ILWU Officers' Statement
On the Frameup Verdict

SAN FRANCISCO—The officers of the ILWU, President Harry Bridges, First Vice-President J. R. Robertson, Second Vice-President Germain Bulcke and Secretary-Treasurer Louis Goldblatt, issued this statement April 4:

The official verdict of guilt found last week in the Federal Court, sounds an alarm that must be answered at once and vigorously by the membership of our Union, and by all workers on land and sea everywhere.

The three officials of our Union were tried in an atmosphere of bitter hostility and at a time of H-bomb hysteria. They were guilty, not of what the jury found, but guilty of leadership in a militant union which can be judged by its great advances.

The immigration service openly and unashamedly admitted that it sought to remove the influence of the three defendants from labor and unhesitatingly intimated that it was willing to use any means, fair or foul, to achieve this.

No Word of Censure to Perjurers

The service admittedly paid and bribed professional witnesses. These paid professional witnesses, perjurers and trained stoolpigeons uttered the most fantastic lies in the court, and though they were trapped in those lies, they were allowed to depart without so much as a word of censure.

Prosecutors were permitted to inflame the basest prejudices and argue openly to the jury that the activities and program of the defendants and their union were dangerous to the nation's security.

It was not accidental that the only worker called on the jury panel, who was Ed Johnson, an old-time longshoreman who had been through all the struggles, was dismissed by the court as being incapable of fairly judging the issue.

ILWU Savvies How Men Are Bribed

Our union savvies the nature of labor frameups. Our union savvies liars and perjurers. Our union savvies how men are bribed. Our union savvies how agencies of the government are able to intimidate and corrupt ordinary citizens.

This fight has but begun and is not lost. Every battle into which our Union has entered has looked tough and progressive. In this case, the court failed to do its job and then allowed the defendants to depart without a word of censure.

They Who Are Bribed

We call upon all men and women who work for their living, on docks, on ships, in mines, in factories, or offices, and all professionals and intellectuals who value their rights as American citizens to rally now and turn the tide before they are themselves engulfed by the forces that thrive upon political and economic bondage.
HE GOT CITIZENSHIP — Henry Schrimpf, the walking boss, ran into no difficulties getting his own citizenship, though he's an admitted ex-communist. He's borne a grudge against Harry Bridges ever since Bridges had him fired off the Local 10 labor relations committee for drunkenness and accused him of taking $10,000 a year from the shipowners.

SEDUCED—Nineteen government agents worked on John H. Schomaker, the laughing hodcarrier of Menlo Park. They even baby sat for him. His testimony was a high point in Schomaker's life, but Longshoreman B. B. Jones refuted it. "Schomaker is a Goddamn liar," Jones told the jury. Schomaker had a better memory for events in 1933 than in 1949.

LITTLE OLD LADY — That's how Prosecutor F. Joseph Donohue defended Mrs. Irene Patti Harris. She testified Bridges told a room-full of people to join the Communist Party back in 1938 when he was already facing deportation. She couldn't remember what happened the week before she testified. The Hearst press said she was a "trial bombshell."

ONCE INTIMIDATED — The Immigration Service had something on Polish-born Lawrence Ross. He'd been living a lie, posing as a native-born American, the son of a Kentucky planter. The prosecution tried to get him off the stand before the defense brought out his lies, but he finally confessed. He pointedly didn't repeat the Central Committee perjury.

"ALL REDS" — Stanley Hancock didn't know all the people at a San Diego meeting in 1935. That didn't stop him from testifying they were all members of the communist party. Under cross-examination Hancock told about some bitter strikes and broken heads in the Imperial Valley in the thirties. He admitted all the workers weren't communists.

MISSING RECORD — The government never produced all the documents on Law Michelle's War Labor Board employment. Michener is an admitted ex-communist and was convicted of bootlegging in the war, things the government is usually interested in. Michener testified he consulted with UAW President Walter Reuther's brother before deciding to stool.

The Fight Is Not Over; Militant Unionism Will Win

(Continued from page 1)

San Diego: "This local still 100 per cent behind all three."

NOT HOW WE SEE IT

"The verdict is not the way we see it." President Clyde Munger and Secretary Ray Keenan of the Columbia River District Council telegraphed the presidents of the four Hawaii ILWU locals, Longshore Local 136 President Harry Kamakau, Sugar Local 145 President Antonio Rania, Warehouse Local 150 President Ernest Arena, and Pineapple Local 152 President Takeo Furukawa, and Regional Director Jack Hall.

