

THE MANOUCHIAN AFFAIR

Two Articles, first published in French in
"Cahiers Leon Trotsky", No. 23, September 1985

The Former "Trotskyist" in the Manouchian Group

and

Behind the Manouchian Affair - A Generation Mised

Translated and re-published by John Archer

1 9 8 8

THE FORMER "TROTSKYIST" IN THE MANOUCHIAN GROUP

The public discussion about the Manouchian affair, which began with the Mosco film, brought out of oblivion one of the members of the group who has been presented as a former "Trotskyist" or as having claimed to be that. The Institut Leon Trotsky, the researchers from which have had the privilege of working in the files of Trotsky's correspondence at Harvard and those of his son Sedov at Stanford, think that it will be useful to turn over to the public domain the information which they have thanks to these archives, which particularly contain a certain number of letters by the person concerned.

Arben Abramovitch Day'tian (which is often wrongly transliterated as Tavitian) was born in Transcaucasia, at Choucha (Zannesur) on November 7 in 1895 or 1898. His father was a working mason and his mother worked at home. He had to earn his living from the age of fourteen, as a locksmith, a printer and finally as an engineer. He entered the Bolshevik Party in 1917 and joined the Red Army in 1918. He spent the whole of the war on the Caucasian front, at first as a simple soldier and later, after a course at a school, as an officer, and became responsible for a political department in his unit. In 1921 he entered the "apparatus" as an instructor and an organiser attached to the Central Committee of the Party in the Caucasus. In 1923 he was sent to the Communist University of Transcaucasia, where he reached the third grade in 1925, but shortly afterwards was excluded for his activity on behalf of the Left Opposition. He went back to his job in the apparatus, was in charge of agit-prop for a district, was later district secretary and finally entered the central apparatus. In 1927 he was one of those who spoke up locally for the Left Opposition, for which he was prevented from working in the Party and sent to work in the trade unions, where he became president of the local workers' committee of railwaymen. At the end of 1927 he was excluded from the Party at the same time as most of the known Oppositionists, and lost his job. He was arrested on September 24, 1928 for his activities as a "Bolshevik-Leninist" at the same time as a number of other Armenian militants, and remained in the hands of the GPU at Eriwan until the end of the year, when he was transferred to Tiflis and then to Akmolinsk, where he met members of the Left Opposition from different regions. On January 22, 1931, he was arrested with all the others in the colony at Akmolinsk, and transferred to the jail at Petropavlovsk, where the regime was hard, and was condemned to three years' imprisonment. After seven months there was an outbreak of typhus, and he was moved to the isolator at Verkhneuralsk, where he took part in the intense political life of the Bolshevik-Leninists in the colony, and later in the famous hunger strike. His name appears in the archives on the list of the prisoners at Verkhneuralsk belonging to the "Bolshevik-Leninist collective", which was sent secretly to Trotsky. He is number 41 in the list of 57 names. He sometimes refers in his letters to a "capitulation" which he regards as a mistake, but we have not been able to find out what form this took or when it happened. In 1934, probably in January, he was sent into exile -

what in those days was called deportation - to Andijan. It was from there that he decided to escape and to leave the territory of the USSR. He crossed the frontier very near to Megrinsk on July 19 or 20 1934, and was at once jailed by the local Iranian authorities.

This is the story which he told to Trotsky and Sedov of his life as an Armenian Soviet citizen. They were suspicious, but they could check in many ways what he said, because they knew many of the prisoners whom Dav'tian mentioned, the dates of their arrest and detention, the places where they had been imprisoned in deportation. Nor did they find any contradiction of consequence in the "biographies" which he apparently prepared at different times. In fact, what caused most anxiety to Trotsky and Sedov, when Dav'tian made contact with them was that he waited more than a year after leaving the Soviet Union to do so. During that time he had written his memoirs, which he entitled "In the Jails of Thermidor; he had associated with the Armenian colony in Iran where he got material help and had sought the means to get to Western Europe. He explained his silence on the ground that he did not know what had happened to Trotsky and Sedov.

As soon as the contact was made, while Trotsky and Sedov were carrying out the elementary steps necessary to verify his story, they insisted on getting from Tarov - which was now his pseudonym - un-ambiguous statements, particularly about the conditions of the repression. He did this especially in the form of an "Appeal to the World Proletariat" which was published internationally in the Trotskyist press. At the suggestion of Trotsky, the International Secretariat opened a subscription to pay for his travel to Paris - which was not to be possible for nearly two more years, because he did not arrive in Marseilles until May 24, 1937.

