31 P.M. and leaving at 2:55 P.M. It was Trotsky's habit to rest after the noon meal until about 3:30 P.M., when he would come out in the yard and spend an hour or so in feeding the rabbits and chickens. This constituted his daily exercise. It is highly improbable that Jacson saw Trotsky on June 4th.

On Wednesday, June 12th, Jacson came in at 10:35 and left at 10:40 in the morning, hardly enough time for him to see Trotsky alone.

On Monday, July 29th, he came in at 2:40 P.M. and left at 3:50 P.M. Jacson could have seen Trotsky in the yard, but

unless Trotsky changed his regular habits, could not have seen him alone in his study.

On Wednesday, July 31st, Jacson came in at 7:05 P.M. and left at 7:10 P.M.

On Thursday, August 8th, Jacson came in at 5:55 P.M. and left at 6:40 P.M. He could have seen Trotsky alone at that time.

On Saturday, August 10th, Jacson came in at 3:25 P.M. and left at 4:02 P.M. Unless Trotsky broke his customary routine, he could not have seen him alone in his study.

On Saturday, August 17th, Jacson came in at 4:35 P.M. and left at 4:46 P.M. He could have seen Trotsky alone for a few minutes on that day.

On the day of the attack, Tuesday, August 20th, he came in at 5:30 P.M.

The entries in the book bear out the testimony of Natalia Trotsky and the members of the household, to the effect that Jacson could have seen Trotsky alone in his study at the very most three times—on August 8th, August 17th and August 20th, the day of the attack.

In all probability, according to the testimony of the guards, the secretaries and Natalia Trotsky, he did not see Trotsky alone at any one time more than five minutes and altogether not more than 20 minutes.

A very short time indeed for Trotsky to confide matters of the most intimate nature, from which Jacson could draw the conclusion that he was nothing but an egotist! A very short time indeed, even if we assume that Jacson saw Trotsky alone for as much as an hour instead of 20 minutes, for Trotsky to propose such tremendously important tasks as committing acts of sabotage in the Soviet Union and the assassination of its principal leaders.

Murder and Sabotage

Can we give the slightest credence to Jacson's claim that Trotsky made either the proposal that he assassinate the lead-

ers of the Soviet Union or commit acts of sabotage in that country?

This is not the first time that such accusations have been made against Trotsky. In the Moscow Trials, almost every defendant and every witness made identical accusations. Here I shall not discuss the significance of the fact that Jacson made these accusations in his "confession," but simply whether or not they contain a single grain of truth.

As is well known, a Commission of Inquiry headed by John Dewey, the famous philosopher, undertook to investigate all of the charges made against Trotsky by the various defendants in the Moscow Trials. The Report of the Commission was printed in a thick volume entitled "Not Guilty," published by Harper & Brothers. One chapter of that report is devoted to the accusation of terrorism and another deals with the charge of sabotage.

The section of the Report dealing with terrorism shows that, during his whole career as a Marxist, Trotsky was in the forefront of all those who struggled against the use of individual terror as a weapon on behalf of the working class. In Russia, under the Czar, the Social Revolutionary Party openly advocated terrorism as a means of struggle against Czarist oppression. Lenin, Trotsky and other Marxists never for a moment ceased to struggle against that idea—not because the Marxists were sensitive about taking the lives of individual oppressors, but because they considered the utilization of individual terror as a disorganizing force in the ranks of the working masses. In general the argument against terrorism amounted to this: if a knife or a bomb or a revolver could displace the class struggle, what use was there to attempt to organize and educate the working masses for the purpose of launching a united struggle against capitalism? Individual terrorism could serve only to foster the idea among the masses that not their own organized efforts but the act of some bold individual would be the means of their liberation. This was contrary to every principle of Marxism.

When Kirov, one of the bureaucratic leaders closely as-

sociated with Stalin, was assassinated in December 1934, Trotsky wrote a pamphlet analyzing the significance of that incident, and warning the Soviet revolutionary youth against the use of individual terror in the struggle against the Stalinist bureaucracy. The Stalinist press, and Vyshinsky, the prosecutor of the Moscow Trials, attempted to tear sentences and phrases out of their context for the purpose of showing that Trotsky actually advocated terrorism. But it is necessary only to read the pamphlet in order to show that Vyshinsky and the Stalinist press were guilty of their usual falsifications.

The Dewey Commission investigated this question of terrorism very thoroughly, both from the point of view of Trotsky's beliefs, and from the point of view of the testimony of the defendants and witnesses at the Moscow Trials. On page 256 of the Report, the Commission says: "*We therefore find that apart from the evidence in our possession which disproves the testimony connecting Leon Trotsky with the alleged terrorist conspiracy, the charge of individual terrorism is not only not proved, but incredible.*"

In a separate chapter, the Commission dealt exhaustively with the charge of sabotage. It analyzed the contradictory testimony of the witnesses with reference to that charge. Trotsky's articles with reference to the building up of industry in the Soviet Union were cited. It was shown that Trotsky was the first to emphasize the necessity of building up industry in the Soviet Union and that Stalin and the group around him derisively referred to Trotsky as the "super-industrialist."

After Trotsky was expelled from the party and exiled, Stalin launched the five year plan, making it clear to everyone that Trotsky, in his insistence upon industrialization, had been correct. But the methods which Stalin followed in industrializing the Soviet Union drew the severest criticism from Trotsky, who showed that these bureaucratic methods failed to take into consideration the needs and wants of the masses, and failed to involve the masses in a democratic manner in the fulfillment of the plans. Trotsky insisted that the method of setting high quotas and driving everybody to attain those

quotas regardless of consequences would end disastrously. And once more Trotsky proved to be correct.