NOBODY SAFE

No person is safe in hysteria-guided America today," they said. "We can only hope for justice in the higher courts. The Hawaiian membership will be behind you in your appeal." The membership of Local 46 in

(Continued on Page 6)

Here's the Gallery of Rats and Perjurers

Bought—Mervyn Rathborne, got more than $5,000 for his testimony. His record includes constant drunkenness and a burglary conviction, expunged the shipowners.

Professional — Manning Johnson makes a living traveling around the U. S. testifying for the government, mostly against aliens. He's been caught in perjury before, and this time he outdid himself with testimony that Bridges was elected to the Central Committee of the Communist Party in New York on a date Bridges was proved to be in Stockton, Calif.

Proved Perjuror — Not only is Paul Crouch a proved perjuror, he's "obviously an innocent man," said Hallinan. Crouch got fouled up with Johnson's alibi along with Johnson. His credibility was not enhanced by his testimony in previous hearings that he'd seen Bridges only at public meetings, not being elected to that Central Committee.

Confessed — The Immigration Service had something on Polish-born Lawrence Ross. He'd been living a lie, posing as a native-born American, the son of a Kentucky planter. The prosecution tried to get him off the stand before the defense brought out his lies, but he finally confessed. He pointedly didn't repeat the Central Committee perjury.

Once Intimidated — The Immigration Service had something on Polish-born Lawrence Ross. He'd been living a lie, posing as a native-born American, the son of a Kentucky planter. The prosecution tried to get him off the stand before the defense brought out his lies, but he finally confessed. He pointedly didn't repeat the Central Committee perjury.

"All Reds" — Stanley Hancock didn't know all the people at a San Diego meeting in 1935. That didn't stop him from testifying they were all members of the communist party. Under cross-examination Hancock told about some bitter strikes and broken heads in the Imperial Valley in the thirties. He admitted all the workers weren't communists.
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The Defense Witnesses Had The Courage To Tell The Truth and Withstand The Prosecution’s Anger

By JEAN BRUCE

SAN FRANCISCO — The defense in the trial of Harry Bridges, J. E. Robertson and Henry Schmidt met the prosecution head on and emerged unscathed.

It was never a passive defense: often it angered the prosecution which found itself challenged at every turn, its witnesses’ lives exposed, its case constantly needling bolstering by more lies.

Chief Prosecutor F. Joseph Donohue took his anger out on the defense witnesses as well as on the defendants and their lawyers.

He went so far as to accuse the shipowners who testified to the court that Bridges’ career was a goddamn liar. — Here he was confronted with the surprising verdict.

Father Paul Melicke, a Catholic priest, probably disturbed Donohue more than any other character witness, with his flat statement: “This is a great difference between militant unionism and communism. Harry is a militant trade unionist. He is no communist.”

Father Paul disturbed Federal Judge George B. Harris too. He asked: “Have you had a medical examination lately?” It is unusual for a judge to question a witness in such a manner.

RESPECTED, SOLID

Respected, solid labor men testified to the good character of the defendants, San Francisco Supervisor Dewey Maud, long active in the AFL. Construction tradesman, Daniel F. Del Carlo, a representative of the AFL, Construction Trades Council, Gus Gaynor of the Railway Clerks, Frank Andrews of ILWU Local 47 in Oakland, WASH., who is active in the American Legion.

Dr. Leo Emlen, the world’s famous surgeon, had known Bridges for years; Reverend Edward L. Peet of the Mill Valley Methodist Church was well acquainted with Robertson’s reputation for truth, honor and integrity.

Bridge’s good reputation for truth, honesty and integrity of selling their souls for a dollar of profit. He asked Willie Christensen when he went to Russia.

COURAGE NEEDED

Some of the defense witnesses had to have courage to withstand the prosecution, like Walter Buck, a director of the defense to say he remembered seeing Bridges in a night club the evening of his wedding. He volunteered to testify.

Kirk Clagston, a construction man in San Francisco, was an usher at the Lee wedding. He had a very clear memory of the incident because one of the longshoremen with Bridges made a remark about the wedding guests being attired in tails. Another longshoreman qualified this and a wedding guest said: “That’s all right, I borrowed my suit from the undertaker.”

Robert Sawyer, another wedding guest, noticed that Bridges even looked at the immigration service got in touch with him before the defense even knew about the marriage.

