



Ad Reinhardt

The Moscow Trial

By Joshua Kunitz

AS we go to press the trial of the Right-Trotskyite Center in Moscow is in its fifth day. Unlike the Dewey Committee, Eugene Lyons, Isaac Don Levine, Simeon Strunsky, the editorial scribes in the capitalist press, and, above all, Leon Trotsky himself, we do not feel that we are as yet in a position to write about every detail of a proceeding in a courtroom thousands of miles away, especially since the reports, with the exception of the abridged transcript of the proceedings appearing in the *Daily Worker*, are utterly inadequate and often deliberately misleading. In the meanwhile I will try to deal with some of the questions raised in the press.

In this connection one little autobiographical note contained in Mr. Denny's correspondence in the *New York Times* of March 4 is worthy of note. Mr. Denny was reporting the three-cornered argument between Vyshinsky, Bukharin and Rykov concerning Tukhachevsky's role in the plot. Using as a springboard Rykov's statement that "Bukharin was afraid that Tukhachevsky might think himself a Napoleon," Mr. Denny makes the following revealing confession:

And thus there came in open court a direct reference to the story whispered in Moscow and given out privately by Soviet diplomatic sources in other capitals, that the real reason for the shooting of Marshal Tukhachevsky and his seven fellow generals was that the Marshal was involved in a Napoleonic plot—a story which, I believe, no correspondent sent out from here because we thought it an inspired attempt to induce us to explain plausibly the execution of distinguished men whose alleged treason we could not credit.

First note the words *real reason*. As if Tukhachevsky's plot to open up the borders to fascist allies was in contradiction to his Napoleonic scheme of a *coup d'état*. But the most damning thing is this smugness with which Mr. Denny admits his own and the other correspondents' prejudice against the Soviet, even to the point of not fulfilling the newspaperman's duty of reporting anything that might throw some light on a much discussed subject. The "story whispered in Moscow" was a good scoop, but the bourgeois

correspondents disdained using it because it might have explained the death of Tukhachevsky, an enemy of the Soviet government, "plausibly." It is this kind of self-imposed censorship that makes the reports of most of the bourgeois correspondents on the trial so misleading. They tend to avoid quoting anything that would make the trial "plausible." Their solicitude for the reputation of "distinguished men" is touching! Yet Trotsky complains that the newspapermen present at the trial have been carefully selected by the government. Which simply proves that even prejudiced reporters cannot wholly conceal the truth.

THE CASE OF KRESTINSKY. If the reader wants to see an interesting revelation of how bourgeois reporters can twist facts and cull quotations so as to make a perfectly "plausible" thing sound *implausible*, let him compare the reports of Krestinsky's confession of guilt, his plea of not guilty, and again, on the following day, his admission of guilt. The reports in the bourgeois press make the whole thing seem rather implausible; when you read the complete transcript in the *Daily Worker*, it becomes completely plausible. Such is the subtle art of reporting. We urge the reader to check up on us on this point by a careful reading of the *Daily Worker* of Friday, March 4.

Now what is the case of Krestinsky? As one who sat through the Zinoviev-Kamenev trial, the Piatakov-Radek trial, and in 1930 the Industrial Party trial, and who has had some intimate acquaintances who were actually detained by the N.K.V.D. for purposes of investigation and then released, I dismiss with disgust all the obscene surmises made by the enemy scribes, including their master, Leon Trotsky. All the horrendous details concocted by these gentlemen—Krestinsky put in a room in which the temperature is suddenly dropped from 120 degrees above zero to 30 degrees below, Krestinsky hanging by his toes, Krestinsky threatened with the "liquidation" of his family—these fantasies simply do not square with reports by *all* the correspondents that on

the following day, after that alleged terrible night of torture, Krestinsky appeared fresher, healthier, and more cheerful than on the previous day, when he seemed extremely nervous and ill. Torture was obviously not the cause of his reversal. For torture can scarcely serve as a tonic.

But what about the threat to the family? That might work in a case tried behind closed doors. But the present trial is a public trial; and Krestinsky is no slouch, after all. He had served for many years as ambassador, he is a European diplomat, he knows the pressure value of aroused world opinion. He had denied the charges, repudiating his own confession on the previous day. What prevented him from appearing in the court the following day and at the proper moment addressing himself to the world press and the representatives of the diplomatic corps with just a few desperate words: "I have been tortured; my family has been threatened with extinction!" The sensation would have been tremendous. Had Krestinsky behaved with such defiance, perhaps the others would have been inspired to behave similarly.