It is clear that he made contact with Sedov, with whom he had been in regular correspondence until then. Sedov arranged with Magdeleine Paz to approach the French authorities to make his position in France legal and thereby afford him some protection. It was thanks to her that he got a perfectly legal passport, completed in the name of Manoukian, which was to be his name up to the time when he was killed. Some days later, he made a declaration about the repression in the USSR to the Paris sub-commission of the Committee of Enquiry into the Moscow Trials, before which he appeared on June 12 and to which he presented materials which impressed its members. He found work, as a worker, and took part in the activity of what was called the "Russian Group" round Sedov and his friend and collaborator Marc Zborowski, who was not then known to be the agent whom Stalin had "planted" close to Sedov. Tarov quickly formed very bad relations with his emigre comrades. He complained especially that they refused to help him to correct and, possibly, to publish his memoirs, and then was angry when they tried to correct him on points of history. The question even came before the International Secretariat, which tried in vain to enable a compromise to be reached. Some months after arriving in Paris, Tarov distanced himself from the Russian Group.

On July 9, 1938, he was to write to Trotsky, some months after the death of Sedov: he could not put up with the atmosphere of permanent internal conflict - and doubtless of mutual suspicion in the Russian Group - and he spelt out what seems really to have been an attack on Zborowski:

"It wasn't their fault, but there was a strange element in our movement which, God knows with what object, has made its way into our milieu and into everything which it influences. I had warned Lyova. He was annoyed and even reproached me. I had to keep my distance already when he was still alive. Life has proved that I was right. Today I continue to distance myself from the "Bulletin"; I cannot do otherwise. With Lyova one could have discussions and disputes, but then we made it up and went forward on our road."

For all that, the Soviet militant had not broken with the Fourth International. Even though he believed that the latter was "in the hands of people who have a passion for palace intrigues", he hoped to play a part in the coming Congress which was being prepared, and he wrote to Trotsky. In fact, it was not he, evidently, but Zborowski who took part with a consultative vote in the foundation congress of the Fourth International, despite the suspicions which hung over him (expressed particularly by Naville). However, he succeeded in publishing in French "a contribution to the criticism of the action programme of the Fourth International", entitled "The Problem is - to see clearly". Very

soon he had no more contact with the comrades who had welcomed and materially helped him, and sought the company rather of circles in the Armenian emigration in Paris, having distanced himself from the nucleus of militants properly so-called. There it is likely that he met Manouchian, who was one of the most dynamic elements.

Nothing, absolutely nothing, from the side of the Trotskyists indicates that the decision by "Tarov" to join the militants of the M.O.I. (main d'oeuvre immigrée) and their armed struggle was accompanied by a revision of his political positions or particularly of his hostility to Stalinism. He broke with his French comrades in order not to endanger them, because he knew that he was engaging in an activity which would lead him quickly to his death. The hypothesis which is suggested by his French comrades' recollections and is corroborated by the foregoing is that he reacted as a soviet patriot (which he was) and that it was the Soviet Union and the October Revolution which he wanted to defend arms in hand and at the cost of his life against the hated Hitlerites.

Some provisional hypotheses?

1. There is no serious reason to think that "Tarov" could have been mixed up in the assassination of Sedov. We know that it was covered from the side of the GPU by an infinitely better placed agent, obviously Zborowski.
2. The content of his complaints against the "Russian Group" and the way in which he distanced himself from it do not in the slightest resemble the behaviour of an 'agent'. They are those of a man of difficult temperament and of frequently surprising reactions, which Sedov particularly found 'trying', an impression which agents generally do their utmost to avoid giving.
3. The questions which arise seem to us to do so for the period in which we lack documents. Who was it who recruited the "ex-Trotskyist" Tarov to the F.T.P. * M.O.I. group? What precisely did anyone know about his past at that point? What price, if any, had he had to pay?

Let us formulate prudently another hypothesis. If Manouchian had knowingly recruited an ex-Trotskyist and had concealed the fact, and thereby become his accomplice, would he have been outlawed by the apparatus?

But, once more, in order to answer these questions, it would be necessary, as Robrieux has remarked in each of his interventions, for those who have the information open their archives.