Because of the possibilities of planned economy the industrialization of the Soviet Union proceeded at a tremendous pace, but the losses due to the bureaucratic methods pursued by the Stalinist clique were tremendous. The policy of forced collectivization pursued by Stalin brought the Soviet Union to the verge of actual famine. Millions and millions of peasants driven by force into the collective farms simply killed their cattle and horses. Conditions became so bad that Stalin had to retreat. The idea of blaming his failures upon alleged sabotage by alleged Trotskyists was one of the principal motives for the staging of the Moscow Trials.

The Dewey Commission obtained testimony of engineers who actually worked in the Soviet Union and this testimony proved conclusively that it was not sabotage but the bureaucratic methods that caused so much confusion, resulting in tremendous break-downs and losses in industry. The Commission concluded with the following verdict:

"In view of all these considerations and of the evidence cited, we find that the charge of conspiracy to sabotage Soviet economy, especially as it concerns Leon Trotsky and Leon Sedov, stands not only not proved, but not credible." (Page 287).

Basing ourselves solely on the findings of the Dewey Commission of Inquiry, we would be justified in dismissing Jacson's accusation that Trotsky proposed that he go to the Soviet Union to attempt the assassination of leaders of that country and to sabotage Soviet industry, as absolutely without foundation.

But we do not have to depend simply upon the report of the Commission. Logic, reason and common sense dictate the conclusion that Jacson is lying from beginning to end, when he claims that Trotsky made these proposals to him. Suspicion as to Jacson's veracity immediately arises from his failure to give any details whatever with reference to these alleged proposals of Trotsky. I asked him if Trotsky gave him

any detailed instructions for committing sabotage or for committing murder. He answered in the negative. Did he discuss with Trotsky the question of the method of his entry into the Soviet Union? The answer was also in the negative. (Here it must be noted that in one of his statements to the police he had made some fantastic remarks about Trotsky telling him to meet some people in Shanghai and from there to go to Manchukuo and then into the Soviet Union, but he forgot that statement when I cross-examined him.) I asked him whether Trotsky discussed with him any aspect whatever of the alleged proposals. And finally, in exasperation, he said: "Trotsky simply told me to go to the Soviet Union and commit acts of sabotage and nothing more; he gave no details."

It is possible to believe such nonsense?

Very significant is the fact that during the whole period of Jacson's acquaintance with Trotsky, the question of the defense of the Soviet Union was constantly being discussed, not only in the Socialist Workers Party in the United States, but also in every section of the Fourth International, and amongst the members of the Trotsky household. Trotsky wrote most of the articles on behalf of the Majority which insisted upon defending the Soviet Union during the Soviet-Finnish war. Can anyone with the slightest intelligence and with a capacity to think independently of Moscow, believe that at the very time when Trotsky was waging a vigorous campaign on behalf of the defense of the Soviet Union against dissident members of his own organization, he would be proposing to Jacson that he go and commit acts of sabotage within the Soviet Union? Preposterous is hardly the word for it, unless one accepts the fantastic theory that a man is capable of working for one cause for 23 hours and 55 minutes of the day and spending the other five minutes in advocating something directly contrary to that cause!

In his speech before the Dewey Commission of Inquiry, Trotsky has a section which he calls, "Theory of Camouflage," a section that completely annihilates the contention of the Stalinists that whatever Trotsky wrote on behalf of the social-

ist revolution and in defense of the Soviet Union was simply to cover up his real designs. (See, "The Case of Leon Trotsky," Page 577, published by Harpers.)

Consider the following: Trotsky, a revolutionist with 40 years of experience, has, according to the press bought and paid for by Stalin's GPU, been instructing his followers since 1931 to commit murder and sabotage in the Soviet Union. And these followers were men of no ordinary abilities. Men like Bukharin, Radek, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Pyatakov, Rakovsky, Smyrnov, and dozens of others who played tremendously important roles in the Russian Revolution, who were experienced in underground work in Russia under the Czar and in capitalist countries all over the world, were the ones who were supposed to have been following Trotsky's instructions. These men failed in their alleged designs. They were all brought to trial and they all "confessed" and were executed.

And now we are asked to believe that Trotsky, experienced revolutionist and conspirator, after the failure of his most capable followers, proposed that a man like Jacson go to the Soviet Union and try to do what these men were unable to do.

And who is Jacson? A complete stranger to Trotsky. A man who came from France without any credentials. A man who had no experience as an organizer and was not even a member of the Fourth International. A man who spoke no Russian, and who talked with Trotsky at most for one hour.

Can anything be more preposterous!

Subject of Conversations Between Jacson and Trotsky

There is ample evidence to prove the contention that in the total of 20 minutes or so that Jacson conversed with Trotsky without anyone else being present, the subject of the conversations dealt with the political question that divided the American section of the Fourth International. Several mem-

bers of the Trotsky household remember distinctly that Trotsky told them that he discussed this question with Jacson.

The fact that Jacson claimed to be a strong defender of the Majority position is in itself highly significant. As I explained before, the Majority of the American party, led by Trotsky, took the position in favor of defending the Soviet Union in the Soviet-Finnish war. Jacson's most intimate friend, Sylvia Ageloff, supported the ideas of the Minority. The struggle between the Majority and Minority became so bitter that it eventually led to a split.

Jacson was not a member of the party, but he was considered a sympathizer, so he could participate in the political discussion going on. He was very careful to tell almost every one of the Trotsky household that he was constantly arguing with Sylvia, trying to win her over to the viewpoint of the Majority. Sylvia Ageloff emphatically denies this, and insists that Jacson never discussed that question with her.