SHAPING DESCRIBED

Henry Schmidt and a solid Bridges remembered the Stockton speech themselves. Bridges and Schmidt along with Robertson, not only refused every item of the prosecution’s case, they told the jury plenty about unionism and its history.

Much of the testimony was in refutation of Schomaker, the only witness who swore that Bridges signed a Communist Party card and paid dues.

Bridges and Schmidt showed that the 1934 strike was run by the strike committee, not the Communist Party as alleged by Schomaker. They testified that the Alien Halt Group, which Schomaker held was started by order to the Communist Party, was organized months before Schomaker ever hit the waterfront.

Schomaker said he was on the waterfront in October of 1932 and called on Bridges then. James J. Ryan, personnel officer of the Veterans Hospital in Palo Alto, identified Schomaker as still working at the hospital on October 20, 1933. Aubrey Lee, a real estate man, had known Bridges for years; Reverend Edward L. Peet of the Mill Valley Methodist Church was well acquainted with Robertson’s reputation for truth, honor and integrity.

No one had expected a conviction. Perhaps the jury was testing the prosecution in every objection and overruled the defense every objection, and who frequently put his own opinion before the jury in aids and loaded questions, added his own peculiar cruel touch to the climax by sentencing Defense Chief Vincent Hallinan to an additional six months in jail for alleged contempt of court and his associate, James Martin, to three months in jail. He was only kind enough to order that Hallinan’s two six month sentences be served concurrently.

A FRAMED CASE

The sentences meted out to the two defense attorneys were obviously in retaliation for their daring to put up a vigorous and magnificent fight against the frameup.

The jury refused to tell the press immediately after the verdict what had happened as to their deliberations or the number of ballots taken, although as was to be expected it later leaked to the daring press of the framers, namely the Hearst papers.

THE FRAMEUP STICKS

In this respect the least press furnished the tipoff to the poisonous character of the whole sordid deal. It quoted “37-year-old juror No. 7, John J. Carey, as saying: “I believe we have arranged a ballot on Bridges just a few minutes after starting deliberations, but it wouldn’t have looked right.”

It was a framed case from the word go and framed right up to the final verdict. It now rests with the American people to decide whether the frame shall continue in higher court.

Bridges has three before been cleared of the charge on which he now stands convicted. He has been acquitted of the charge on which the government blanks require such information.

There was the refutation of Mervyn Rathbun by Bridges and Robertson and Betty Teixeira and Jean Murray.

In fact every prosecution witness was sworn by one or more of the defense witnesses to be a liar or definitely suspect of being subject to pressure and intimidation and/or the inducement of a payoff by the government.

Typical of the newspapermen covering the frameup trial were Henry Wings of the San Francisco News, shown above perusing a paper, and Dick Pearce of the Examiner, just waiting for the verdict.

Hysteria Serves The Frameup

(Continued from page 1)

The jury filed into the courtroom. No one had expected a conviction. All had expected that at the worst, there would be a hung jury.

There had, however, been some hint of conviction the night before when Bridges walked into the courtroom to ask for clarification and instructions on the consecu-

ance count of the indictment, for without finding the defense guilty of the conspiracy that would hardly be point in finding them guilty of conspiracy to com-

mit the crime.

Judge George B. Harris, who almost unanimously ordered every objection to the prosecution in every objection and overlooked the defense every objection, and who frequently put his own opinion before the jury in aids and loaded questions, added his own peculiar cruel touch to the climax by sentencing Defense Chief Vincent Hallinan to an additional six months in jail for alleged contempt of court and his associate, James Martin, to three months in jail. He was only kind enough to order that Hallinan’s two six month sentences be served concurrently.

The sentences meted out to the two defense attorneys were obviously in retaliation for their daring to put up a vigorous and magnificent fight against the frameup.

The jury refused to tell the press immediately after the verdict what had happened as to their deliberations or the number of ballots taken, although as was to be expected it later leaked to the daring press of the framers, namely the Hearst papers.

THE FRAMEUP STICKS

In this respect the least press furnished the tipoff to the poisonous character of the whole sordid deal. It quoted “37-year-old juror No. 7, John J. Carey, as saying: “I believe we have arranged a ballot on Bridges just a few minutes after starting deliberations, but it wouldn’t have looked right.”

It was a framed case from the word go and framed right up to the final verdict. It now rests with the American people to decide whether the frame shall continue in higher court.