But nothing of the sort happened, or is likely to happen. In three consecutive trials, the cream of the opposition, the staunchest of Trotsky's followers, many of whom when they were with the revolution had displayed on occasions supreme physical courage, men like Mrachkovsky, Muralov, Bakaiev, Dreitzer, Piatakov, had appeared in open court, and not one of them, not *one*, displayed the courage, the ardor, the devotion to principles expected of genuine revolutionists. Trotsky complains that all these people had been morally and physically broken by the N.K.V.D. Well, here is Mr. Trotsky himself. May we ask him whether he can imagine any tortures devised by man, however cruel and refined, that would so break his spirit that he would publicly reject everything he stood for, admitting that he was a spy, a counter-revolutionist, a murderer? Of course not. Mr. Trotsky would reject such a suggestion with a great show of scorn. Well, is it possible that in the entire oppositionist leadership there was



"Conditions in the Soviet Union are terrible!"

Robert Joyce

only one man, Trotsky, who was really a man, and that all, now mind you, *all* his aides, have been and are craven cowards, confessing to crimes they did not commit? That does not stand to reason. Why does Thaelman—a “Stalinist”—hold out in the Nazi prisons? Why did Dimitroff, a “Stalinist,” dare defy the Nazi court and the blustering Goering?

How can Trotsky and his literary Charlie McCarthys account for this striking difference in moral stamina, in manhood, in revolutionary loyalty? The only man, out of an entire group of oppositionist leaders, who remains an impenitent Trotskyite, is Trotsky himself—the only one of the top leadership who has not yet faced the proletarian court. A queer phenomenon, worth pondering. . . .

DISCREPANCIES IN EVIDENCE: One of the major sports indulged in by Trotsky and his apologists is the catching up of some chronological discrepancies in the testimony of the self-confessed liars facing the proletarian court. By a clever sleight of hand, these gentlemen endeavor to create the erroneous impression that the Soviet court subscribes to and sponsors everything uttered by the witnesses. Nothing can be further from the truth. Time and time again Vyshinsky has indicated his contempt for the witness's apparent frankness. He knows that these people, for the most part, admit only what has been incontrovertibly established. They admit their guilt, because they have been caught with the goods. Pretending sincerity, they almost always try to shield those of their accomplices who have not yet been caught. When the investigating authorities can check up on their confession, they do it. When they are not in a position to check up, the court listens to the testimony, but does not necessarily swallow it. It all depends whether the bit of evidence fits with the general picture, by this time pretty clearly delineated, of the plotters' activities. This is true not only of the judges, but of the workers sent by their factories to observe the trial. Thus in Monday's *Pravda* (quoted in the *Herald Tribune's* Moscow cable) appeared numerous letters from worker observers impugning the veracity of the defendants. One letter reads: “You feel they are not saying everything. Grinko is faking every word.” The reason for this “faking” is obvious, and Joseph Barnes, who knows Russian, an accomplishment most of the other American correspondents lack, explains it in the *Herald Tribune* (March 5) quite well. He writes:

Rykov, Bukharin and especially Krestinsky continued their serial confessions today, but in language which lent some support to the suspicion of many foreigners that they might be sabotaging the trial.

This suspicion was strengthened when the publication in *Pravda* of the stenographic report of the confession on Wednesday of S. A. Bessenov, former counselor of the Soviet Embassy in Berlin, revealed that Bessenov had dated his last alleged communication with Trotsky neatly at a time when Trotsky was in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean. Bessenov told the court:

“I received a letter from Krestinsky for Trotsky in December 1936, or perhaps at the beginning of January 1937. I delivered it through Johanson at

the end of December, and received an answer from Trotsky after several days.”

Actually, Trotsky sailed from Norway in the small steamship *Fagerstand* on December 19, 1936, and arrived in Mexico exactly one month later. A Norwegian police official accompanied him to prevent his using the radio or debarking at any intermediate port.

Attempts to discredit Soviet justice by making grotesque statements or reversing confessions are not beyond men who have confessed such bitter enmity over a period of years. On the other hand, most of the prisoners appeared indubitably sincere and repentant today.

