

Anatomy of an Incompetent and Dishonest Trotskyite Attack

A Critique of Doug Greene’s Review of Furr and Bobrov, *Trotsky’s Comintern Conspiracy*

Grover Furr

On December 3, 2024, the online Trotskyist journal “Firebrand” published a very negative review¹ by Doug Enaa Greene of the book by myself, Grover Furr, and Vladimir L. Bobrov, titled *Trotsky’s Comintern Conspiracy. The Case of Osip Pyatnitsky*. Kettering, OH: Erythrós Press & Media, LLC, 2024. This response is by Grover Furr.

Introduction

Doug Greene thinks that confession evidence is not good evidence because confessions can be faked. He quotes the statement in our book *Trotsky’s Comintern Conspiracy* that *all* evidence can be faked. This is a true statement. But Greene ignores – or wants his readers to ignore – the fact that *all* evidence must be corroborated, checked against other evidence.

Greene does this because he would like to dismiss the conclusion of our book – that Leon Trotsky was indeed conspiring with the Nazis and Japanese, as well as with his own secret followers in the USSR, with Rightists like Nikolai Bukharin and Aleksey Rykov, and with German agents and home-grown fascists.

Greene ignores – or wishes his readers to ignore – the fact that Trotsky himself never cites evidence for many of the claims he himself made during the 1930s. In other books I have demonstrated with evidence that

¹ At <https://firebrand.red/2024/12/the-inquisition-with-footnotes-grover-furrs-stalinist-conspiracy-theories/>

in his writings in the 1920s and 1930s Trotsky lied to an extent scarcely imaginable.²

Stalinist?

Greene calls me a “Stalinist academic.” Admittedly, the ending “-ist” can be purely descriptive. The word “Trotskyist” denotes followers of Leon Trotsky, and they accept this term. However, Joseph Stalin has been demonized to the point that calling someone a “Stalinist” is an insult – unless the person describes himself as one.

I am not a Stalinist, however that word is defined. I do not “defend,” much less “apologize for,” Stalin. Likewise, I do not defend the Soviet Union. The term “Stalinist” suggests a parallel with “Trotskyist.” Trotskyists treat Trotsky’s writings as unquestionably true. You will seldom – if indeed ever – read critiques of Trotsky by Trotskyists. This is the sign of a genuine cult.

The second reason I reject the term “Stalinist” is this: I do not treat Stalin’s writings like Trotskyists treat those of Trotsky. I strive to discover the truth.

For more than two decades I have been searching for real, provable crimes by Stalin. I have yet to find even one. I intend to keep on searching. If and when I find a provable crime by Stalin I will certainly publish about it. No Trotskyist can make such a claim with respect to their “hero.”

² See Trotsky's “Amalgams”: *Trotsky's Lies, The Moscow Trials As Evidence, The Dewey Commission. Trotsky's Conspiracies of the 1930s, Volume One*. Kettering, OH: Erythrós Press & Media, LLC, 2015; *Leon Trotsky's Collaboration with Germany and Japan: Trotsky's Conspiracies of the 1930s, Volume Two*. Kettering, OH: Erythrós Press & Media, LLC, 2017; *New Evidence of Trotsky's Conspiracy*. Kettering, OH: Erythrós Press & Media, LLC, 2020; and the chapter “Trotsky on the Testament” in *The Fraud of the 'Testament of Lenin'*. Kettering, OY: Erythrós Press & Media, LLC, 2022.

For many years I have been researching every “crime” of which Joseph Stalin has been accused, using primary source evidence from former Soviet archives. Whenever I discover that some accusation against Stalin is false I publish that result. At that point those who are displeased with my conclusion –Trotskyists and pro-capitalist anticommunists -- attempt to dismiss my research by the logical fallacy of *ad hominem* attack known as “name-calling” as Doug Greene does in this essay.³

Examining Greene’s Essay

Greene claims that I “cherrypicked data” and use “crude falsehoods.” But he fails to cite a single example of cherry-picking or falsehood in my works.

Evidence

Greene accuses me of having no evidence. Obviously, he either believes or wishes that this were true. But it is not true. Our book cites many, many pages of evidence – statements and confessions by Pyatnitsky and by his co-conspirators.

However, Greene himself makes numerous fact-claims without evidence. Here is one example:

Soviet leader Joseph Stalin initiated a series of public show trials to eliminate his political competition within the Communist Party

Did he? Where’s the evidence? Greene cites *no* evidence that this was the purpose of the show trials. He can’t, because there isn’t any. I have studied the Moscow Trials for years in great detail. One of my books is titled *The Moscow Trials as Evidence*.