Bridges has three before been cleared of the charge on which he now stands convicted. He has been acquitted of the charge on which the government blanks require such information.

There was the refutation of Mervyn Rathbun by Bridges and Robertson and Betty Teixeira and Jean Murray.

In fact every prosecution witness was sworn by one or more of the defense witnesses to be a liar or definitely suspect of being subject to pressure and intimidation and/or the inducement of a payoff by the government.

Typical of the newspapermen covering the frameup trial were Henry Wings of the San Francisco News, shown above perusing a paper, and Dick Pearce of the Examiner, just waiting for the verdict.
Big Story

Newsman, radio reporters, photographers, newshams swarm around ILWU and Harry Bridges in the frameup trial in San Francisco. Tension reached breaking point just a few minutes before the shocking verdict was announced by the jury.

Fight Against Get Bridges' Drive To Be Broadened and Intensified

By William E. Dodd

SAN FRANCISCO—The fight for the brand of democratic trade unionism which Harry Bridges personifies, will go on, broadened and intensified until all the forces of reaction are licked.

Conviction of Bridges, J. R. Robertson, and Henry Sears by the Federal Court here April 4 points up the fury of the government's hysterical drive to silence the leaders who speak for the rank and file of American labor. It makes the rallying of all trade union forces in the battle, a task of the utmost urgency.

1934 STRIKE WON

This fight began in 1934 when West Coast maritime workers won a bitter strike against the entrenched industrial interests.

To understand how the previous persecution of Bridges' militant leadership connects with the current smear it is important to look at the history of the campaign to "get Bridges."

Militancy of the strikers—Bridges, the chairman of the strike committee—and the history-making gains won for union members instilled an undying hatred in the hearts of the industrialists and agents, who were the men who used the smear. Without the unity of the strikers. They determined from that time on to "get Bridges."

INVESTIGATIONS START

First efforts of these interests to pillory Bridges came at sessions of the House Appropriations Committee in the 74th Congress in 1936. Demands for an investigation were launched there inspired by private interests such as the California Department of the American Legion, the Portland, Ore., and Los Angeles police departments, the San Francisco Industrial Association, a notorious strikebreaking and labor spying outfit, the Associated Farmers, terrorist organization of the big farmers and agents of various utility, railroad and steamship companies.

As a result of "dependo's" by these private interests, the Department of Labor undertook an investigation. A memorandum report of its findings was made public February 28, 1936. It found that Bridges "was in the clear, and that his status as an immigrant was entirely regular."

In February 1936 Bridges him, 1940, to permit the Department of Labor to hold official hearings to determine once and for all his status.

WARRANT ISSUED

Shortly after, on March 2, 1936, the Labor Department issued a deportation warrant charging in effect that Bridges "had been a member of the Communist Party and that organization advocated the overthrow of the government by force and violence.

On June 12, the warrant against Bridges was amended to charge that he "was and is" a member of the Communist Party. James M. Landis, Dean of the Harvard University Law School, was picked to preside over the deportation hearing. The hearing began Thursday and San Francisco July 19, 1939. Dean Landis held that "the evidence therefore, establishes neither that Harry Bridges is a member of nor affiliated with the Communist Party of America."

CAMPAIGN GOES ON

As a consequence of Landis' decision the labor Department on January 8, 1940 cancelled the warrant of arrest and dismissed the charges.

But the enemies of labor did not cease their campaign of persecution, for almost immediately another Bridges trial began. A bill introduced by Representative Allen of Pennsylvania, was passed by the House on June 12, 1940, the sole purpose of which was to deport one individual—Harry Bridges.

Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, asked for his opinion on its constitutionality, called it a bill of attainder.

ANOTHER WARRANT

Later, Congress amended the U.S. Immigration Act, June 28, 1940, which made the deportation of an alien if he had been at any time affiliated with any organization advocating the overthrow of the government by force and violence.

A second warrant for Bridges' arrest was issued on February 12, 1941, to deportation Immigration Law. A second hearing was held in connection with the deportation March 31 to June 12, 1941, presided over by Judge Charles R. Sears.

Sears' finding was made on September 25, 1941, and in it he held that Bridges was guilty of membership in the Communist Party. This opinion, however, was overruled January 3, 1942, by the district court of revision on the ground that the record requires us to find that membership was a reaffirmation of the Communist Party or the MWIU has not been established.

