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.

Read the “SOCIALIST APPEAL” 2d.

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.

Price One Penny
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 the voice of 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 swallow "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.

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 unconscious section of the working class will see this false film. Despite the healthy skepticism 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.

**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 usually cost a few months' pay, which was luxury for a couple of weeks. In his diary, Davies wrote:

"Lay Henderson met us at the border town of Negoreleyo. 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 Bull's advice was helpful in every way, and particularly very sound in suggesting that we bring a supply of foods."

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

- Don't eat 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.

**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..."

The Soviet bureaucrats admitted that the occasion was dramatised for propaganda purposes. It was designed: first, as a warning to all existing and potential plotters and conspirators (read political oppositionists to Stalin) within the Soviet Union; second to discredit Trotsky abroad; and third, to solidify popular national feeling in support of the Government against foreign 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 action was disapproved by the producer. The fantastic nature of the trials would have been too obviously exposed had they been shown separately. Yukovenko, as the chief of the G.P.U., was responsible for bringing the alleged "terrorists" and "15 columnists" to book in the first two trials. But he was himself a "terrorist" at one time, Tukachevsky, shown in the film was implicated in one of the public trials and was most carefully exonerated by the state press (the Yezhov). 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 actually 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 rifles, to gifts of Hitler under the leadership of Trotsky. Vysinsky, the prosecutor, ex-Menshevik who opposed the Bolshevik Revolution, shows himself a defender of the workers' conquests. Tukachevsky, the outstanding military leader of the Red Army for years, is shown mounting 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 1919 and received a book of marks 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 Seecett 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 received 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 film? Why, when 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. Rosengoldt "confessed" that he had been an agent of the British Secret Service since 1926! Rakovsky "confessed" that he had been
an agent of Britain since 1924! Khedjyev, "confessed" that Bukharin stressed the need to make connections with England, as from the standpoint of the "Fifth Column"... "the most feared enemy of the state and the protectorate..." And so on, and so on.

If the section of the confessions which "proves" these men to be paid agents in the pay of British imperialism are rejected by ex-Ambassador Davies and Byrnes, 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 extracted under torture. 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 Pyatakov stated that in December 1935, he went to Germany where he met an agent of Trotsky who "urged..." Pyatakov to 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 located.

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 Göring 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 wined with his staff in Moscow when Poland was being carved up? The newsreels show the sumptuousness 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 committed the crimes.

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 facetist 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. No Trotskyites, but Anarchists, Socialists of various parties have been victims of the murder machine of the G.P.U. STALIN WAS THE INNOCENT 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 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 forerunners and proponents of counter-revolution in the near future, are attempting to break down the barriers of State Monopoly of Foreign Trade in the interests of British and American imperialism, under the cloak of "stalinizing the countryside."

There is an old saying among the British working class: when the boss puts our leaders on the back-burner 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 some of the working class administering the stab in the back.

The workers must protest against this false film. If the capitalist gets 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.