P. S. This article had already been drafted and set up when Philippe Robrieux sent us a copy of his article in Historama, "Who brought down Manouchian?". We fully concede to him that it is necessary to explain what Lissner says and the police reports about the arrest of "Tarov". None the less, these two sources are equally vulnerable, and a long enquiry would be needed to decide about the hypothesis which he advanced. On the other hand, we do not think that it would be right to write that "Sedov did not long survive his break with Manoukian"; it was Zborowski who was the source of danger to Sedov and there is no reason to suggest that anyone else was "guilty" or "implicated", in the present state of our knowledge of the death of Sedov.

BEHIND THE MANOUCHIAN AFFAIR:

A GENERATION MIS-LED

by Rene Revol

The polemic which has developed over the banning by one of the networks of Mosco's film, "Terrorists in Retreat" had has one merit, at any rate: facts which certain people have been straining for forty years to conceal or to mis-represent have now come out into the light of day. For years Stalinists, Gaullists and others have been doing their best to efface from history the role in the Resistance of foreign militants and, especially, Jewish militants. The struggle for the truth which certain witnesses and historians are carrying on today reveals that these men and women have not been eliminated merely from commemorative plaques, official speeches and the literature...

Many works have been devoted to them in recent years. We only wanted to notice them in this issue of the Cahiers when the affair of the film erupted and threw this literature into high relief. Louis Gronowski - Brunot (1) and Adam Rayski (2), leaders of the FTP - MOI, have recently published their memoirs. To these we should add the earlier memoirs of Melinee, the companion of Myssak Manouchian⁽³⁾ and of Claude Levy, a former resistance fighter in the FTP-MOI in Toulouse⁽⁴⁾. We can also add the evidence of Moshe Zalcman⁽⁵⁾ about Joseph Epstein, an FTP leader who was shot in 1944. Finally - without claiming to have exhausted the sources - we should not pass in silence over the work of Maurice Rajsfus, "L'An Prochain la Revolution. Les Communistes juifs immigres dans la tourmente Stalinienne 1930 - 1945", which relies on an abundance of documents and many statements by witnesses to retrace what he himself calls "A Generation Mis-led".⁽⁶⁾

The Emigres and the Communist Party

Since the beginning of the 1920's, Jewish worker-militants from Poland had been flowing into France, to get away from poverty, pogroms and police persecution. We find them organised in trade unions, in the occupations at which they excelled, forming their sections and publishing their own newspapers in Yiddish. They also joined their own parties. The Bund felt very serious competition from these emigres, because they flowed into the ranks of the Communist Party. They were up-rooted, they were particularly sensitive to internationalism and they were fascinated by the October Revolution. Gronowski and Rayski have described the movement of this generation which grouped round the "Jewish Sub-Section", and formed one of the language groups of the M.O.E. (main d'oeuvre etranger) which became the M.O.I. (main d'oeuvre immigree). There were disciplined people. As Trepper mentions (appropriately quoted by Rajsfus) they had enthusiastically participated in "cleaning-up" the Jewish milieux, especially of "Trotskyist" influences⁽⁷⁾. None the less, they came under suspicion at the time when the French Communist Party was wrapping itself in the tricolour and had re-discovered the Marseillaise. Apparently the Jewish sub-section was dissolved in March 1937. A great many of its members were at the fronts in Spain at that time. (8). In the statements which Rayski made to Rajsfus - in which he was more out-spoken than in his own memoirs - he particularly mentions Spain and the necessity to maintain an "unbroken" front, in order to justify the attitude of those militants who were condemned, like Charles Rappoport, the Moscow Trials in 1938, at the time of the trial of Bukharin. Gronowski writes: "Rappoport was right, and I feel ashamed whenever I think over this period".⁽⁹⁾

The Hitler - Stalin Pact

The Jewish Communists felt the signature of the German - Soviet Pact on August 23, 1939 very deeply, and M. Rajsfus notes that even today their leaders "have still hardly got over the blow".⁽¹⁰⁾ They knew that their backs were against the wall, that they were the outcasts of Europe. Inside the Communist Party they accepted the pact when it was presented as a manoeuvre, but they crowded the army recruitment offices. Former members

of the International Brigades even joined the Foreign Legion. Rayski, in Naie Presse for September 4, called for struggle against Hitler "by the side of the French people" and said not a word about the Pact. Moreover, relations with the immigrant organisations were broken off, on the initiative of the Communist Party, as Gronowski, who was in charge of the M.O.I., gives us to understand. All these militants, who had driven out the Trotskyists, had approved the extermination of the Old Guard and had fought in Spain, where the party assured them that they "were continuing the battle of Verdun, were overwhelmed by the pact, isolated from their party, astonished, when they read L'Humanite, to see that it was not attacking Hitler. They remained loyal to their party, but at the same time they constructed clandestine systems for mutual help and support, but also fighting groups, in order to be ready when the time came.