TO SUPREME COURT

Attorney General Francis Biddle refused to agree with the recommendations of his own Board of Appeals and ordered the deportation of Bridges May 28, 1942. Appeals were taken through the lower courts but they all refused to order a rehearing of the case. Finally, on December 27, 1944, Counsel for Bridges filed a petition for writ of certiorari with the Supreme Court.

June 18, 1945, the Supreme Court reversed the lower courts and held the warrant for Bridges' deportation unlawful. In a concurring opinion, Justice Frank Murphy said that the deportation of Harry Bridges—Emerging from the fourth frameup machinery was oiled up immediately thereafter and on the backs of the work of friends, agents, stoolpigeons and intimi- dated members of the government held a club, a new gimmick.

NEW GIMMICK TRIED

On September 17, 1945, Harry Bridges took the oath of citizenship before Supreme Court Judge Thomas M. Foley in San Francisco. Character witnesses were J. R. Robertson and Henry Sears. The fourth frameup machinery was oiled up immediately thereafter and on the backs of the work of friends, agents, stoolpigeons and intimi- dated members of the government held a club, a new gimmick.

Waiting

The marbled halls outside the federal court in San Francisco were already thickening, but the frameup victims got used to them during the trial's four and a half months. Here Elinor Kahn, research director for the defense, chats with Defendants Bob Robertson in the center and Henry Schmidt on the right, before the verdict came in.
Waterfront Seethes With Anger Against The Raw Deal Verdict

By RUTH SUTHERLAND

Along the docks the men stood in little groups, talking in angry voices. In the gallery of the great President Wilson, just in from the Orient, the cooks and messmen exclaimed against the injustice.

The waiters in the magnificent dining room serving the last of the passengers—the bell boys, the firemen, the stewards, spoke as bitterly as the guards at the pier gates, the longshoremen unloading the vessel and the cab drivers lined up along the gate waiting for disembarcking passengers.

The verdict against Bridges, Robertson and Schmidt, in the previous day, Tuesday, April 4, had appalled the men who knew the reason for such a verdict and the meaning of such a verdict.

"It's a raw deal," said Roy Taylor, Local 10 member. "We all know the big money in this country is out to break the backs of the unions."

NONE WILL ESCAPE

Franke Verde and Ed Proutch, also of Local 10, paused in their work on Pier 44, to say no American would have a chance if the government could get convictions without evidence.

Felix Buda, Local 10, said he was sure the trial was unfair though he hadn't a chance to attend the sessions. "I know Bridges is innocence—he wouldn't be a fair trial!"

Two drivers were leaning against a Yellow Cab, talking about it.

R. Hoffman, one driver, observed that all the government witnesses were paid or testified under pressure concerning their citizenship.

"The government can make us all communists if they want to—except from Roosevelt to Bridges," he said.

TOO MUCH MONEY

"The trouble is," Hoffman continued, "there's too much money behind this deal to get Bridges. Every big mogul in the country is throwing in to the union because they think they have to break the unions.

"William Moore, the other driver, said the government would have a hard time to get him a job in the future after he was caught. Because his lineage runs back generations in the ILWU, he said, because they think they have to break the unions.

"Tootsie Mercer, steward, never saw such a jury," he said. "The judge was partial all the way through. He was obvious to everyone and then the jury must have been fixed up and unfair. That's all that matters."

The vote against Bridges, Robertson and Schmidt was 38 for the prosecution and 36 for the defense. The transcript of testimony alone covers some 8,500 pages, more than in any of the three previous Bridges trials.

"We got ourselves worked for nothing," said Belvin. "I never saw a fair trial."

"There is no jury to try a case like Bridges'—Robertson, Schmidt verdict was fixed up and unfair. I thought the jury must have been paid or testified under pressure.

"I can't say the government prosecuted Robertson and Schmidt to be dismissed," said Bill Zimmerman, on the Wilson. "It is 1 m, pantry cook, stepped from the pantry to ask if the reporter knew who "fixed" the jury the government gave the jury the same as they have given to their enemies for years."

"The Longshoremen are fed up with the government. They have been used against the government."

"The Longshoremen are fed up with the government. They have been used against the government."
179th Day

Defense Counsel James Martin MacInnis continued his closing argument.

MacInnis: "It Wasn't Fair; It Wasn't Clean; It Wasn't Good"

Here's the last installment of the Bridges' trial, which was held in the court of law from March 29 to April 7, 1950. The trial was held in the 23rd District Court of the United States, and the defendant was William S. Bridges, a labor leader who had been accused of subversion.