Because Jacson did not show signs of great political understanding, Trotsky, on several occasions, asked some of the members of his household to talk with and explain to Jacson the nature and significance of the political question involved, so that he would be thoroughly convinced of the correctness of the Majority position. Trotsky himself was willing to spend a few minutes with Jacson for that purpose.

In corroboration of the conclusion that the subject of the two or three conversations between Trotsky and Jacson dealt with the political struggle between the Majority and Minority in the American party, is the fact that the article which Jacson brought with him on the day of the attack is one dealing with that very question, and was entitled, "The Third Camp and the Popular Front." The "Third Camp" was a slogan which the Minority advanced during the fight in the American party, meaning to indicate thereby that as against the Hitler-Stalin camp, and the French-British camp, there should be a third camp—the camp of the working class and colonial peoples. The Majority rejected the slogan, deeming it to be incorrect, because it considered the Soviet Union as a workers'

state, and therefore, regardless and in spite of Stalin, belonging to the camp of the revolutionary working class.

The article brought by Jacson for the purpose of inducing Trotsky to read it so that he would have an opportunity to strike the fatal blow, did not in reality contain any of Jacson's ideas. They were the ideas of one of the secretaries of Trotsky, who had spoken about this very matter in the presence of Jacson, who utilized those ideas to write the article (the text of which shows no sign that he understood these ideas very well).

From Jacson's own testimony and from all other evidence available, the conclusion is inescapable: Jacson's claim that Trotsky spoke to him about the necessity of sabotaging Soviet industry and assassinating the principal leaders of the Soviet Union, does not contain a particle of truth.

Date of the "Confession"

It is worth noting that whereas the body of the "confession" is typed, the date as well as the signature are in pencil at the bottom of the letter. In his testimony Jacson claimed that he typed the letter on the afternoon of the day of the crime. What was the reason, if that is so, for failing to type in the date in the usual manner, at the very top of the letter?

Obviously, the letter was prepared beforehand with the object of putting in the date on the very day it would become possible to commit the murder.

Contradictions in Jacson's Testimony

Jacson's "confession" is the document which he prepared for the purpose of explaining the murder. It was the only document found on his person at the time that he was apprehended. He specifically asked that it should be published in case anything happened to him.

It would stand to reason that, if he were telling the truth, every assertion made in that "confession" would have impressed itself so indelibly upon his memory that it would have been impossible for him to forget a single statement. For we must assume, if he is telling the truth, that he pondered over

this matter very carefully, considering it from every angle, and finally coming to the conclusion that it was necessary to take Trotsky's life.

But lo and behold! Instead of remembering every major assertion in that "confession," as would be expected if he were telling the truth, and sticking to these assertions through thick and thin, his subsequent statements show serious contradictions with the statements made in his "confession," indicating that he failed to memorize the contents of the "confession."

That fact is conclusive evidence that the "confession" is a tissue of falsifications.

It is highly significant that upon cross-examination he refused to answer many questions on the ground that they were asked for the purpose of making him contradict himself, and Judge Trujillo very wisely remarked that if he were telling the truth, he should not be afraid of contradicting himself. No one forgets the contents of a letter (provided those contents contain the truth) written under the circumstances that Jacson wrote this letter.

The following are the contradictions between the "confession" and Jacson's subsequent statements, indicating that the contents of the "confession" are false and that he did not memorize them very carefully:

1. In his "confession" he states that he was won over to Trotskyism through contact with youth of his age at the Sorbonne University. (We shall omit here comment on the fact that in 1938, when he claims to have accepted Trotskyism, he was already 34 years old and could hardly be considered a "youth.") In his subsequent statements, he asserted that it was Sylvia Ageloff who won him over to Trotskyism.

2. In his "confession" he states that after he met the Trotskyists, he was "convinced of the justice of their ideology, and wholeheartedly I joined their organization." In his subsequent statements he admitted that he never had joined the organization, but was simply a sympathizer.

3. In the "confession" he states that the member of the Bureau of the Fourth International who proposed that he

make the trip to Mexico, supplied him "with all the means, expenses of the trip, papers, etc." In his later statements he said that this member gave him only \$200 and that his mother gave him \$5,000.

4. The clear inference of the "confession" is that he was disillusioned with Trotsky even before Trotsky made the proposal to him to go to Russia for the purpose of assassinating Stalin. Under cross-examination he stated that he was disillusioned after Trotsky made him the proposal to go to the Soviet Union and commit acts of sabotage.

5. In his "confession" he states clearly that Trotsky "proposed to me that I go to Russia in order to organize there a series of attempts against different persons, and in the first place against Stalin." In his subsequent testimony he denied that any such proposal was made to him by Trotsky but insisted that the proposal was that he commit acts of sabotage. Nothing is mentioned in the "confession" concerning sabotage.

6. In the "confession" he indicates that the reason for the murder was to remove the chief of the workers' movement who "did not do more than prejudice it," and who "was nothing but the bloody enemy of the working class." According to the "confession" he decided to sacrifice himself completely for that noble purpose. In one of his subsequent statements, however, he asserted that he had decided to kill Trotsky because Trotsky had "crushed" him; because "it was Trotsky who destroyed my nature, my future, and all my affections. He converted me into a man without a name, without country, into an instrument of Trotsky. I was in a blind alley and then I thought I would kill him and commit suicide."

