

WARNER'S FAKE FILM

'Mission to Moscow'

A Falsification of History

MISSION TO MOSCOW — THE FAKE FILM WHICH FALSIFIES AND DISTORTS A FAKE BOOK OF THE SAME TITLE, WRITTEN BY EX-AMBASSADOR J. E. DAVIES, CORPORATION LAWYER AND ALLEGED TO BE THE WORLD'S WEALTHIEST DIPLOMAT, IS NOW BEING SHOWN IN LONDON.

Despite the blurb which it has been given by the press and particularly by the publicity agency of Warner Bros., it is having a poor showing up to now.



J. E. Davies, wealthy corporation and banking lawyer, poses with a section of his valuable Russian Art collection. "I am definitely not a communist. I am a capitalist. I am proud of the designation," said Davies to Stalin.

Read the
"SOCIALIST
APPEAL"
2d.

Price
One Penny

"MISSION TO MOSCOW"—

The film introduces a new technique in unscrupulous capitalist propaganda. It is a classic example of how a wealthy, demagogic capitalist can sell himself to the public. This technique has more in common with fascism than with political enlightenment and truth.

In the United States the outstanding liberals and socialists, together with the Socialist Workers' Party have raised their voice in a strong protest against this false film and its vicious distortion of the ideas and life purpose of Leon Trotsky. Not so in Britain. Apart from the Glasgow "Forward", the so-called socialist press has remained silent or justified the film. So also with the bulk of the liberals. Certainly there has been no honest protest from these gentlemen who prate their "moral" outlook before the working class.

Several Minor Falsifications

Between the book and the film there are a number of important contradictions apart from the Moscow Trials.

The film shows Davies and his family having an "excellent" and "real food" meal at the border town station when they entered Russia. Such a treat after eating "Ersatz food" in Germany for a couple of weeks. In his diary Davies wrote:

"... Lay Henderson met us at the border town of Negoreloye... Henderson, the poor man had eaten some 'bad food' (an experience here quite common) the night before and had been pretty sick..."

In a letter to a friend, he wrote:

"Dr. Bunkley... has given us a list of 'don'ts' as to what we should eat and avoid at diplomatic dinners. There is a lot of contagion in foods here. There is no cream save for ice cream, nor vegetables that are safe, so Bullit's advice was helpful in every way, and particularly very sound in suggesting that we bring a supply of food."

In a footnote to his diary, Davies gives a list of "don'ts" which are:

"Don't drink unboiled tap water.
"Don't drink milk or cream.
"Don't eat any milk product (ice cream, butter, custards, etc.) of local origin.
"Don't eat raw vegetables.

As a film, it is dull and boring. The only lively and interesting scene is the important section which purports to be a reproduction of the infamous Moscow Frame-up Trials. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that the biggest section of the politically conscious section of the working class will see this false film. Despite the healthy scepticism towards propaganda films which is common among wide sections of the workers, this vicious film will be used against the revolutionists and socialists in Britain.

"Don't eat canned vegetables unless you know they are from the U.S.A.
"Avoid rare or underdone meats.
"Avoid all sausages.
"Be very careful about fish..."

And his comment:

"No wonder the staff here have their own commissary for supplies."

If this is true of the foodstuffs supplied at the Embassies, what hopes that Davies and his family would have had such an excellent meal on the railway canteen.

The film portrays Davies as "Mr. Know All". He saw everything that was to be seen—even to the extent of observing that Russian machinery was bolted down and transportable for war purposes. And what he did not see, obliging American technicians in Russia informed him of; for instance the "sabotage afoot."

Read his book. Despite the careful selections of his "despatches" and "quotations" from his diary, he makes no claim to be so well informed.

Significant to note, he gives no "quotes" from his diary during the period of the Red Army's invasion of Poland and Finland, although the film shows that he returned to America and campaigned for an alliance with Russia, there is no proof for this in his book and it is most likely, on the contrary that he was a rabid anti-Soviet "liberal" during that period 1939-1940 in which he maintains silence in his book.

The Trials

The main section of the film with which we are concerned here is the frame-up Moscow trials. The principal purpose of these "trials" was to discredit Trotsky in the world labour movement. Davies admits this in his carefully "edited" book. In his despatch dated February 17th, 1937 to the "Honourable The Secretary of State" he wrote that "off the record..."

enemies—Germany and Japan." (Mission to Moscow, Left Book Club Edition, page 38).

In the film the public trials are telescoped into the secret trials of which there exist no records. If we allow a wide latitude for dramatic licence, there are nevertheless a number of awkward questions which must be asked.