Already they were surprised in October 1940 by not receiving any directive from the PCF, which had resumed contact with them in August 1940, in connection with the requirement that Jews had to register at the police station in the district where they lived. After May 14, 1941 and the arrest and deportation of several thousands of Jews, these militants went underground and prepared for action, in which some of them were already taking part in the strike of the miners in the Nord and Pas-de-Calais. On June 22, 1941, when the news came that the Wehrmacht had attacked the Soviet Union, we can assert, the men of the M.O.I. were ready to fight, more so than the PCF and more so than Stalin, who at first refused to believe the news. The first blows, in summer 1941, were struck by them.

The F.T.P. - M.O.I. in the War

The F.T.P., "Franc-Tireurs et Partisans", were formed at the beginning of 1942. They were under the command of Charles Tillon (10a), and included armed action groups in Paris and in most of the large cities. It is very likely that at that time the great majority of the groups came from the M.O.I., and from then on were called M.O.I. - F.T.P. Maurice Rajsfus thinks that they were organised "before even the slightest directive had reached them from the leadership of the PCF, which will still be hesitating about what forms of activity to undertake" (11). The same historian notes the discretion of Charles Tillon about the preponderant role of the fighters of the M.O.I. and goes on:

"Most of the official historians of the French Communist Party who deal with the struggles of the Resistance experience the same lack of memory about those whom, no doubt, they regard as supplementary, about whose existence, struggles and sacrifices little needs to be said."

There were four detachments of F.T.P. - M.O.I. from March 1942 onwards in the Paris region, and then, after the wave of repression in March 1943, there were two; the people who sabotaged the railways, led by the Rumanian Jew, Bocsov, and the guerilla fighters led by the Armenian Manouchian and the Polish Jew, Rayman. They developed rapidly in the provinces: the 35th Brigade at Toulouse, the Carmagnole at Lyon, Liberte at Grenoble and Korzec at Marseilles. It was these groups of foreigners who in 1942 and 1943 carried out about 80% of the armed actions and acts of sabotage which the F.T.P. can claim credit for.

Roger Pannequin, the former commandant of the F.T.P. in the Department of the Nord, is a witness on this point:

"It was truthfully for narrow nationalist reasons that the special features of immigrant groups were suppressed. This enabled an 'F' to be put on at the end of F. T. P. to make them into the Franc-Tireurs Partisans Francais. In fact the F.T.P.F. never existed. The extra 'F' never came along until after the Liberation, when they wanted to show that they were good nationalists. It was then that the names of those who had done the biggest jobs were expunged... When they needed something sensational to announce, it was the lads of the M%O%I% whom they sent to get killed.... It was to get forgotten the treachery, the un-admitted policy of collaboration (though real) with the Nazis, that they gave the order in 1942 to go into battle heads down and carried out the most insane missions, with the immigrants out in front." (12)

Here we touch the heart of the problem. Communists and Jews, former fighters in Spain,

always believed that they must fight against Nazism and that it was their lot to be the first to do so. They did it with all the greater determination if, at the same time, they were defending the Soviet Union in danger. But could they be French "patriots". Obviously not! To the chauvinist orientation of the PCF and the notorious headline in L'Humanite "To each his Boche", there was counter-posed the shouts of those who were being shot, "Long Live the German Communist Party", as well as the last letter of Manouchian: "I declare that I have no hatred for the German people". It is equally significant that the amnesty of the official and dutiful historians of the PCF has extended to another of the activities of the immigrants in the Resistance, the T.A., otherwise known as the "Travail Allemand" or "German Work"; that enterprise of demoralising the German army could have drawn close to the "propaganda of fraternisation" which the Trotskyists carried out by the Trotskyists and which was cynically exploited to present them as "Hitlero-Trotskyists".