MORE ON EVIDENCE: But one need not ascribe all inaccuracies in witness's testimony to malicious intent. There are such things as slips of memory. People may unconsciously confuse days and years and persons and facts. Take the *Report of Hearings on the Charges Made Against Leon Trotsky in the Moscow Trials*, issued by the so-called Commission of inquiry under John Dewey's chairmanship. Turn to pages 592-593 which contain Appendix II, entitled Factual Corrections. It is a letter addressed by “defendant” Trotsky to the Commission, and the opening sentence in that document reads: “The depositions which I made before the sub-commission in Coyoacan contain some factual inaccuracies . . .” He then proceeds to enumerate and correct six such alleged inaccuracies. (Incidentally, one minor inaccuracy which the impecunious editors of the *NEW MASSES* were especially eager to see corrected, Mr. Trotsky omitted to mention. And that is that, being “a semi-official organ of the GPU, the *NEW MASSES* is a recipient of “subsidies” from the Soviet state. But we'll let it go at that, hoping that Mr. Trotsky's authoritative testimony will not deter our readers from sending contributions to the magazine so as to insure its next week's publication.) I do not wish to be carping. But it seems to me that a man who failed to remember that his daughter-in-law was *not* traveling with him on the steamer from Copenhagen to Paris and said that she *was* traveling, is not exactly in a position to demand that the memories of others be infallible. Especially, since the others were facing an unfriendly prosecutor, unfriendly judges, and an unfriendly spirit in the courtroom, whereas Mr. Trotsky had the great advantage of making his depositions in the warm intimacy of a benevolent, whitewashing family gathering.

“MAKERS OF THE REVOLUTION”: The bourgeois scribes, though they are not the only ones, express deep-felt concern over the great number of once “prominent officials and heroes of the revolution” who are now charged with spying, wrecking, and plotting the overthrow of the very system they themselves had presumably been instrumental in building up. Let us examine the record of these “makers of the Revolution.” Space does not allow a detailed study of the biographies of all of them. I will only take up the two central figures at the present trial—Bukharin and Rykov. What is their history?

Long before the revolution, during the imperialist war, Lenin had characterized Buk-

harin as “devilishly unstable in politics,” and somewhat later as “confused, non-Marxist, and non-socialist.” It is well to remember this fact because it provides a key to the understanding of an important historical development.

The question may be asked: “If Bukharin was so unstable politically, and if his thinking was ‘confused, non-Marxist, and non-socialist’ why was he kept in the Bolshevik party, and why did he have one of the leading positions?” Any one familiar with incipient revolutionary movements in this or any other country can supply the answer. First, a young movement cannot afford not to utilize any bit of talent that comes its way. And, certainly, as regards his general culture and his ability to write, Bukharin was one of the more richly endowed in the young party. Second, vacillation and lack of clarity in one's thinking do not necessarily disqualify anyone from Party membership, so long as the person involved accepts party discipline and carries out the tasks the party assigns him. Not everybody has it in him to be a Lenin or a Stalin or a Dimitrov. A growing party must utilize to the utmost the human material available at any particular time. Bukharin was kept in the Party and was placed in responsible places not because of his serious defects, already perceptible then and destined to become glaring in later years, but in spite of them; for there is always the hope that a young man may learn and change. Experience in the revolutionary movement has done that for many.

In 1917, Bukharin's un-Marxist confused thinking led him to expound a conception of the proletarian revolution which placed the peasantry outside its pale, a conception which, if actually followed, would have ruined the chances of the Bolshevik revolution at the very outset. Fortunately, it was Lenin, and not Bukharin, who formulated party policies and tactics. And Lenin never underestimated the importance of the peasantry as allies of the revolutionary proletariat.

Four months after the October revolution, Bukharin made his factionalist debut by organizing the so-called “left Communist” group. Bukharin and his “left Communists” regarded Lenin as an opportunist and accused him of right-wing tendencies. They asserted that the Bolshevik Party, then led by Lenin, had upon coming to power in October immediately begun to degenerate, to break with the international revolution and enter upon a career of petty bourgeois policies. They were bitterly opposed to the Brest-Litovsk treaty sponsored by Lenin, insisting that “after the signing of the Brest peace the socialist organization of Russia must be inevitably abandoned” and that the Soviets will develop into “executors of the will of world capitalism.” I am calling attention to all these points of attack on Lenin's policies, because they are so clearly reminiscent of the contemporary oppositionists' attacks on Stalin's policies. This is an essential point to remember: Stalin is not the cause of opposition; Lenin, in his time, was just as much exposed to the oppositionists'

onslaught as Stalin is at the present time. And Bukharin and his "left Communists" and their Socialist Revolutionist confederates plotted against the life of Lenin at that time as Bukharin and his Zinovievite and Trotskyite confederates have been plotting against the life of Lenin's best pupil, Stalin, in more recent years. Incidentally, Trotsky at that time, though not allied with Bukharin, was also in opposition to Lenin's peace policy.