³ See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Name_calling#Common_misconceptions

Greene's claim here is the logical fallacy of "begging the question" -- assuming that which should be proven. For a good description of this fallacy see the Wikipedia page.⁴ Yet Greene accuses me of using logical fallacies even though he does not cite a single instance where I do.

Here is another example of Greene making a fact-claim without evidence::

Under threat of execution, leading Bolsheviks confessed ...

But **Greene cites no evidence** that any defendant confessed because he was threatened with execution!

I have been searching for such evidence for more than 20 years. Anticommunist and Trotskyite "scholars" have every incentive to find and publish such evidence. But none has come to light.

Therefore, Greene is "bluffing" his readers. Or, in plain language, lying to them.

Greene continues:

After Nikita Khrushchev's "secret speech" denouncing Stalin's crimes in 1956, and especially after the opening of the Soviet archives in 1991, the old narrative about the trials has largely been discredited.

Here too Greene cites no evidence to support this claim. And no wonder -- his statement here is false.

* In his "Secret Speech" to the XX Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on February 25, 1956, Khrushchev hinted that

⁴ At https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Begging_the_question

the executions of the Moscow Trials defendants may have been unjust. He cited no evidence that this was so.

In my 2011 book *Khrushchev Lied* (Russian edition, 2007) I proved -- with evidence -- that not a single accusation of Khrushchev's against Stalin in the "Secret Speech" is true.

* Greene's statement about "the opening of the Soviet archives in 1991" is false.

A few archival documents began to be published even before 1991. But it was not until the end of that decade and the beginning of the '00s that the publication of documents from former Soviet archives became a flood. These documents tend strongly to confirm the guilt of the Moscow Trials defendants.

For decades I have been searching for, identifying, locating, obtaining, studying, and drawing conclusions based on these documents. This primary source evidence has completely overturned the accusations against Joseph Stalin made by Leon Trotsky and by generations of Trotskyists and professional anticommunist historians.

Greene claims that I have no proof ("For Furr, the lack of proof becomes the best proof possible ..."). This is another falsehood. Our book has close to one hundred pages of evidence of the Trotskyite conspiracy inside the Comintern and its links to the military conspiracy known as the Tukhachevsky Affair and to the defendants in the Moscow Trials.

Greene says:

Furr cannot substantiate these fantastic charges with physical evidence from the Soviet archives or anywhere else.

False again!

* Greene does not seem to realize – or, at least, does not want his readers to realize – that “fantastic” is not a statement about the charges. It is a statement about Greene himself – *he* considers them “fantastic.” But what he, or I, or anyone thinks is irrelevant. Only *evidence* is relevant.

* Documents are physical objects. Right? (They aren’t “imaginary” so they are physical, i.e., material objects.) And we have an enormous number of them..

Greene then says:

As he readily admits: “No documentary evidence of collusion with Soviet conspirators, including Leon Trotsky, has been found in the prewar archives of Germany and Japan.”

He then states the following:

Yet this does not deter Furr, since he argues that the lack of physical evidence and documentation merely proves how effective the “Trotskyite–Fascist” conspiracy was in covering their tracks: “All vital information would exist only in the minds of the participants. In fact, if such incriminating documents were found, the mere fact of its existence ought to raise suspicion of fakery!”

Greene omits the passage in our book that precedes this statement. This is a quotation from an article by Russian historian Yuri N. Zhukov in the leading Russian historical journal *Voprosy Istorii* of the year 2000 on the “Kremlin Case,” a conspiracy that came to light in 1935. I reproduce this passage in full below.

Of course, the lack of evidence in this hypothesis should be alarming. Direct or indirect [evidence], but irrefutable. And for this reason, **we must resolve the question of whether there is evidence at all in such cases.** Could it have been obtained during the investigation of the “Kremlin case”, and

if so, what kind? Plans to arrest members of the top [lit. the “narrow”] leadership, a list of members of the future Politburo and government, anything like that? Or lists of conspirators, certified by their signatures? Or maybe declarations, decrees, public announcements prepared in advance for announcement immediately after the seizure of power? **Hardly! because any normal conspirator preparing a *coup d'état* would do everything possible to avoid the existence of this kind of evidence.**

Greene also omits these passages below:

“Most conspiracy theorists don't understand this. But if there really were a C.I.A. plot, no documents would exist.”