The immigrant militants in the M.O.I. detachments were caught in a terrible contradiction. For them, the struggle of the moment against the brown masters of Europe was the same as the struggle for the liberation of mankind from all oppression, but they were carrying that fight on under the leadership of a party which prevented them from fighting and disguised them as "patriots"; all the evidence, even that from those who are still linked to the PCF, bear witness to this contradiction and to the awareness which they had of it. Can we doubt the state of mind of the M.O.I. fighters of the Manouchian group, when we know that they welcomed into their ranks, knowing fully what they were doing, the former officer of the Red Army, the engineer A. A. Dav'tian, who had escaped from the USSR, who had been in the prison at Verkhneuralsk, a militant of the Left Opposition in the USSR and then a member of the "Russian Group" of the Fourth International, known as Tarov and executed under his false identity as Manoukian? (13)

Is there a "Riddle of the Red Poster"? (13a)

In his book, which was published at the beginning of 1985, Adam Rayski talks about the "riddle of the red poster". The least we can say is that, following up the efforts of Melinee Manouchian, Philippe Robrieux, Maurive Rajsfus, M. A. Burnier, Luis Gonzales Mata and others, and especially thanks to Mosco's film which stayed suppressed for so long, this "riddle" is no longer a riddle at all. None of Marchais' bellowings can silence the truth. In two words, what do we know?

1. The F.T.P. M.O.I. Group which Manouchian and Rayman led was the only one to remain inside Paris in summer 1943: the leaders of the PCF had decided to send most of their other units into the "maquis". There remained in the cities only the survivors of the immigrant groups, which none the less they flung into spectacular activities intended to demonstrate that "French patriots" were active.
2. When they felt the police grip closing on them, the immigrant fighters demanded to be redeployed in the large cities in the Southern zone, where, where they could protect themselves within their own communities. The Jewish group of Rayski began by being refused, and then was authorised (14). To the demand from Manouchian, the secretariat of the PCF refused, through the intermediary of the the military leadership which directly controlled the Manouchian Group through the leadership of the M.O.I. The order was transmitted to the Manouchian Group by a certain "Roger": "if anyone abandons their work, they will immediately be regarded as deserters".(15). They were then sent on missions of every increasing danger. Manouchian, speaking about the party leaders, said to Melinee, "I believe that they want to send us to our deaths". In his last letter, just before he was executed, he made it clear:

"I pardon all those who have done me hard or have tried to do me harm, except the one who betrayed us to protect his own skin and those who have sold us."

3. "The one who betrayed us". Everyone agrees to point to "Albert", that is, to Joseph Dawidowicz, even though we have had to wait more than forty years for him to be anything more than an initial. This was a former militant in the XIth district, who was appointed by "Roger" as "political commissar" with the M.O.I. Many of the militants - and especially Rayski and Manouchian, came into conflict with him, because of the brutality which was usual with him and also because of his methods. He was arrested in Oct

ober 1943, and it was learned soon afterwards, through a policeman in the Resistance, that he had given some names. Rayski was informed. But the information never reached Manouchian. Joseph D., when he was freed, led Manouchian into a trap. Why was Manouchian not warned? Some days later, the leaders of the M.O.I. arranged a meeting with Joseph D. to which he came without Gestapo protection - which is again something inexplicable - and they executed him (16). Was this just treachery? No. L'Humanite for May 14, 1985, which blames him for the destruction of the Manouchian Group, still is playing with his memory: "This man, who had had the courage to engage in the struggle in the shadows, was to crack". And why did this man, when he cracked, give only names such as those of Epstein, Manouchian, of M.O.I. people and more M.O.I. people - but not the names of other leaders, such as "Roger" and others, whom he knew well?

4. "Those who have sold us" (17). According to Tomasina, who was in the same cell, Manouchian, who told him the name and the role of the "political commissar" Albert, formally accused "Roger" of sharing the responsibility. Who is Roger? Did he act alone? Why is he still "under cover"? There are people who believe that these questions should not even be asked. Gronowski is silent. Rayski avoids any investigation and stays with Albert. Resistance personalities favour history being censored, and oppose the film being shown on television, considering the questions which Mosco poses to be "defamatory" (18). Stephane Courtois, whose contribution in Le Monde seems at first to be open to enquiry and reflection, comes down in the end on the repression, the treachery of Joseph D. and the imprudence of the fighters (19).

Finally, two hypotheses have been advanced. Philippe Robrieux formulated in 1984, in volume four of his "Inside History of the PCF", relying on known materials, and on the contradictions in the memoirs of Jean Jerome and the evident fabrications which they contain, that "Roger" was Jean Jerome. The latter has not brought a legal action for defamation against him. In June, M. A. Burnier and Luis Gonzales Matta, in Actual - soon to be supported by the evidence of Melinee Manouchian - suggest the name of the Rumanian Boris Holban, formerly a general for Ceaucescu (20), who denies that he was in Paris on the date in question. In each case, whether "Roger" is Jean Jerome, or is Boris Holban or is a third person, it is clear that he did not commit a purely personal act of "betrayal", but was simply obeying his orders when he "abandoned" the fighters (21).