The trial was characterized by intense emotions and heated arguments, with both sides presenting their case with great vigor. The defense was led by Defense Counsel James Martin MacInnis, who delivered a powerful closing argument. He argued that the prosecution had sought to prove guilt by association, asking defense witnesses such questions as, "Did you visit the Soviet Union?" or "Did you go to the movie 'The Bridge'?" He dismissed the patriotism and its symbols, calling the attention of the jury to the embarrassing design of the court's ceiling, which includes the swastika and the fascist mace.

MacInnis argued that the government witnesses were not telling the truth and that the defense had raised doubts about their credibility. He presented his case with great emotion, stressing the importance of liberty and justice. He concluded his argument by saying, "It was not fair. It wasn't clean. It wasn't good."

The trial ended on April 7, 1950, with the jury verdict of not guilty. The verdict was a victory for the defense, which had argued that the prosecution had used tactics of guilt by association to smear Bridges and other labor leaders.

The trial was a turning point in the history of the Cold War, and it highlighted the use of tactics of guilt by association to smear political opponents. The verdict was a victory for the defense, which had argued that the prosecution had used tactics of guilt by association to smear Bridges and other labor leaders.

The trial was a turning point in the history of the Cold War, and it highlighted the use of tactics of guilt by association to smear political opponents. The verdict was a victory for the defense, which had argued that the prosecution had used tactics of guilt by association to smear Bridges and other labor leaders.
Defence Objects To Instructions Against Supreme Court

(Continued from Page 6) Bridges was not a member of the Communist Party.

IMPROPER ARGUMENT?

"Where's Walter Lambert and Slim Connolly and Jack Shaw?" he went on.

Because he thought them improper he read back to the jury some of the most effective words of Macinnis' argument. He accused Macinnis of appealing for one juror to hold out for the defence.

He read also Hallinan's moving peroration on how people all over the world "would ring bells and dance in the streets" in the event of an acquittal.

Donohoe denounced the World Federation of Trade Unions as "communist and atheist" and pointed out that Bridges was head of the maritime department of WFTU.

The last bullsawkh against the red wave is this blessed land of ours. Of course Bridges wanted to be one of us to destroy us," Mr. Bridges brags of his respect for the law. "You are the rank and file of America. You are the witnesses. Of course Bridges wanted to perorate on how people all over the years have been intimidated by the insurance service. You must ignore the contents of any questions to which we were committed or which has been stricken.

SUPREME COURT RULED OUT "I am informed that this case is now considered the longest in the history of this district.

I strove during the course of 1949, that Bridges was head of the maritime department of WFTU.

The court and you as jurors are the guardians of a great heritage... The federal courts throughout this country have been the bulwark of our democracy.

ENTITLED TO FAIR TRIAL

"The defendants deny they are or were members of the Communist Party. On the issue that Bridges is a member, eleven witnesses have testified. As opposed, the defendants have offered two witnesses besides themselves.

"You have exhibited great and abundant patience... I realize the toll on your physical, mental and emotional welfare.

"It is your duty to accept my instructions as I have given it to you.

"From time to time I cautioned the jurors on legal matters. At the conclusion so dear of the witnesses... I have tried to remain impartial and judicial. I believe I have done so.

"It has been my duty from time to time to reprimand counsel, to instruct the jurors, also, to ignore the fact that a civil suit against Bridges looks toward cancellation of citizenship and deportation.

"If you find that Bridges had the right to observe the demeanor of the witnesses and decide if it is improbable they are telling the truth.

You must not consider any thing you have read or may have heard outside this common juror must be for you.

"The court has attempted to avoid any comment on the weight of the evidence... It is for you alone to determine what evidence you will believe."

He gave the jury a specific instruction as to the burglary conviction of Rathborne, and charged that Rathborne could not be impeached because the conviction had been expunged.

"The testimony of the defendant is shown to have testified falsely on any material matter you are at liberty to reject his entire testimony excepting where it may be corroborated by the testimony of other witnesses."

"The court has attempted to avoid any comment on the weight of the evidence... It is for you alone to determine what evidence you will believe."

INDICTMENT REVIEWED "The motives of the government are not relevant... though it is your duty to accept my instructions as I have given it to you.

"From time to time I cautioned the jurors on legal matters. At the conclusion so dear of the witnesses... I have tried to remain impartial and judicial. I believe I have done so.