- Gerald Posner, “author of an anti-conspiracy account of the Kennedy assassination, on efforts to obtain C.I.A. documents relating to the assassin.” Quoted by Scott Shane, “C.I.A. Is Still Cagey About Oswald Mystery.” *The New York Times* October 17, 2009, Section A p. 11

“Instructions on concrete organization questions regarding preparation for underground conditions must be given only verbally. . . At the very least it should have been specified that these names and addresses be given strictly orally ... “

- O. Weber. “How Not to Prepare For Underground Conditions of Revolutionary Work.” *The Communist International*. July 1, 1932, 417.

Greene continues:

If foreign powers were funding a “Fascist–Trotskyite” conspiracy, then what would the paper trail realistically look like? Did the

conspirators hold their own conferences? Did they have orders? Did anyone write their memoirs? Where are the receipts listing the funds they received to conduct espionage, assassination, and wrecking? **No physical proof was provided in the Soviet courts that allegedly verified this vast conspiracy.**

Greene is either ignorant of the facts – in which case he has no business writing about them – or he lying to his readers again. For physical evidence was indeed produced by the prosecution in the Moscow trials.

Here are a couple of examples. First is an exchange from the August 1936 Trial between the prosecutor, Andrei Y. Vyshinsky, and defendant Valentin Ol'berg:

Vyshinsky: Permit me to show this: is this the passport? (The commandant of the Court presents the passport.)

Ol'berg: Yes, that is the one. It really was issued by a real consul in the name of the Republic of Honduras. (English transcript, p. 89).

The second example is an exchange between prosecutor Vyshinsky and defendant Stroilov at the January 1937 Moscow Trial..

Next, please hand to the accused Stroilov this black book. (Stroilov is handed a book of an office journal type in a black binding.)

What is that black book?

Stroilov: It is my diary.

Vyshinsky: Where did you keep it?

Stroilov: I kept it while I was abroad.

Vyshinsky: In what year?

Stroilov: All the time I lived there.

Vyshinsky: Is it in your handwriting?

Stroilov: Everything here. . . .

Vyshinsky: Please look first, do not take it for granted.

Stroilov: Everything here is mine.

Vyshinsky: Yours?

Stroilov: Yes.

Vyshinsky: And is the meeting with Wüster and Berg recorded in your handwriting?

Stroilov: All this was written when I was in Germany, and when I returned to the Soviet Union I continued it probably for about two months. That was already here in the Soviet Union.

Vyshinsky: When did all this happen?

Stroilov: In 1930-31.

Vyshinsky: And it was then that you wrote it?

Stroilov: Immediately.

Vyshinsky: Very well. Let me have that book back again.

This book has been attached to the files as material evidence.

I request the Court to look at page 23, which contains a reference to the meeting with Berg; page 27, which contains a reference to a conversation with Berg; page 37, which contains a reference to a letter from Wüster; page 33, which also contains a reference to Wüster; page 35, which contains a reference to Wüster; page 43, which contains a reference to Sommeregger. The character of these meetings and conversations was explained to you by the accused Stroilov yesterday. I want to draw your attention to the fact that these meetings are confirmed in the diary of 1931.

Stroilov: Of 1930 and 1931. (English transcript pp. 272-273)

So “physical proof” of the conspiracy was indeed presented at the Moscow Trials. (Of course confessions, once transcribed, are also “physical proof.”)

Greene then insists that evidence of the conspiracy with Germany and Japan should have been found in the archives of these countries.

Nor was anything uncovered in the archives of Germany and Japan. The German authorities were noted for meticulous record keeping, so it is reasonable to assume they would have left proof in

the archives. In that case, why didn't Soviet researchers find any after occupying Germany in 1945?

Here Greene is wrong in several ways.

* He ignores the conclusion of Yuri Zhukov and the two statements about conspiracies that I have quoted above. In short, no written records should be expected.

* Like courts of law, historians decide guilt or innocence based on the evidence that *is* available, not on what is *not* available.

* Greene gives no example from anywhere of archival evidence of such a "paper trail" -- the planning of a conspiracy by the conspirators *before* the conspiracy was either successful or was stopped.

Neither the assassins of Julius Caesar nor those of Abraham Lincoln left a "paper trail." Here are a couple of more recent examples:

* Lavrentii Beria was either arrested or killed at a meeting of the Presidium⁵ of the CPSU on June 26, 1953. Afterwards, several participants recorded their versions of this event. (These versions do not agree – but that is another matter.) So we have evidence of the conspiracy *after* it took place – just as we do in the case of the Rightist and Trotskyite conspiracies.