5. There was not just one "Manouchian affair". Perhaps it is the "red poster", the real one, which appeared before the other one came out of the shadows where it would probably have remained. Claude Levy has told, in "The Pariahs of the Resistance", the tragedy of the "35th Brigade" of Toulouse, which was launched into a series of operations following the execution of its leader, Marcel Langer, who was abandoned by his superiors in the hierarchy, who treated its members as "provocateurs" and did not inform them of the traps which the police were preparing for them, about which all the Resistance movements were informed. M. A. Burnier and Luis Gonzales Matta accuse lieutenant-colonel Casimir Lucibello of the break with these young fighters; he denies this (22). A serious enquiry would doubtless show that, in the course of the last months of the Occupation, nearly all the groups of the M.O.I. got themselves caught in this way, in circumstances in which their pursuers seemed to know all about them.

Can we be surprised at the Manouchian affair, whoever "Roger" might be, or at the Toulouse affair - was it Lucibello or not? The GPU, or, if you prefer it, the secret services of the USSR were not absent from either the FTP or the leadership of the PCF. We know that, when it was necessary, they never hesitated to get the task of purging the ranks carried out by others (23). And were not these same M.O.I. fighters who survived persecuted, spattered with mud and massacred in the countries of Eastern Europe during the 1950's. The bashfulness of the gentlemen in the "juries of honour" is surprising, to say the least.

What was the Cause?

In 1943 the balance of the war had swung. In Italy the fascist regime fell. The De Gaulle Government was installed in Algiers. The Communist International was dissolved. Stalin was getting ready for the end of the war and the re-establishment of the order which required that those who had thought they saw the revolution outlined through the Resistance should be crushed. The PCF was a decisive element in this plan, a force of

order for the re-establishment of the bourgeois state on its feet in France. The policy of class collaboration, the alliance with De Gaulle, required that the M.O.I. be liquidated, as well as these foreign militants whose heroism and activity in the armed resistance could tarnish the tricolour image of the PCF and even give standard-bearers to movements which tended to go beyond the framework of the restoration. Already in 1939 - 40 Stalin had handed over to the Gestapo German Jewish Communists. He would not be concerned that Jewish resisters were handed over at the moment when the sacred union was realised and in its name. Mr. Rajsus writes:

"Definitively, if we put on one side the methods used in one and the other case, these betrayals, which co-incided with the discussions preceding the entry of the French Communists into the Algiers Government, were in the end neither more reprehensible nor more surprising than the acceptance of the German-Soviet Pact... In the end, the name of the person who set up this rather less than distinguished operation of the Communist Resistance is relatively secondary, because any cadre of Stalinism - sufficiently motivated - would be able to take charge of such a mission." (24)

Moreover the operation covered a period of years. According to Rayski, a directive from Jacques Duclos laid down that the role of the Jewish resisters was to be minimised; in September 1944 Leon Mauvais advised them to "efface" it; from 1945 onwards the books of "history" either francised or suppressed the names of emigres; the 1951 edition of "Letters of Those who were Shot" issued by the PCF did not include that of Manouchian; it was necessary to wait until 1955 for Aragon to "celebrate" Manoucnian - who had not deserved that.

While Robrieux continually repeats that the PCF should open its archives, many others act and talk as if they were deaf to so elementary a demand. Claude Bourdet denounces "an anti-communist coalition" - where he does not forget to detect the hand of "Trotskyists" - which is said to be continuing to repeat the propaganda of the Nazis and insist that Jews and foreigners played a large role in the Resistance(25) These are strange things to say. But likewise there are strange silences. There is that of Gronowski who does not say a word. There is that of Rayski, who said more to Rajsfus than he did to his readers, to whom Stephane Courtois pays the compliment of being "the only responsible person who today accepts disclosing his confidences without reticence", even while Mme. Kriegel in Robert Hersaut's Figaro assures us that he "is putting in their place the outrageous proceedings and the inconsistent fabrications which are fashionable today"!(26). Has neither one nor the other of them remarked how "discretely" he passed over his own condemnation for espionage in France in 1959? The witnesses have certainly not told all, but isn't it time that some people, who claim to be professional historians, should choose between what remains of their Stalinist self-assurance and the scrupulous search for a truth which cannot please everyone?