"It has been my duty from time to time to reprimand counsel, to instruct the jurors, also, to ignore the fact that a civil suit against Bridges looks toward cancellation of citizenship and deportation.

"If you find that Bridges had the right to observe the demeanor of the witnesses and decide if it is improbable they are telling the truth.

You must not consider any thing you have read or may have heard outside this common juror must be for you.

"The court has attempted to avoid any comment on the weight of the evidence... It is for you alone to determine what evidence you will believe."

He gave the jury a specific instruction as to the burglary conviction of Rathborne, and charged that Rathborne could not be impeached because the conviction had been expunged.

"The testimony of the defendant is shown to have testified falsely on any material matter you are at liberty to reject his entire testimony excepting where it may be corroborated by the testimony of other witnesses."

"The court has attempted to avoid any comment on the weight of the evidence... It is for you alone to determine what evidence you will believe."

INDICTMENT REVIEWED "The motives of the government are not relevant... though it is your duty to accept my instructions as I have given it to you.

"From time to time I cautioned the jurors on legal matters. At the conclusion so dear of the witnesses... I have tried to remain impartial and judicial. I believe I have done so.

"It has been my duty from time to time to reprimand counsel, to instruct the jurors, also, to ignore the fact that a civil suit against Bridges looks toward cancellation of citizenship and deportation.

"If you find that Bridges had the right to observe the demeanor of the witnesses and decide if it is improbable they are telling the truth.

You must not consider any thing you have read or may have heard outside this common juror must be for you.

"The court has attempted to avoid any comment on the weight of the evidence... It is for you alone to determine what evidence you will believe."

He gave the jury a specific instruction as to the burglary conviction of Rathborne, and charged that Rathborne could not be impeached because the conviction had been expunged.

"The testimony of the defendant is shown to have testified falsely on any material matter you are at liberty to reject his entire testimony excepting where it may be corroborated by the testimony of other witnesses."

"The court has attempted to avoid any comment on the weight of the evidence... It is for you alone to determine what evidence you will believe."

"The motives of the government are not relevant... though it is your duty to accept my instructions as I have given it to you.

"From time to time I cautioned the jurors on legal matters. At the conclusion so dear of the witnesses... I have tried to remain impartial and judicial. I believe I have done so.

"It has been my duty from time to time to reprimand counsel, to instruct the jurors, also, to ignore the fact that a civil suit against Bridges looks toward cancellation of citizenship and deportation.

"If you find that Bridges had the right to observe the demeanor of the witnesses and decide if it is improbable they are telling the truth.

You must not consider any thing you have read or may have heard outside this common juror must be for you.

"The court has attempted to avoid any comment on the weight of the evidence... It is for you alone to determine what evidence you will believe."

He gave the jury a specific instruction as to the burglary conviction of Rathborne, and charged that Rathborne could not be impeached because the conviction had been expunged.

"The testimony of the defendant is shown to have testified falsely on any material matter you are at liberty to reject his entire testimony excepting where it may be corroborated by the testimony of other witnesses."
The Fight Against the Fram eup is Not Over: Military Unionism Will Win

(Continued from Page 2)

Port Hueneme, Calif., meeting April 4, unanimously pledged themselves to the task of presenting the big lie of the Bridges case to the American people --- as in the verdict we see a noose, a noose of rotten rope.

"We are convinced that it is a gross frameup, bought and paid for by the Immigration Department."

ILWU Local 94 reported that its membership meeting April 4 voted unanimously that "we stand 100 percent behind our international officers, Bridges, Robertson and Schmidt and will support them with all of our strength and resources.

The executive board of Local 9 in Seattle wired continued support until final victory.

Rank and file members of Locals 19 and 20 wired their backing.

Local 208's membership in Chicago telegraphed Bridges: "The Jewish Defense League is our inspiration. We are with you in this fight till victory is won. We refuse to submit to the reactionaries who wish to destroy the International trade union movement."

At a membership meeting April 4, Local 9's General Conven tion gave Robertson a standing ovation when he spoke to them on the official question. Words of encouragement came from other unions and their mem bers, too.

Gar Gurner, long active in the Railway Clerks and a character witness for Bridges, telegraphed:

"From minor defences to major victories count me in."

The executive board of the International Fishermen & Allied Workers, in session in Seattle when the verdict was announced, went on record "pledging continued support to smash the unAmerican plot directed against the ILWU and all other progressive unions.