But there is no evidence from the former Soviet archives of this conspiracy *before* it took place. The only document we have from the Presidium meeting where this arrest / murder happened is a draft agenda by Georgii Malenkov stating that Beria was to be removed from heading one ministry and appointed to head another. Nothing about arresting him, let alone killing him.

⁵ The Politburo was renamed Presidium in October 1952.

* In October 1964 Nikita Khrushchev was removed from the position of First Secretary of the CPSU by Leonid Brezhnev and others as a result of a conspiracy that had begun by March 1964 if not earlier. Once again there are no written records of this conspiracy *before* it occurred.

* In the case of the Trotskyite military conspiracy known as the Tukhachevsky Affair we do have some indirect evidence in a Czech archive *before* or *during* the conspiracy, and from a German source *after* the conspiracy. I refer the reader to our book on the Tukhachevsky Affair.⁶

Greene then writes:

For Furr, the lack of proof becomes the best proof possible, with which we can prove the existence of Santa Claus and angels alongside a “Trotskyite–Fascist” conspiracy.

But Greene is misleading – that is, lying to his readers. There is plenty of testimonial proof in the confessions of the guilty and in the accusations of their confederates.

Greene admits this:

That means the only evidence available to Furr are confessions. In fact, close to half the book is composed of lengthy transcripts of interrogations and confessions from Soviet police archives. He [Furr] believes that Pyatnitsky freely confessed his guilt and that no torture or physical coercion was employed by the NKVD, the Soviet secret police, to produce false testimony.

There is no *evidence* that Pyatnitsky was coerced into confessing. What Greene, or anyone else, “believes” is irrelevant.

⁶ Grover Furr with Vladimir L. Bobrov and Sven-Eric Holmström, *Trotsky and the Military Conspiracy. Soviet and Non-Soviet Evidence with the Complete Transcript of the “Tukhachevsky Affair” Trial*. Kettering, OH: Erythrós Press and Media, LLC, 2021.

Then Greene attempts to claim that confession evidence should be considered invalid. He writes:

This contradicts the evidence we possess from the Soviet archives. The collection *Road to Terror*, edited by J. Arch Getty and Oleg V. Naumov and first published in 1999, provides ample details. For example, the NKVD authorized quotas for mass arrests in July 1937.

Yezhov did this. Note, however, that the first two Moscow “show” trials had already taken place, in August 1936 and January 1937. So there can be no question of a “contradiction” as regards these two trials.

Second: Stalin and the Politburo set *limits*, not quotas – maximum, not minimum – numbers for arrests. NKVD chief Nikolai Yezhov illegally ignored this order.

In April 1939 after his arrest Yezhov admitted this and the torture and execution of persons he knew to be innocent. I have discussed the so-called “Great Terror” – a term that responsible researchers reject – and Yezhov’s own conspiracy in my book *Yezhov vs Stalin. The Truth about Mass Repressions and the So-Called ‘Great Terror’ in the USSR* published in 2016. For an older account that does not have all the primary sources available in 2016 see my article “The Moscow Trials and the “Great Terror” of 1937-1938: What the Evidence Shows,” and the numerous confessions of Yezhov and his men reproduced there.⁷

None of Yezhov’s victims were defendants in the Moscow Trials or, as far as we know today, involved in the Trotskyite conspiracy in the Comintern which is the subject of our book. See more below, about Mikhail Frinovsky.

⁷ At https://msuweb.montclair.edu/~furr/research/trials_ezhovshchina_update0710.html

Greene writes:

While it was true that the defendants at the Moscow Trials were not physically tortured — this would have made the frame-up too obvious — they were still under threat. They lived in a society where torture of suspects was pervasive and families were threatened.

Another lie by Greene! For he has *no evidence* that the trials were “frame-ups.” This is the logical fallacy of “petitio principii” or “begging the question,” of *assuming* that which must be *proven* – with evidence.⁸

The phrase “under threat” are “weasel words,”

... a word or phrase aimed at creating an impression that something specific and meaningful has been said, when in fact only a vague, ambiguous, or irrelevant claim has been communicated.⁹

Why? Because *all* arrested persons are “under threat” in one way or another. But that does not invalidate every statement they make.

Yezhov and his men tortured many persons they arrested as a part of Yezhov’s own conspiracy. This became known to investigators only after the fact. I have reproduced and discussed the evidence of this in *Yezhov vs Stalin*.

As for “families were threatened” – again, what is Greene’s *evidence*? He does not mention even a single example. Does he know of one? If so, why not cite it?