Today we are no longer in 1936 or in 1943. The 1950's are behind us. The truth can no longer be suppressed. But the search for truth continues to be a struggle more necessary than ever - an integral part of the struggle for the liberation of humanity (27).

N O T E S

- (1) "Le Dernier Grand Soir" (Le Seuil, 1980)
- (2) "Nos Illusions Perdus" (Ballard, 1985)
- (3) "Manouchian" (Editeurs Francais Reunis, 1974)
- (4) "Les Pariahs de la Resistance" (Camlan-Levy, 1970)
- (5) "Joseph Epstein - Colonel Gilles" (La Digitale, 1984)
- (6) "Le Devoiement d'une Generation" (Aux Editions Mazarine, 1985)

- (7) Rajsus, op. cit., p. 40. On the Trotskyist Jewish Group, which produced the journal Klorkeit, and on the circumstances in which it dissolved itself, see Leon Trotsky "Oeuvres", Vol. 2, July - Oct. 1933, p. 170.
- (8) Especially in the Jewish brigade known as Dombrowski in the Botwin Company.
- (9) Gronowski, op. cit., p. 89.
- (10) We may take note that, in 1985, the question of the German-Soviet Pact was such a burning one that, in the televised discussion which followed the screening of Mosco's film, in opposition to Roger Pannequin, everyone flew to defend the representatives of the PCF, up to and including M. Chaban-Delmas, who said: "The German-Soviet Pact - everyone regrets it. So don't let's talk about it any more".
- (10a)* Charles Tillon was born at Rennes in 1897. He worked as an engineer and joined the French navy in 1916. He was one of the leaders of the mutiny on the battleship Guichen in 1919, for which he was sentenced to five years' hard labour and deported to Morocco. After returning to France, he was first elected to the Central Committee of the PCF in 1931. As a leading trade unionist, he was elected as a Communist deputy in the National Assembly for Aubervilliers, a seat which he held until 1955 from 1936. In April 1939 he was held with the last of the Spanish Republicans by the fascists at Alicante. He organised the armed struggle against the German forces of occupation and their Vichy-ite collaborators, as commandant-in-chief of the National Military Committee of the F.T.P. up to the Liberation. In September 1944 he joined the Government as Minister for Air, becoming Minister for Armaments in 1945 and for Reconstruction in 1947.
- (11) Rajsfus, op. cit., p. 177.
- (12) Statement to Rajsfus, op. cit.
- (13) The statements of Arben A. Dav'tian (known as Tarov) were, like those of Ciliga, among the first to provide information about the camps and Stalinist repression. They were to form the basis for the campaigns of solidarity with the internationalist militants in the USSR, which the Trotskyists carried on who particularly assisted Tarov.
- (13a)* The "Red Poster" was published and exhibited by the anti-resistance forces in France. Above pictures of ten foreign resistance leaders, it put the question, "Are these people liberators?", and below, as the picture shows, it read "Liberation by the Army of Crime?", conveying the impression that the resistance was an affair conducted by "un-patriotic" foreigners. See next page.
- (14) Rayski, op. cit.
- (15) Manouchian, op. cit.
- (16) "Albert" was formally interrogated before he was executed. A record of the examination was made. Who is concealing this document?
- On the other hand, there are several facts which discredit the hypothesis that the sole cause for Manouchian's death was that he was denounced by "Albert".
- First of all, who denounced "Albert"? Secondly, he was not arrested until October 26; he could not, therefore, have then supplied information which enabled the whole Manouchian Group to be tracked down and caught from the beginning of the month onwards. There must have been at least one betrayal or leakage earlier.