Four of the infamous Russian Frame-up trials—one secret and three public—are telescoped together in the film. It is no accident that this method of amalgam has been resorted to by the producer. The fantastic nature of the trials would have been too obviously exposed had they been shown separately. Yagoda as the chief of the G.P.U., was responsible for bringing the alleged "terrorists" and "fifth columnists" to book in the first two trials. But he was himself a "defendant" at the third trial! Tukachevsky, shown in the film was implicated in one of the public trials and was most carefully exonerated by the state prosecutor Vyshinsky. A short time later he was shot after "trial" in camera.

But, the height of fantasy was reached when Yezhov—the personal friend of Stalin—who brought Yagoda to trial was also shot and to crown it, the chief judge of all the trials, Ulrich, was shot after a secret trial!

The trial scenes show men like Bukharin, Radek, Sokolnikov and others confessing to be "agents of Hitler" under the leadership of Trotsky. Vyshinsky, the prosecutor, ex-Menshevik who opposed the Bolshevik Revolution, is shown as a lynx-eyed defender of the workers' conquests. Tukachevsky, the outstanding military leader of the Red Army for years, is shown mouthing a speech which was in the actual trials made by Muranov. Krestinsky is shown confessing that under Trotsky's instructions he made contact with the German General Staff in 1921 and received 250,000 marks a year for espionage activity.

What are the facts about the personalities and the statements at these trials?

It is true that the Russian Government made an arrangement of a military character with the German Government which was led by the Social Democrats. General Von Seecket did have contact with the Red Army which was training German Army officers. But the agreement was made while Lenin was at the head of the Government. Stalin supported the agreement at the time. When Trotsky, according to Krestinsky, in the film scene, was receiving 250,000 marks a year for espionage, the mark was tens of millions to the pound. Trotsky would have received the price of a box of matches for a year in exchange for the Soviet Union!

Why was Tukachevsky, who was tried and shot secretly, brought into the "public" trial, while people like Rakovsky were kept out? Because some of the accused, including Rakovsky confessed to being agents and Fifth Columnists on behalf of British Imperialism. Rosengoltz "confessed" that he had been an agent of the British Secret Service since 1926! Rakovsky "confessed" that he had been

WARNER'S FAKE FILM

an agent of Britain since 1924! Khodajayev "confessed" that Bukharin stressed the need to make connections with England, as from the standpoint of the "Fifth Column" . . . "the most feasible proposal was a British protectorate . . ." And so on, and so on.

If the section of the confessions which "proved" these men to be paid agents in the pay of British imperialism are rejected by ex-Ambassador Davies and by Warner Bros., what makes him accept the confessions that they were agents of Hitler?

Despite the statements of the charwomen of the G.P.U., including D. N. Pritt, practically no documents were entered into the court records as substantial evidence in the trials. Davies admits this in his book. But to prove a connection with Trotsky, the "confessors" had to claim that they met Trotsky outside Russia. For the first time it became possible to check up on the veracity of the "confessions".

Thus Piatakov stated that in December 1935, he went to Germany where he met an agent of Trotsky who:

"urged . . . Pyatakov should fly to Oslo . . . Next day he met this agent Heinrich or Gustav, who gave him a specially prepared German passport and attended to all the customs formalities. The plane arrived at Oslo at approximately 3 p.m. They drove for about 30 minutes to a small house where Trotsky was then awaiting them." (Page 23, Official Trial Report issued by Anglo-Russian Parliamentary Committee, 1937).

The Director of the Oslo airport at Kjeller, which Vyshinsky "established" as the airport in question, issued a statement to the press while the trial was proceeding, that no foreign airplane arrived at the airport from September 1935 until the 1st of May 1936. This was published in the world press. Konrad Knudsen, a Norwegian Labour M.P., at whose house Trotsky was a guest during his stay in Norway, telegraphed Vyshinsky before the conclusion of the trial that it had been confirmed that no foreign or private plane landed at the Oslo airdrome in December and that as Trotsky's host, he confirms that no conversation could have taken place in Norway between Trotsky and Pyatakov.

In view of the fact that the Director of the airport was a Government official; that the Norwegian Government was a Labour government; that there was a military guard at the airport records, etc.; and also in view of the fact that a Norwegian M.P. together with his family testified that Pyatakov's evidence on this score was untrue, Vyshinsky was duty bound to cross-examine him on this score and raise the matter during the trial of Pyatakov. This is doubly true when it is remembered that Trotsky denied meeting Pyatakov and issued two lists of questions to Pyatakov which were published in the world press. The fact that Vyshinsky did not put the detailed questions to Pyatakov proved conclusively that a cross examination of the testimony would have blown it to hell and that the trial was a carefully rehearsed frame-up to implicate and discredit Trotsky.