These contradictions indicate not only that Jacson had forgotten the contents of the "confession" but also that neither he nor his immediate superiors who organized the crime thought of the possibility of his being apprehended. Evidently it was expected that Jacson would succeed in escaping or would be killed. Jacson himself says that he had high hopes of escaping. His reason for the use of the pick-axe was to kill Trotsky with one blow, hoping then to be able to leave the

ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE

house before the crime was discovered. Contrary to his usual custom, he had parked his automobile so that it faced in the direction of the city. He also admitted having a substantial sum of money on his person. All this indicates that he had great hopes of escaping.

And if he did not escape, the "confession" in the form of the letter found on his person, clearly indicates that it was prepared for the eventuality of his being killed.

Obviously the possibility of being caught and compelled to undergo an examination did not enter his mind, nor the minds of the people behind him. Consequently the necessity for memorizing the contents of the letter so well that he would not forget them was completely overlooked.

It may be that Jacson's immediate superiors had instructed or expected him to commit suicide if there was any danger of his being apprehended. Jacson's failure, for one reason or another, to fulfill this instruction was indeed fortunate for us, because it enabled us to produce additional proof, through the statements he made contradicting the "confession," that every major assertion in his "confession" is utterly and completely false.

Political Explanation of the Murder

Our analysis of all the evidence leads to the conclusion: Jacson lies from beginning to end.

But we have not as yet explained the murder. By proving that the reasons advanced by Jacson for committing the murder cannot possibly be the true reasons, we have not yet solved the problem.

Why did Jacson commit the murder? Did he have any superiors guiding him in his plans and actions? If so, who are they?

To explain the murder we must turn our attention away from the obscure figure who wielded the pick-axe, whose name and origin are not known, and turn to one of the most significant political struggles of the century and to the sinister figure, the modern Genghis-Khan, the leader of the bureaucratic caste that for the present controls the destiny of the Soviet Union.

Let us assume that by chance Jacson had succeeded in escaping after having committed the murder. Let us even assume that the murder would have been committed in such a way that no one knew who the murderer was. The question of the real responsibility for the murder, even under these assumed circumstances, would not be difficult to answer, especially for those who have followed the struggle that Trotsky has been waging for many years against the usurper now ruling behind the walls of the Kremlin.

No evidence other than the murder itself would be necessary for people with political knowledge and understanding to conclude that STALIN is responsible for the murder.

The political struggle between Trotsky and Stalin has been going on for over sixteen years. From the very beginning of the struggle, Stalin depended upon distortion, falsehood and slander. As the struggle developed and became ever sharper, Stalin showed that he would stop at nothing. Everyone

took it for granted that Trotsky had to surround himself with guards in order to seek protection against attempts by agents of Stalin to assassinate him.

It is only necessary to place the actual record of the struggle between Stalin and Trotsky before every intelligent individual not taking his beliefs from Moscow, to convince him that Stalin alone is responsible for the murder of Trotsky. To study the actual record of the methods used by Stalin in his fight against Trotsky is to convince oneself that no one could have consummated this murder except at the instigation and under the direction of Stalin who, of course, acted through the organization by which he wields his power in the Soviet Union and throughout the world—the organization commonly known as the GPU—the secret police of the Soviet Union.

Even prior to Lenin's death and while Lenin was ill, Trotsky had already begun a struggle against the bureaucracy which under the leadership of Stalin was becoming more and more powerful. He waged a fight for democracy within the party. He struggled against every tendency toward the creation of a bureaucratic clique which would constantly limit the rights of the masses.

Immediately after Lenin's death, that struggle became more acute, and in its course Stalin and his friends did not hesitate to revise and falsify the role that Trotsky played in the Russian Revolution. It was the first step taken by Stalin in the struggle against Trotsky, a step which led inevitably to hundreds of frame-ups, to the murder of thousands and thousands of Trotsky's followers, and finally to the murder of Trotsky himself.

All of the differences between Trotsky and Lenin prior to the Russian Revolution were dug up, exaggerated, taken out of context, for the purpose of turning the members of the party and the Russian masses in general against Trotsky. The close association between Lenin and Trotsky ever since the Russian Revolution, the role that Trotsky played as organizer of the Red Army, everything was distorted and falsified.

What Stalin Represents

It was at that time that Stalin, representing the interests of the bureaucratic clique, a clique that was satisfied with things as they were in Russia, a clique that was no longer interested in the Socialist revolution outside of the boundaries of Russia, propounded his "theory" of socialism in one country. The theoretical struggle waged by Trotsky against that theory was a fierce one, because Trotsky saw in that system of ideas the inevitable degeneration and ultimate destruction of the Soviet Union. To Trotsky the world was a unit, inextricably bound together by economic ties created throughout the whole history of capitalism. To him, socialism was a product of the highest forces developed under capitalism, and it was inconceivable that a backward and *isolated* country could achieve socialism, which to him meant a stage of society where the productive forces would be developed to a higher degree than they had ever reached under capitalism, and where the masses would have a higher standard of living than the best they enjoyed under capitalism.

Social, economic and political conditions throughout the world enabled the Stalinist bureaucracy to consolidate its power and defeat the advanced section of the working class represented by Trotsky. The methods which Stalin used in the struggle against Trotsky became more reprehensible as the struggle became more bitter. It was in 1927 that Stalin spread the accusation that the Left Opposition led by Trotsky was plotting an armed insurrection against the Soviet State. This criminal falsehood was easily disproved, and it was found that this accusation could be made only because the GPU had sent one of its own agents into the ranks of the Left Opposition to act as a provocateur.