- (17) Charles Lindeman, a PCF Senator, claimed in the discussion on July 2, that when "when Manouchian wrote, on the eve of his death, about 'those who have sold us'", he meant the men of Vichy. But, as Philippe Robrieux has noted) Manouchian turned to the Germans and said to them in effect, "I do not hate you", and then to the French police, to say, "You have sold your souls to the Occupiers". He did not say, "You have sold us". That would be trying to prove too much. And, in that last letter, unlike the others who were jailed with him, Manouchian made no claim to belong to the party, of which he had for years been a member.
- (18) Le Monde, June 15, 1985.
- (19) Ibid. June 2 - 3, 1985
- (20) Some, such as A. Adler in Le Matin, content themselves with presenting Holban as just an ordinary retired engineer; they forget to ask him about the evident freedom with which, in our time, he travels between France and Rumania.
- (21) Other questions remain to be elucidated in this connection. Is there an "Epstein mystery? Everyone repeats the PCF version about him, without discussing it. He does not figure in the list of the sixty-six arrests. Moreover, neither Epstein nor Manouchian are mentioned in an underground L'Humanite report. In the film, Holban mysteriously declares that "Epstein was already liquidated when Manouchian was arrested", but this contradicts the entire version of the arrest. The mystery is about a man who belonged to the secret apparatus in Spain and who, it seems, had his doubts about the German-Soviet Pact. But, finally, let us take note of the fact that, before he was arrested, he was living with the sister of Ramon Mercador. (From correspondence with Phillippe Robrieux).
- (22) Actuel, June 1985. Lucibello is National President of the Association of Former Comrades of the Resistance.
- (23) A recent book, "Service B", by the two journalists Roger Faligot and Remi Kauffer (Fayard 1985) sheds some light on the GPU presence in the F.T.P. They assemble, among other matters, a whole collection of facts which tend to prove that part of the leadership of the F.T.P. in Lyon was practically handed over to the

Nazis.

- (23a) See note (10a) above. Charles Tillon has recently published three books inspired by his "difficulties" with the PCF of which he was for so long a leading cadre. These are: "Les F.T.P.", (Juillard, 1962 and 10/18, 1971): "La revolte vient de loin", (Juillard, 1969), an autobiography: "Un Proces de Moscou", (Seuil, 1971).

In "Le Proces de Moscou a Paris", Tillon devotes a good deal of space to the witch-hunt of which he and Andre Marty were the victims in the PCF in 1952, in passages which indicate the suspicions which appear to have been already formed in the international Stalinist apparatus of those whose revolutionary enterprise, they might fear, could lead them outside the limits of the "line", that is, of Stalin's policies.

- (24) Rajsfus, op. cit., p. 226.

- (25) Interview in Le Matin, June 13, 1985. However, this did not prevent Rouge from presenting Claude Bourdet as the central figure in a discussion on the Manouchian affair. a discussion in which there was no one, with the exception of M. Rajsfus, to say to him in reply: "The Manouchian affair has to be studied under a magnifying glass, in the context of what the Communist movement has been since the 1920's, when we have had sixty years' political gangsterism, enbroidered with disgraceful events like these and even worse... to the point of political assassinations like that of Trotsky in 1940. We can understand nothing of the whole business, if we do not understand that we have there the context of the Manouchian affair."

- (26) Figaro, April 16, 1985

- (27) The struggle for the truth about this affair is always a matter of concern when we see the considerable forces which have applied themselves to "surrounding" the screening of the film with a press-campaign and a discussion which have no aim but to suppress the evidence and the facts which Melinee Manouchian has produced and which the other witnesses and historians have brought out into the light of day. L'Humanite hammered away day after day, but its good faith was suspect. The front line was held by Figaro, Annie Kriegel, Gaullist personalities, Alexander Adler in Le Matin, Rayski and Holban himself. From this point of view, the "discussion" reached the peak: there were three official representatives of the PCF, supported by Chaban-Delmas and Pineau; Roger Pannequin was thus carefully isolated, because they refused to invite either Mosco or Melinee Manouchian - even if we do not mention the strange personage who presented himself as Manouchian's former bodyguard, whom no one could remember and who, it was discovered - the following day - is employed as an orderly at the Soviet Embassy in Paris.

The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that every entry should be supported by a valid receipt or invoice. This ensures transparency and allows for easy verification of the data.

Furthermore, it is noted that the records should be kept in a secure and accessible format. Regular backups are recommended to prevent data loss in the event of a system failure or disaster.

In addition, the document highlights the need for consistent data entry. Standardized formats and codes should be used throughout the system to avoid confusion and errors. Training for staff on proper data entry techniques is also essential.

Finally, the document stresses the importance of regular audits. Periodic reviews of the records help to identify any discrepancies or anomalies early on, allowing for prompt investigation and correction.

The second part of the document provides a detailed overview of the system's architecture. It describes the various components, including the database, the user interface, and the reporting modules. Each component is explained in terms of its function and how it interacts with the others.

The database is designed to store all transaction data in a structured and efficient manner. It supports complex queries and reporting, allowing users to analyze the data from multiple perspectives.

The user interface is designed to be intuitive and easy to navigate. It provides a clear and concise way for users to enter data, view reports, and manage the system.

The reporting module generates a variety of reports, including daily sales summaries, monthly performance reviews, and detailed transaction logs. These reports are essential for monitoring business performance and making informed decisions.