⁸ See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Begging_the_question

⁹ See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Weasel_word

I have been researching these matters for many years and have never come across a single example. So this is yet another “bluff” – i.e. lie – by Greene.

Greene continues:

Despite Furr’s claims, documentary proof of frame-ups does cast suspicion on confessions.

This is doubletalk. Does Greene mean that a single case of “documentary proof” of a “frame-up” invalidates *all* confessions? He has just quoted me as follows:

Knowing that he has no certainties, nor a “smoking gun,” Furr states that there is no such thing as conclusive proof since any evidence can be forged or faked, making it unreliable: “As always in the writing of history our conclusions must be provisional. Historians do not deal in ‘certainties.’ As more evidence comes to light in [the] future, we must be prepared to adjust or even discard our earlier conclusions.”

This is true. In research, as in detective work, there is no such thing as a “smoking gun” – meaning, evidence that is conclusive in itself, has only one possible interpretation. *All* evidence can be interpreted in multiple ways. Therefore all evidence, including evidence from confessions, requires corroboration.

Greene does not even try to refute this statement. Instead, he sidesteps the whole issue. The fact is that *confessions are no more and no less valid as evidence than any other kind of evidence*. All evidence has to be checked and corroborated.

We have a great deal of evidence of the Trotskyite conspiracy with Germany and Japan. I have discussed much of it in my books on Trotsky. There is nothing to refute it.

Greene writes:

This raises another issue about the confessions: their lack of corroborating evidence ... In both the Moscow Trials and Furr's work, no form of corroborating evidence is provided at all.

Greene appears to believe – incorrectly – that the statement of one conspirator cannot be considered corroboration of the statement of another conspirator. This is false. Then Greene states:

For instance, the confession of a suspect to multiple murders is only valid if they can show where the bodies are buried.

This is nonsense. No such rule of evidence exists or could exist. Greene has invented it and is trying to foist it off on his readers.

Greene then adduces a quotation from Nikolai Bukharin in the 1938 Moscow Trial. But he completely misconstrues it by omitting important parts of it. Here is more of Bukharin's statement (his entire statement is very long). I have put the part that Greene quotes in **boldface**.

I shall now speak of myself, of the reasons for my repentance. Of course, it must be admitted that *incriminating evidence* plays a very important part ... The point, of course, is not this repentance, or my personal repentance in particular. The Court can pass its verdict without it. **The confession of the accused is not essential. The confession of the accused is a medieval principle of jurisprudence.** But here we also have the internal demolition of the forces of counter-revolution. And one must be a Trotsky not to lay down one's arms. (English transcript pp. 777-778)

Bukharin said that one of the “very important” reasons for his confession was “incriminating evidence.” At the February-March 1937 Plenum of the Central Committee Bukharin said that he had received copies of

dozens of statements accusing him – that is, confessions against him – by his accomplices, including more than 20 on a single day.

All the “incriminating evidence” Bukharin refers to was accusations against him made in confessions by his co-conspirators. Bukharin recognized – as Greene does not – that these confessions were strong evidence against him.

Faced with so many accusations by his friends and co-conspirators Bukharin realized that denial was futile. The same was true of Osip Pyatnitsky, as Vladimir Bobrov and I show in *Trotsky's Comintern Conspiracy*.

Greene then says:

In addition, Furr states that no frame-up was involved because Stalin sincerely believed there was a conspiracy.

Greene is lying. We never make or imply this absurd statement.

It is the case that there was *both* a serious Trotskyite-Fascist conspiracy *and* that Nikolai Yezhov, pursuing a conspiracy of his own, beat, framed, and executed many innocent people.

In his confession statement of April 11, 1939, Mikhail Frinovsky, Yezhov's second-in-command, both exposed Yezhov's conspiracy *and* confirmed the guilt of the Moscow Trials defendants. In 2010 I put Frinovsky's statement on the web, in both the original Russian and in English translation.¹⁰

Meanwhile, in private letters exchanged in invisible ink and available in the Harvard Trotsky archive, Trotsky himself and his son Leon Sedov

¹⁰ English translation at <https://msuweb.montclair.edu/~furr/research/frinovskyeng.html> Russian original at <https://msuweb.montclair.edu/~furr/research/frinovskyrus.html>

discussed the “bloc” between the Trotskyite and Rightist conspiracies – a bloc that Trotsky always denied.¹¹

Ivan Nikitich Smirnov, leader of the Trotskyist underground in the USSR and a defendant at the August 1936 Moscow trial, wrote to his daughter that the Trotskyite underground really was connected with the Nazis.