In the light of the above it is not necessary in this article to trace further Bukharin's political peregrinations from one camp into another. By 1929, Bukharin from his early extreme "leftism" swung to extreme "rightism," being now opposed to the rapid industrialization and collectivization of the country. And in the most recent years we see him working hand in hand with all the opposition groups in a united terrorist, spying, wrecking front of disgruntled but armyless leaders against the Soviet regime and the Communist Party. Such is the history of the man who from the very outset manifested his "devilish" political instability, and "his confused, non-Marxist, and non-socialist" thinking.

The history of Rykov is not essentially different from that of Bukharin. "Conciliator and opportunist" for decades prior to the October Revolution, Rykov in 1917, at the April Party Conference, "bluntly took a stand against the seizure of power and opposed the Socialist revolution." Vacillation and doubt have characterized this man through his entire subsequent career, until finally he joined Bukharin and Tomsy in 1929 in their bitter fight against the Party's plan of Socialist construction. And while Premier, as it turned out later, Rykov "enrolled into Soviet state departments the most bureaucratic and non-Bolshevik elements and from them enlisted future participants in illegal espionage, disruptive and provocative activity."

Even this sketchy recital of Bukharin's and Rykov's achievements suggests that the tremendous progress made by the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, economic, political, cultural, has certainly been made not owing to the efforts of these people, but despite them. They were unstable from the beginning; soon after the revolution their waverings increased; then they became oppositionists; and finally, plotting in the underground, torn away from the masses, they landed in the camp of fascism and counter-revolution. A path of development not unknown to the history of revolutionary movements in other countries.

And one final point. Eugene Lyons and Isaac Don Levine have been shedding crocodile tears over the disappearance of the old Bolsheviks. Well, as history shows, some of those who had been thrown by the wave of revolution to the top were never really Bolsheviks. They were camouflage revolutionists who collapsed under the strains and stresses of building Socialism. The real old Bolsheviks are still at the helm. Molotov, Stalin, Voroshilov, Kalinin, Manuisky, Kaganovich are also old Bolsheviks. The vast majority of the Central Committee of the Communist

Party are also old Bolsheviks. They remained loyal to the working class and the Revolution. And they receive all the glory and honor which they deserve.

WHY THEY REMAINED UNEXPOSED.—What makes this whole business so incredible, I hear some people say, is that these prominently placed wreckers and spies remained unexposed for such a long time. The answer to this is: 1. It was not always possible in the upsurge of revolution to trace effects to their real causes; 2. The protective revolutionary coloring of many of the wreckers and spies made such tracing extremely difficult; 3. There was a large body of more obvious enemies—kulaks and former capitalists, landlords and nepmen and bourgeois specialists—on whom responsibility for evils would naturally be placed first; 4. It took many years before an adequate number of devoted Soviet experts in ideology and technology could be trained to make revolutionary vigilance truly effective; 5. Above all, the head of the N.K.V.D., Yagoda, whose job it was to unearth just such crimes, was himself a member of the counter-revolutionary organization and more interested in shielding its members than exposing them.

THE PRESSURE OF FASCISM.—One fundamental idea needs to be borne in mind if the meaning of the trials is to be understood: the degeneration of the Trotskyites and their allies in the Zinoviev-Kamenev and Bukharin-Rykov groups into agents of fascism is not merely the result of the weakness of individuals, but of the pressure of the hostile capitalist world, particularly its fascist sector, which surrounds the lone country of Socialism. The activities of these groups were actually an expression of the sharpest class struggle between the worlds of capitalism and Socialism. Stalin in his speech last march at the meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (published in this country under the title, *Mastering Bolshevism*) pointed out that it was precisely the failure to grasp the full implications of this capitalist encirclement that caused the leaders of the Party and the government and the whole Soviet people to be far less vigilant against concealed enemies than they should have been.