In the early part of 1928 Stalin exiled Trotsky to Alma Ata, in a far-off corner of the Soviet Union. But even while in exile, Trotsky kept in contact with the thousands of his followers in the Soviet Union, followers who were exiled to Siberia and treated in the cruelest fashion, in many cases suffering death. Not satisfied with having Trotsky remain in

exile within the confines of the Soviet Union, Stalin in January 1929, ordered his exile to Turkey. Undoubtedly Stalin must consider this one of the greatest blunders of his career—for by exiling Trotsky, he permitted him to write and work as he pleased for a period of eleven years. But we must not forget that at that time Stalin was still not in a position to silence Trotsky. It required years of counter-revolutionary work before Stalin felt safe to murder the men who were responsible for organizing and leading the Russian Revolution.

The attacks against Trotsky continued; the Communist International, having been transformed from an instrument of the social revolution throughout the world into a servile tool of Stalinism, was the vehicle through which Stalin carried out his attacks against Trotsky outside of the Soviet Union. Trotsky was accused of being in the pay of those imperialists who at the given moment did not happen to be on more or less friendly terms with Stalin.

As the situation in the Soviet Union grew worse, and as the possibilities for an uprising of the Russian masses became greater, Stalin had recourse to more desperate methods. When Kirov, one of his henchmen, was assassinated in December 1934, he utilized this as a pretext for the beginning of a ferocious attack against every one of the old leaders connected with the revolution. He was determined to get rid of everyone who could possibly furnish leadership to the masses when and if they should rise in opposition to Stalin.

The Moscow Trials

The infamous Moscow Trials were organized; men who had devoted all their lives to the cause of furthering the interests of the Socialist revolution were compelled to stand up in a courtroom and "confess" to the most fantastic falsehoods. Broken morally and physically, they assumed responsibility for acts that they could not possibly have carried out, for plots which they could not possibly have organized—all in order to save the lives of their loved ones and, either through

POLITICAL EXPLANATION

death or imprisonment, escape the tortures suffered at the hands of the GPU.

Throughout these trials Trotsky was declared to be the source of all these alleged plots, the organizer of all the alleged acts of sabotage and terrorism.

Why were these trials held? Why were these frame-ups necessary for Stalin? Three main reasons explain the staging of the trials. 1. To shift responsibility for the chaotic conditions in industry away from Stalin to alleged Trotskyist saboteurs. 2. To remove every individual who could possibly head an opposition. 3. To discredit Trotsky, the one man who was not in Stalin's clutches.

Trotsky was accused of being in league with Hitler. At that time Stalin was still pursuing a policy of attempting to form an alliance with "democratic" French and British imperialism. Hitler was then intransigent and spoke openly of his desire to seize the Ukraine. As was indicated above, Trotsky was always accused by the Stalinist press of being in league with that section of the imperialists which happened to be most hostile to Stalin. Prior to being thus linked with Hitler, Trotsky was accused of serving the interests of French imperialism.

The defendants in the Moscow Trials were not of course the only ones killed by Stalin. They were the ones who consented to assume roles assigned to them by the GPU. Not one of them was a real oppositionist, a member of the Left Opposition led by Trotsky. The real oppositionists remained steadfast in their loyalty to their ideas and refused to "confess" to anything of which they were not guilty. For every one who "confessed," there were hundreds of those who refused to bow to Stalin's dictates and they were murdered without any pretense of trial.

But Stalin could not be satisfied. For the man whom Stalin feared and hated most remained alive, the man whose powerful mind and pen were constantly delivering blows at Stalin in the form of books and articles read by hundreds of

POLITICAL EXPLANATION

thousands of people throughout the world, could not be placed on trial before a GPU court in the Soviet Union.

Due mainly to Trotsky's exposures, the Moscow Trials themselves came to be accepted as frame-ups by world public opinion. They failed miserably in their main objective—to discredit Trotsky. They succeeded only in discrediting their author.

After the Moscow Trials it was inevitable that Stalin should make a desperate effort to kill Trotsky.

Trotsky's son, Serge, who had remained in the Soviet Union when his father was exiled, was arrested during the Moscow Trials, although he had never participated in any political activities and for that reason thought he was safe in the Soviet Union. He was accused of the preposterous crime of spreading disease germs among the workers in his factory. No word has come from him and it must be assumed that he was murdered by the GPU.

Trotsky's second son died in a hospital in Paris in 1938, under circumstances which justify the belief that he was poisoned by Stalin's agents.

One result of the Moscow Trials was the expulsion of Trotsky from Norway. The Norwegian Social-Democratic government which had given him asylum in 1935 weakened under Moscow pressure, and had it not been for the Cardenas government of Mexico, the chances are that Trotsky would have fallen into Stalin's clutches then. When President Cardenas permitted Trotsky to enter Mexico, he struck a real blow at Stalin, for Trotsky was able to continue exposing the brutal dictatorship for which Stalin stood.

Stalin's Mexican Campaign

Stalin, however, is not the type of man who admits defeat. The distance between Mexico and Moscow was not so great that he could not continue to harass Trotsky. The Communist International was at Stalin's disposal and it became the duty of the Communist Party of Mexico as well as that of the United States to continue the attack on Trotsky in every way

POLITICAL EXPLANATION

possible. All the filth and all the slanders of Moscow found their way into the Mexican and American Stalinist press.

The GPU paid special attention to the Mexican labor movement. It succeeded in winning over to its side figures playing important roles in that movement, chief of whom was Lombardo Toledano, a lawyer who won the leadership of the Mexican Confederation of Labor. After Toledano paid a visit to Moscow, it was noticeable that he followed the Stalinist line in every particular, especially in his attacks on Trotsky.