In my last word, I said this to all the wavering Trotskyists. We must disarm decisively and quickly ... Keep in mind that **the Gestapo men who figured in the trial were not front men, but real, clever fascists. Whether TROTSKY wants it or not, his periphery has become intertwined with the Gestapo.**

In one of the articles in the Bulletin¹² he [Trotsky] really did write: "STALIN must be removed." What does that mean? **He really did give GOL'TSMAN¹³ the order for me to commit a terrorist act. He [Trotsky] has reached a dead end,** and our young people must get out of it as soon as possible.¹⁴

Greene claims:

Furr's effort to reconcile Yezhov versus Stalin with the narrative of the Moscow Trials has no basis in historical fact.

How does Greene know what the “historical facts” are? *What is his evidence?* He doesn't know, and has none. Evidently Greene hopes his readers -- at least his Trotskyist readers -- will not notice.

¹¹ See the three letters translated into English at <https://www.marxists.org/archive/broue/1980/01/bloc.html> and

¹² The *Bulleting of the Opposition*, Leon Trotsky's newsletter after his exile from the USSR in February 1929.

¹³ Another defendant in the August 1936 trial.

¹⁴ I.N. Smirnov to his daughter Ol'ga I. Smirnova, August 23, 1936. At <http://showtrials.ru/predsmertnye-pisma-i-n-smirnova-zhene-m-g-korop-i-docheri-o-i-smirnovoj/>

Greene continues:

Furr's attempt to construct conspiracies within conspiracies is built on faulty premises and internal inconsistencies. In the end, his entire narrative of Soviet history cannot be squared with reality.

What "faulty premises" and "internal inconsistencies," Doug? You haven't identified any.

And what "reality?" To establish facts, you need *evidence* and you have none. You haven't established any facts at all. Without facts "reality" has no meaning.

Greene:

Since Furr has no coherent evidence at all, he strains to make a case that cannot be made ... the mountain of data does not prove his central argument that Pyatnitsky was involved in a vast conspiracy.

False. The confessions of Pyatnitsky are corroborated by the confessions of many of his co-conspirators. In turn, Pyatnitsky confirmed their confessions and gave details of the conspiracy that only one of its leaders could know.

This included knowledge that Trotsky was working with the Nazis and Japanese, and that Pyatnitsky himself was stealing funds from the Comintern and sending those funds to Trotsky. This money – US\$15,000 a year for several years -- was supposed to go to workers struggles and against colonialism worldwide.

The case that we make is indeed "coherent." The evidence we present documents a serious Trotskyite-Nazi conspiracy within the Comintern. The confessions are mutually corroborative.

Greene ends with four paragraphs of insults and the false claim that he has refuted our conclusion. He writes:

However, the mountain of data does not prove his central argument that Pyatnitsky was involved in a vast conspiracy.

Greene hopes his readers will believe this. No doubt his Trotskyist readers will *want* to believe it.

This is the logical fallacy of “Confirmation Bias”:

... the tendency to search for, interpret, favor, and recall information in a way that confirms or supports one's prior beliefs or values. People display this bias when they select information that supports their views, ignoring contrary information, or when they interpret ambiguous evidence as supporting their existing attitudes. The effect is strongest for desired outcomes, for emotionally charged issues, and for deeply entrenched beliefs.¹⁵

In our book we prove beyond any doubt that, according to the available evidence, Pyatnitsky was not just “involved” but was one of the leaders of this dangerous Trotskyite conspiracy that included, among other serious criminal acts, collaboration with the Nazis and Japanese.

Trotskyites Are Not Marxists

Trotskyists, like Doug Greene, claim to be Marxists. But they are not Marxists at all. Why? Because Marxists are materialists. Materialists decide the truth or falsehood of statements not on belief or “faith” in “great leaders” like Jesus Christ or Leon Trotsky, but on *evidence*. But Trotskyists “believe” Trotsky and “disbelieve” the mountains of evidence of Trotsky’s crimes.

¹⁵ See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Confirmation_bias

Trotskyism is a true cult because Trotskyists reject any and all evidence that their hero, Leon Trotsky, having lived many years as a socialist and then as a communist, during his last years collaborated with the Nazis, Japanese, German agents, and home-grown fascists against the Soviet Union.

To the extent that a person is a Trotskyist, that person is not a Marxist. Trotskyists' rejection of objectivity poisons the search for the truth about the successes and failures of the Soviet Union.