And it was inevitable that the capitalist and especially the fascist countries would seek to utilize every factional group that appeared within the Communist Party in an effort to undermine and overthrow the Soviet regime. It was equally inevitable that if factionalism were persisted in, it would sooner or later become a conscious auxiliary of the fascist governments.

That the Trotskyites desire the overthrow of the Soviet regime is no longer a matter of dispute. Trotsky has stated as much publicly. In his pamphlet, *The Soviet Union and the Fourth International*, written in 1934 prior to the Kirov assassination, Trotsky said (p. 25):

"No normal 'constitutional' ways remain to remove the ruling clique. . . . The bureaucracy can be compelled to yield power into the hands

of the proletarian vanguard only by force."

And a resolution adopted at the convention of the American Trotskyites in January of this year states:

"The character and methods of the present dictatorship, its armed suppression of all opposition or suspicion of opposition, has done away with all possibility of peaceful reform of the state, and leaves the masses only the road of political revolution."

These are unequivocal statements. And being practical men of action, the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Bukharin crowd drew the logical conclusions from their program. Since they had no support among the masses, but were a relatively small group of people in key posts, the only way they could attempt the overthrow of the Soviet regime was with outside aid. And who today would be more ready to give them this aid than Hitler and the Mikado? But there are, after all, two sides to every bargain. In return for outside military assistance, the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Bukharin clique became spies, wreckers and assassins for the fascist countries and set as their goal the restoration of capitalism. This was the inescapable logic of the course they pursued.

WHY THEY CONFESSED.—This also accounts for their lack of moral stamina, their inability to stand up and challenge and defy, their shamefaced apologies and futile regrets. It is possible to be heroic, even to face torture and death, when in your innermost self there is the conviction that your cause is just, your fight is noble, and that all about you, in the court room and in ever broadening circles in the outside world, there are millions who, roused by your example, will carry on the struggle long after you are gone. But when you have betrayed your Party, betrayed your class, betrayed your country, betrayed your own past, when you have spied and wrecked and sold out and plotted war, and have finally been caught and exposed to public obloquy, what is there to sustain you? There is a void without, and a void within. You collapse—a political and moral ruin. And when you feebly try to describe your "objective" and formulate your "philosophy" as Bukharin did, the masses whom you have betrayed laugh in your face.

These people confessed because they were guilty, because they were caught red-handed, and finally because they found themselves not only without any moral conviction of their own, but utterly without any mass support among the people they had betrayed.

They failed, and that is something to rejoice over. Had they succeeded, it would have been a catastrophe not only for the 170,000,000 people of the Soviet Union, but for the common people of the entire world. It would have precipitated world war and might very well have struck a death-blow to democracy everywhere. The leaders of the Soviet government and the Communist Party, by exposing this conspiracy in all its horrible detail and wiping out these nests of fascist spies, are therefore doing an incalculable service to all who stand for democracy and peace.

The "Haves and Have-Nots"

CONCERTED ACTION OR ISOLATION: WHICH IS THE PATH TO PEACE?

By Earl Browder

The following speech was delivered by Earl Browder before the Carolina Political Union at Chapel Hill, N. C., on March 3.

RECENT events, since I accepted your kind invitation to address the Carolina Political Union, serve to sharpen considerably the issues involved in finding an effective peace policy for the United States. The aggressions of the bandit governments have engulfed Austria, in the heart of Europe, and proclaim quite openly that Czechoslovakia is next. To the north of us, the province of Quebec seems to have been rather firmly seized by admirers and imitators of Hitler and Mussolini. To the immediate south, in Mexico, only the firm actions of President Cárdenas have forestalled a fascist putsch, inspired and directed from Europe with the collaboration of American vested interests.

At our Caribbean doorstep, in Cuba, the puppet Batista, raised to power by American sugar interests, has passed over to the tutelage of Herr Goebbels. Within the United States itself, the incitations of big-business fascism to the assassination of President Roosevelt have become common knowledge; and in the last days has been added the revelation of a German spy-ring actively operating on our soil to purchase military secrets, especially regarding the defenses of the Panama Canal. The events in China continue their inexorable course, more obviously than ever involving the future of America.