Stalin's determination to get rid of Trotsky must have increased ten-fold after his pact with Hitler and after war was declared. Had not Trotsky predicted, even while Stalin was aiming to ally himself with French and British "democratic" imperialism, that Stalin would change his tactics and seek an alliance with Hitler? Was not Trotsky the one man who analyzed every move of Stalin and exposed his acts before the whole world? Especially must Stalin have been bitter because the world press, after war was declared, gave tremendous publicity to Trotsky's predictions and Trotsky's views. It was undoubtedly then that Stalin became more and more insistent that the GPU take every measure necessary, no matter how desperate, to silence the voice of Trotsky and to destroy his pen forever.

The campaign against Trotsky in Mexico became ever more virulent: "Death to Trotsky" was the slogan issued by the Communist Party of Mexico. *El Popular*, Toledano's paper, and *El Futuro*, a magazine edited by the fellow travelers of the GPU, contained innumerable articles against Trotsky; the most fantastic falsehoods concerning him were printed in the press of the GPU. "Trotsky was an agent of the Dies Committee; Trotsky was in league with American imperialism; Trotsky supported the reactionary forces of Mexico; Trotsky was the greatest counter-revolutionary in Mexico"—all of these and much more appeared in the pages of the GPU press day after day, week after week.

When the Spanish Civil War came to an end with the defeat of the Loyalist Army, a large portion of the GPU

POLITICAL EXPLANATION

forces operating in Spain came to Mexico. It is probably no over-statement to say that the greatest concentration of GPU forces, outside of the Soviet Union, was in Mexico. Report after report came to Trotsky and his friends of new GPU agents arriving in Mexico. There could be only one reason for this—Stalin's orders to the GPU were: "Kill Trotsky!"

In March 1940, during the Congress of the Mexican Communist Party, a secret session was held dealing with the question of the campaign against Trotsky. In general a division of labor exists in the ranks of the Stalinists. Those who work in the open have the task of trying to discredit an individual hated by Stalin through falsehoods and slanders, thus preparing the ground for those whose task is to carry out the actual murder. The actual murderers are members of a secret section of the GPU, and are unknown to all Stalinists except those who are directly charged with the criminal task.

On the 24th of May 1940 came an attack. In the middle of the night a gang of 25 to 30 men, dressed in police and soldiers' uniforms, attacked the Trotsky house, after tying up the Mexican police who were guarding the house. The guard on duty at that time was Robert Sheldon Harte. How he was persuaded to open the door has as yet not been ascertained. There is good ground to believe that someone whom Harte knew induced him to open the door and it was then that some members of the gang, carrying machine guns, entered into the yard, firing over 300 bullets into the walls of the house, and into Trotsky's bedroom. By a miracle, Trotsky, his wife and grandson escaped the bullets of the gangsters. When they heard the shooting, Trotsky and his wife immediately rolled off the bed and took shelter in a corner of the room where darkness concealed them from the eyes of the attackers. Trotsky's grandson had his toe grazed by a bullet.

The attack showed expert planning with full knowledge of the lay-out of the whole house. The guard, Robert Sheldon Harte, was murdered because he could probably recognize some of the attackers. His body, buried in an isolated house

and covered with lime, was found some weeks later.

Who but the GPU could have organized and carried out this assault? The Stalinist press—*La Voç de Mexico*, *El Popular*, and *El Futuro*—accused Trotsky of organizing the assault himself. The fantastic theory of self-assault was diligently propagated by the defenders of the GPU until the police succeeded in capturing members of the gang who had participated in the assault. Those who were held were found to be connected in one way or another with the Communist Party.

The Communist Party came out with a statement claiming that these men had been expelled from the party, but the fact remains that they had been members of the party and in all probability their expulsion if it took place at all, was simply nominal, in order to avoid a direct connection between the participants in the assault and the Communist Party itself. Two women were arrested who had rented lodgings in the neighborhood for the purpose of seducing the police who guarded the house. One of these women was a former wife of David Serrano, one of the leaders of the Communist Party of Mexico. The other had worked in the office of the Communist Party. Serrano himself was taken into custody because other participants implicated him in the assault.

The Arrest of Siqueiros

No sooner was the theory of self-assault dropped by the press defending the GPU, than the attack was attributed to "adventurous and uncontrollable elements." The leader of the attack turned out to be the Mexican painter, David Alfaro Siqueiros, a well-known Stalinist. He had achieved the position of Colonel in the Loyalist Army during the Civil War in Spain. The Communist Party disowned him although shortly before the attack the Communist press had praised him highly.

Claiming that he was not a member of the Communist Party since 1929, Siqueiros insisted that neither the Communist Party nor the GPU had anything to do with the assault of May 24th, and that it was organized independently

of those two organizations. He admitted that he attended secret meetings of the Party and talked at those secret meetings, but contended that he was permitted to do so only as a sympathizer. He admitted that he was president of the League against War and Fascism, and the League of Mexican Intellectuals, two organizations that followed the Stalinist line closely.

In court Siqueiros at first admitted only partial responsibility. He told the fantastic story that the purpose of the attack was simply to "get documentary evidence of Trotsky's counter-revolutionary activities" and insisted that his participation was confined simply to the "external investigation."

However, when confronted by his accomplices, he accepted the truth of their statements. Two of them definitely stated that Siqueiros, dressed in the uniform of a Major of the Army, accompanied them in an automobile belonging to Siqueiros and containing all the machine guns and revolvers. They were driven to Coyoacan, and after arriving in the neighborhood of the Trotsky house, Siqueiros was the one who disarmed the police who were guarding the house. He accepted the testimony of these witnesses, as well as of all the other witnesses who implicated him, but refused to say anything further. His policy, evidently, is to accept everything the witnesses present against him and no more.