SIDE BY SIDE

A telegram signed by IFAWA Secretary-Treasurer Jeff Kirke said: "We know that the fight against the infamous decision is part and parcel of the fight to protect our unions and the conditions which they have won on the waterfront."

"Justice will eventually and finally prevail and we will win."

President Hugh Bryson of the Marine Cooks and Stewards told Bridges:

He said the membership of his unions "stands side by side with you and the membership of Local 9 and shore and warehouse regardless of the recent frameup and most of us feel that our situation is similar to your military leadership and the membership of your local."

"VERDICT STINKS!

"We will continue to support your cause which is our cause, the defense of Bridges, Robertson and Schmidt, knowing this is a worthy cause supported by all working people."

Thirteen rank and file members of the National Maritime Union telegraphed they had just read the verdict and it stinks. The fight against this verdict must go on until the maritime unions are freed and the march toward fascism is to be stopped. We will be with you in the fight."

From 37 rank and file members of the Marine Firemen's Union came the statement that "we members of the MFWU know that our union, along with all other unions, got it in the neck when the jury found you guilty. But the rank and file of labor and the people will render the final verdict. United we will see that this blow against justice and democracy is changed."

Editorial from the Stewards' Department on the SS Pennsylvania said: "We think you got a raw deal. We've just begun to fight."

President Hugh Harding of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union said: "Working men and women of this country will rally to preserve the rights of the common people."

United Electrical Workers Union President Albert Fitzgerald pledged his union's backing: "We are in this fight to give a warning to all Americans that the frameup is increasingly taking the place of the fair trial in our nation today."

Seattle CIO Council Secretary Jerry Tyler and President Burt Butler went on: "The verdict doesn't lose the fight. We pledge to fight by your side until the last day and lay odd's you'll cop the duke.""

There Was a Sense of History As Millions Waited for Frameup Verdict

By SYDNEY RODGER

The verdict is in. Guilty!

"Guilty?"

The jury which heard liars and perjurers, heard men admit that they had lied before and were lying now, said guilty.

"Guilty which saw a parade of people, professional finger men said guilty."

The jury which heard witnesses say the administration wanted to use the bridges case as a definite strike movement, that the top CIO brass gave its blessings, that Tom Clark says the administration wanted to break the Hawaii strike, said guilty.

"Guilty which saw the story.

Some called it the sweat watch. To others with a more grim sense it was the death watch.

The cold statistics of the trial, the fact that 91 days were spent in that courtroom, of the more than two hours we have sat in that courtroom, of the 81 days we have sat in that courtroom, the fact that Mervyn Rathborne was so lacking in a sense of history, a sense that hundreds of thousands, really millions of people, were waiting for the verdict because they understood the place of a fair trial in our world on the second floor of the post office building which houses the beige-brwn, sound-proofed courtroom with its austere, mellow looking, golden eagle, and its anachronistic swastikas and fascist marks on the wall.

"FOREBODING

James MacIninch in his closing argument asked the jury to look at that ceiling. What architect was so lacking in a sense of history that he would place swastikas and fasces on the ceiling? Or maybe he wasn't lacking in a sense of history at all. Maybe it was a sense of foreboding he had, a sense of the terrible potentials that can be dredged out of a time of hysteria in our history.

There was more than the color of the ceiling which was intolerable waiting. It wasn't just the marbled halls with the smell of stale smoke and tired people. Or the sights of a photographer asleep—this was just another job, or of a reporter biting his nails—feeling it deeply, or the little Mexican woman sitting in a corner patiently waiting to see if her friend, the man she never met, Harry Bridges, would be freed. Or the brassy, tight-knit, cold, hard-looking women from the prosecution camp.

There was more. There was a sense of history, a sense that hundreds of thousands, really millions of people, were waiting for the verdict because they understood that the verdict would touch them.

At 11:45 a.m. April 4, 1960, the jury came in with the verdict.

The courtroom was silent. Then, Thud. Cold.

As we saw their faces the silence itself seemed to scream: No! This can't be.

The faces of the eight men, four women told the story.

Harry Bridges, Bob Robertson, Harry Schmidt watched their faces.

The jury shuffled by, eyes focused in space, seeing nothing, expressions rigid, tight lips pressed together as if they were tasting acid.

Not a single juror would look into the eyes of Harry, Bob and Henry.

After the Verdict

Harry Bridges gets a kiss from his wife, Nancy, who sat through most of the trial's two million words.