At the Dewey Commission of Inquiry into the Moscow Trials, dozens of official documents were produced and numerous statements were made by well-known people not sharing Trotsky's political ideas, which completely blasted the statements of Pyatakov as lies.

As with Pyatakov, so with the other "witnesses" who "confessed" to being in touch with Trotsky. On every count, the confessions insofar as it was possible to test them, were demonstrated by the Dewey Commission as being fabrications and lies.

The final demonstration that the trials were a frame-up from beginning to end was given by the refusal of the Stalinist government to lay charges

The facts are that it was not Trotsky but Stalin who made such an agreement!

From 1931 Trotsky in article after article and in several pamphlets warned of the dangers of Hitler's rise. He advocated a united workers' front of the German Communist Party with the Social Democrats. But Stalin instructed the German Communist Party to have a united front with the Nazis, with Hitler, against the Social Democrats.

Pyatakov "confessed" that Trotsky informed him of extended discussions, he—Trotsky—had held with Hess. The facts are that it was not Trotsky but Molotov and Stalin who had extended discussions with Hitler and Hess. In the book "Mission to Moscow", under the date line November 14th, 1940, Davies wrote:

"Molotov and his staff of sixty-five in number left Berlin today after having had extended discussions with Goring and Hess and other industrial experts and after a second long conference with Hitler and Ribbentrop. The official communique gives no actual light on what occurred except that 'it led to agreement on all important questions of interest to Germany and the Soviet Union'."

Remember how Von Ribbentrop was feasted and wineed with his staff in Moscow when Poland was being carved up? Remember the beaming smile on the newsreels of that meeting. It was not Trotsky, but Molotov who said that "fascism is a matter of taste". It was not Trotsky but Stalin who said that the unity of Hitler Germany and the Soviet Union had been "sealed with blood."

So with every crime that Stalin has charged to Trotsky. It was precisely Stalin who carried out the crime.

Stalin charged Trotsky with advocating and carrying out acts of individual terror. The facts are that it was Trotsky who was murdered by an agent of Stalin—Jacques Mornard. It was the Stalinist together with the fascist

against Leon Trotsky with the Norwegian Government and demand his extradition which they could have legally done, and which Trotsky publicly demanded. Since this would have meant a public trial in a Norwegian court, Vyshinsky was unable to follow this course. Had the charges been genuine and backed with any evidence at all, what better demonstration could Stalin have given to the world working class, than to have had this proved by public trial in Norway? The failure to do so is the most convincing and damning proof of Trotsky's innocence and of Stalin's guilt.

The trials claimed to prove that on the basis of these incriminating witnesses and defendants that Trotsky had made an agreement with Hitler.

press who applauded Trotsky's assassination. So was Trotsky's son, Sedov killed by the assassins of the G.P.U.; so were 8 of his secretaries, one after the other. Not only Trotskyists, but Anarchists, Socialists of various parties have been victims of the murder machine of the G.P.U. **STALIN WAS THE INDIVIDUAL TERRORIST — NOT TROTSKY.**

At the trials, Trotsky was accused of wanting to bring the Kulaks once again into existence and to introduce various forms of capitalism into Russia—including the elimination of the State monopoly of Foreign Trade.

The facts are that it is Stalin who has introduced a class of rouble millionaires, farmers who are in essence Kulaks; it is Stalin who has increased wage differences to such an extent that the basis of a new ruling class is being prepared and who will be the fore-runners and proponents of counter-revolution; it is Stalin who is preparing to break down the barriers of State Monopoly of Foreign Trade in the interests of British and American imperialism. **ON ALL COUNTS STALIN IS GUILTY OF THE CRIMES HE ATTRIBUTES TO TROTSKY.**

The film is aimed against the revolutionary movement of the working class. It will assist the campaign of reaction which will be, and is being, directed against revolutionary workers particularly the Trotskyists, as "fifth columnists" in the coming period of class struggles.

There is an old saying among the British working class: when the boss pats our leaders on the back it is time to expect a stab in the back from the leaders. That is why this film has been produced: because Stalin and the national "communist" parties have long left the socialist path—have long been administering the stab in the back.

The workers must protest against this false film. If the capitalist get away with this, we can expect a flood of a similar type of reactionary propaganda films—glorifying the rich man who has a soul of gold, and vilifying the revolutionists who aim to change the social system.