The efforts of Siqueiros to remove responsibility from the Communist Party and the GPU were so pathetic that all he did was to fortify the conviction that he could not possibly have acted independently of the GPU.

The Assassination

The May 24th assault failed of its objective. One can imagine that Stalin's rage knew no bounds. The whole world blamed him for a job in which he had been unsuccessful. Undoubtedly the moment he was advised of the failure, he must have given orders that there must be no failure the next time, and the next time was to be very soon.

Immediately after the May 24th attack Trotsky's friends decided to strengthen the defenses of the house. They raised

POLITICAL EXPLANATION

between three and four thousand dollars and transformed the house into a veritable fortress. But Stalin's GPU had different methods in mind. To attempt a mass attack on the fortified house involved too great a risk and the chances for another failure were too great. The next method to try was assassination by one who had access to Trotsky.

The man necessary for that purpose was available. Upon that man fell the task of fulfilling Stalin's orders. Jacson was that man. Whether Jacson was willing to assume the task because of a feeling that he must obey any order of the GPU implicitly, or whether, as he claimed immediately after the murder, he was compelled to do it because the GPU had some powerful hold on him, has not as yet been ascertained and may never be ascertained. One thing is sure—Jacson could act and did act only as an agent of Stalin's GPU.

Stalin, as the representative of the Soviet bureaucracy, could not rest secure until he had murdered the man who was the spokesman of revolutionary Marxism and the creator of the Fourth International dedicated to the overthrow of the Stalinist bureaucracy. To destroy the representative of the movement that constituted the greatest potential danger to the Stalinist bureaucracy was absolutely essential for the representative of that bureaucracy.

Nor, in explaining Stalin's determination to kill Trotsky, can Stalin's personal character be ignored. Envy, hate and desire for revenge play a large role in his make-up. Nothing could give him greater personal satisfaction than the knowledge that the man who could so well expose his lies to the whole world was forever out of the way.

Trotsky, alive, was a constant reminder to Stalin that he was lying, and that the world, through Trotsky's pen, knew he was lying.

All the efforts of Stalin's literary sycophants to build him up as the right-hand man of Lenin and, next to Lenin, the greatest leader of the Russian Revolution, fell flat. The living Trotsky was a refutation of that falsehood.

POLITICAL EXPLANATION

All his pretensions to have built socialism in the Soviet Union were ridiculed and exposed by the living Trotsky.

All his efforts to assume the mantle of Lenin and pretend to be interested in the Socialist revolution throughout the world were frustrated by the living Trotsky.

All that Stalin said, all that Stalin did, was based upon lies. The living Trotsky exposed them.

No wonder Stalin's hatred of Trotsky knew no bounds; no wonder he was determined to overcome every obstacle to kill Trotsky.

With the force of a mighty state behind him, with inexhaustible financial resources at his disposal, he could not help but finally succeed in his designs.

Distance was no obstacle. His powerful hand reached from the Kremlin to Mexico and through the instrumentality of an obscure figure, he sunk a pick-axe into the brain of the man who represented everything contrary to that which is represented by the man who murdered him.

Jacson, an Agent of the GPU

How simple it is to explain every one of Jacson's moves and every one of his falsehoods once we accept the fact that his masters were agents of the GPU, under the direct supervision of Stalin himself. His lies, his activities, become clear only when he is considered as an agent of the GPU operating under its direction. It is interesting but immaterial as to when he became a GPU agent. We sincerely hope the Mexican authorities will succeed in revealing his true identity and nationality, but whether that is done or not is immaterial. His activities before the murder, the murder itself, can be explained only by accepting the fact that he is an agent of Stalin's GPU.

Take his story to the effect that a member of the Bureau of the Fourth International sent him to Mexico; his claim that he does not know who this member is; his assertion that this member furnished him with a false passport and with expense money. This story is unbelievable unless one substitutes for the member of the Bureau of the Fourth International, *an agent of the GPU*. Then it all becomes clear that it was an agent of the GPU who instructed him to go to Mexico; it was an agent of the GPU who furnished him with the passport; it was an agent of the GPU who furnished him with the necessary expenses.

Take his story to the effect that the member of the Bureau of the Fourth International told him not to appear too anxious to meet Trotsky—to wait in Mexico and pretend to be in business there. Absurd and unbelievable—unless one substitutes for the member of the Bureau *an agent of the GPU*. Would not the GPU tell him that very thing—not to appear too anxious to see Trotsky; to worm his way into the Trotsky household through Sylvia Ageloff? *This is what the GPU would do—and this is what the GPU actually did!*

Take his story of the false passport. What a ridiculous

story he gave us! That he did not have to do a single thing with reference to the passport; that it was given to him complete and that he never examined its contents although he knew it was false. All that he knew was that Frank Jacson was the name contained in the passport. He did not know where Jacson was supposed to have been born or where he was supposed to be residing.

But his assumed ignorance is quite easy to explain when one understands what an important bit of evidence the passport would be if it were found or if its contents were known. Jacson knew that very well and was anxious to conceal every possible clue to the nature of the document.

Fortunately for us and unfortunately for Jacson and the GPU, the origin of the false passport used by him was discovered.

It was a passport used by a Canadian citizen who enlisted in the International Brigade to fight in the Spanish Loyalist Army. Tony Babich, the man who had the original Canadian passport, died in Spain. His picture and name were taken out and the picture and name of Jacson inserted.