In facing the problem of finding an effective policy to maintain peace and democracy, in a world where winds of war and fascism blow ever more wildly, the people of the United States are involved in deep confusion of counsel. In a world setting quite new, the disillusionments of the last World War are gathered into a system of deep-seated prejudices, and call for the isolation of the United States from the rest of the world, which is to be allowed to go to hell in its own way, while the United States finds its own path for itself alone. Against this naïve and irrational dream, there arises more and more the understanding that peace (and consequently democracy also) can be preserved only by the coöperative and concerted action of all peace-loving peoples of every country, and the governments whose policies they can still determine.

The central issue is the choice between isolationism or international concerted action as the path to peace. The greatest debate of our day is on this issue, which is gradually involving the whole of the thinking population.

The position of my party, the Communist Party, has from the beginning of this discussion been definitely against isolationism and in favor of the path of concerted action.

Last year, during the discussions around the falsely-named Neutrality Act, we formulated our views with much precision, advocating legislation which would sharply distinguish between those governments which upheld their treaty obligations with the United States, under the Kellogg-Briand Pact and the Nine-Power Pact, and those which violated these obligations. We advocated that those governments which upheld their treaty obligations should be guaranteed freedom of access to the American market, and if necessary be assisted by credits when the victims of the treaty-breakers; while the bandit governments, which dishonor their obligations, should be barred from access to American markets or credits. We advocated consultation between the United States and the governments maintaining their treaty obligations, to obtain the maximum concerted action along these lines to restrain the bandit governments.

Our sharpest criticism of President Roosevelt and his administration has been, for a long time, against their failure to come forward with such a positive peace policy, their apparent willingness to compromise with or surrender to the crudest isolationism, as exemplified in the infamous Neutrality Act and its special application against loyalist Spain, while the bandit nations continue to draw war materials from American markets.

Therefore, when President Roosevelt made his peace speech in Chicago, on October 5, indicating a turn away from isolationism and toward concerted action, we of the Communist Party gave immediate and unstinted support to this declaration of policy, and called upon the people to demand its practical application. We recognize full well all the difficulties that beset the implementation of this policy, but we also recognize that the only alternative is the drift to certain disaster.

Such is the confusion in public debate in these days, that there are still people who reject President Roosevelt's Chicago speech, either wholly or entirely upon the grounds that the Communists support it, and therefore it must be wrong. What would such people, most of them good Christians no doubt, answer to a Communist declaration of support of the Ten Commandments? Let us hope that, in a day in which the Communists more and more find themselves in agreement on current issues with great sections of our population, and often even with a majority, to refute such argumentation will soon be unnecessary. At

least I hope that with this audience I need not demonstrate that those who reject Communism as a program of social reorganization, need not necessarily take an opposite position to that of the Communists on every issue of the day, that our arguments should be dealt with on their merits on each question under discussion.

Another appeal to prejudice that is made by enemies of the policy of concerted action consists in charging that this is a special interest of the Soviet Union; since this policy is also supported by the Soviet Union, this is proof, they say, that the whole policy is a clever trap by Stalin to trick America into fighting his battles. Even David Stern, the supposed New Deal newspaper publisher, issued a hysterical outburst to this effect on the occasion of Stalin's recent letter in which he pointed out that maintenance of peace is an international problem, can only be solved by the international action of those who want peace, primarily the workers, and concluded that it is necessary for the Soviet Union to pursue such a peace policy that will win the support of the workers of the capitalist lands so that they will help restrain the war-makers.

It is not necessary to be an enthusiastic supporter of the Soviet Union, and an admirer of Stalin, as I am, in order to see the falsity and downright dishonesty of such appeals to prejudice. First of all, the policy of concerted action for peace, or "collective security" as they say in Europe, was first enunciated by the French republic—before the People's Front came to power there. Then it was adopted by the League of Nations, with the withdrawal of the bandit governments from that body as a consequence. The Soviet Union came into the picture to support a peace policy already worked out by all the democracies of the world except the United States; and at the same time it greatly improved its relations with the United States.

Surely even the most rabid enemy of the social and economic system in the Soviet Union must, if he is really an advocate of international peace, welcome joyfully the accession of that great power to the peace alignment of the world. No one who is ready to base his opinions strictly on the record can deny that the Soviet Union has been the most consistent supporter, in word and deed, of world peace and disarmament as its needs have been formulated by the great body of democratic nations in the world. Stalin's letter was a further rallying of the one hundred and eighty million population of the Soviet Union in the cause of peace; instead of attacking him for it, it would be more to the point if his