Who controlled the International Brigade? It is a matter of common knowledge that the Stalinists—that is, the GPU—controlled the International Brigade.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the GPU took away the passport of every volunteer fighting in that Brigade, including American and Canadian volunteers.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the GPU kept the passports of every volunteer who was either killed in action or killed by the GPU.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the GPU utilized those passports for their agents all over the world.

More than any other bit of evidence in the record of the whole case, conclusively proving that Jacson was a GPU agent, is that the passport used by Jacson was one belonging to an individual who fought in the International Brigade and died in Spain.

No wonder Jacson either destroyed or returned the passport to the people who gave it to him! No wonder Jacson refused to divulge anything at all with reference to the passport! If there were no other evidence at all, the fact that the passport comes from those who controlled the International Brigade would alone be sufficient to convict Jacson as a tool of the GPU.

A GPU Confession

In addition to the evidence furnished by the information which we now have with reference to the origin of Jacson's passport, the GPU itself actually furnished us with a document which notified the whole world that the murder of Trotsky was committed under its direction. For the "confession" in the form of a letter found on Jacson after he was apprehended, can be considered only as documentary evidence which in and of itself proves that the hand of the GPU was behind the murder. The letter will go down in history as one of the most stupid blunders ever committed by the GPU—a blunder that is understandable only on the hypothesis that the GPU people who were directly responsible for the plot could not resist the temptation of trying to cover up their tracks by making Jacson appear to be a "disillusioned" follower of Trotsky.

The pattern of the letter is a dead give-away. Examine the "confessions" of the defendants in the Moscow Trials and you will see at once the similarity of pattern between those "confessions" and Jacson's "confession." All of the "confessors" were allegedly loyal followers of Trotsky, and had become "disillusioned" by Trotsky's egotism, by his enmity toward the Soviet Union and by the alleged fact that they were asked to sabotage Soviet industry and to kill Stalin and other leaders of the Soviet Union.

The same hand that was responsible for the "confessions" in the Moscow Trials dictated Jacson's "confession."

There are changes and additions. The changes and additions are further proof of the GPU authorship of the letter.

The Moscow defendants claimed that Trotsky was in league with Hitler and the Mikado; Stalin's foreign policy demanded then that all of his enemies be considered in alliance with Hitler and the Mikado. But Stalin's foreign policy has changed since then; Hitler has become a close friend of his, while his enemies for the time being are Great Britain and the United States. And so the letter of Jacson mirrors that change in foreign policy; now Trotsky conspired with "a certain powerful government (whose consul visited him often) and with a certain parliamentary committee" (an obvious reference to the United States and to the Dies Committee). Even the phraseology is the same, for in the Moscow Trials Trotsky was in alliance with "a certain central European government and a certain Far Eastern government."

Trotsky is accused in Jacson's "confession" of being the enemy of the Mexican government and of being contemptuous of the Mexican Revolution. Read the press that defends Stalin and his GPU ever since Trotsky came to Mexico, and you will see the very same accusations. "Trotsky, the enemy of the Mexican people; Trotsky contemptuous of the Mexican Revolution; Trotsky opposed to the Cardenas Government" the only government in the world that gave him asylum!

The GPU may be clever in organizing a cowardly murder, but it is not so clever in its attempts to cover up its tracks.

When Trotsky's house was being remodeled, after the May 24th attack, Jacson could not resist the temptation to make the remark, at one time to Joseph Hansen and at another time to Sylvia Ageloff, that all this remodeling would not help Trotsky. "The GPU will use different methods." How well he knew!

Conclusion

We have considered all the evidence from every possible angle. One verdict alone is possible. *Stalin, whom we accuse of being responsible for the murder, is guilty.*

The record of the methods Stalin used in his struggle against Trotsky proves it.

Jacson's falsifications in his attempt to conceal the real perpetrators of the murder prove it.

Jacson's passport proves it.

Jacson's "confession" proves it.

Stalin, through his GPU, murdered Trotsky.

The sentence must be: "DEATH TO STALINISM." Not death to Stalin, but to the system which he represents.

And the executioner will be, *must be*, the working masses throughout the world, rising in their organized might to destroy the Stalinist world of cynicism, falsification, brutality, murder.

Though basing itself on the property relations achieved by the October Revolution, Stalinism exists, in the last analysis, because the capitalist world, with its fascism, war and dreadful suffering, continues to exist.

The destruction of the capitalist world by the working masses will mean the death of the Stalinist bureaucracy.

Trotsky's murder will be avenged by the victory of the ideas for which he fought all his life—the victory of true democracy, freedom, equality, peace—the victory of *Socialism*.

October 11, 1940

BOOKS and PAMPHLETS

116

Pioneer Publishers

University Place

New York City

By **LEON TROTSKY**

The Stalin School of Falsification	
326 pages	\$2.50
The Third International after Lenin	
357 pages	\$1.50
Lessons of October	(Cloth) \$.75
125 pages	(Paper) \$.50
Whither France	(Cloth) \$.75
160 pages	(Paper) \$.50
In Defense of the Soviet Union	
40 pages	10c
War and the Fourth International	
35 pages	10c
Stalinism and Bolshevism	
40 pages	10c
I Stake My Life... (Answer to charges made during Moscow Trials)	
24 pages	5c
Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution	
46 pages	5c
Living Thoughts of Karl Marx... (Introduction by Trotsky)	
184 pages	\$1.25
The Case of Leon Trotsky... (Report of the John Dewey Commission of Inquiry at Mexico)	
What Is Socialism?	
600 pages	Reduced price.... 25c
By ALBERT GOLDMAN	
47 pages	10c
Why We Defend the Soviet Union	
31 pages	5c