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This letter of Vanzetti to his friends in France speaks eloquently for itself. It was written in the midst of the personal case undertaken by Governor Faller and his advisory committee, headed by President A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard, to quiet the questions being asked by a distressingly large number of "respectable and substantial" citizens.

Vanzetti is perhaps more clearly revealed in this letter than in any other he wrote. A man of genuine intellect, with unusually penetrating powers of analysis and wit, he here displays the qualities that made him develop greatly under a seven-year torture that would have broken most men—qualities of courage and faith that made him take his seat in the electric chair in a calmly heroic manner rarely equaled in history.

Guided by reason, Vanzetti at the time he wrote this letter, could see no other outcome than that which he and Sacco finally suffered. Yet in his words as here set down one detects that pervading quality of human warmth which made him unwilling to distrust all the characters in the tragedy even though his reason insisted that none of them deserved trust.

Vanzetti loved people, and in this letter one finds him seeking to hold fast to the surface attributes of President Lowell, President Strout, and Governor Faller that seemed to promise human decency in them. That these attributes fooled Vanzetti and others of his intellectual caliber is a sign not of Vanzetti's too-great belief in appearances but rather a sign of the terrifying cleverness with which hypocrisy and prejudice in modern America work their ends.

This letter is a document revealing the disgraceful means of a Massachusetts governor, posing as political idealist, and the president of one of the country's greatest universities were willing to adopt to carry out their designs. Assuming an attitude of sympathetic friendliness in Vanzetti's presence, they required to their secret chambers and waited to give orders to the executioner to kill him.
TO THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST
DEFENSE COMMITTEE
52 Rue des Prairies, Paris (France)

Dedham Jail, July 19, 1927

DEAR COMMUNITY:

Your good letter of J une 18th reached me in due time and toward the end of the same month I had ready a long, circumstantialized reply, dealing with the subjects of your letter and answering to its questions.

Then last midnight of June 30th, we were suddenly awakened, told to dress quickly, well manacled, taken to an automobile, escorted by several others, filled with armed guards, and thus hurriedly transferred from the Dedham jail to the State Prison in Charlestown, Mass., where we are now confined in two separate cells of Cherry Hill Wing, waiting for August 10th, fixed by the Governor for our execution. And in the surprise, confusion, and terror of that midnight transference my letter to you was lost, together with our little hope of one month of more respirable fresh, country air, and of vital sunlight.

So I am now re-beginning my writing on this 10th of July, 1927—settled by Thayer's death sentence, as the beginning of the week in which we should have been executed. Instead, we still have before us the grand prospect of 30 days of solitary confinement before to be burnt alive to death on the electric chair. A great prospect indeed!

You asked me if I knew that you have interested in our behalf The League of Rights of Man and other elements; if I approve it or if I prefer that you appeal to workers and revolutionary circles; and how I like your attitude too, and language on the case. (I trust in my memory, in saying the proceeding, for your letter remained in Dedham jail.) I am glad and have nothing to object to your interesting the League of the Rights of Man and other associations or persons in our case.

Convicted of two crimes, of which I am entirely innocent, ruined by our seven years of an imprisonment that is a law's terrible execution; facing now the extreme punishment of death after having proved my innocence and the criminal iniquity of my trial and of my trials; of such a one, not have to appeal to any class-justice and still less to a superior conception of justice such as the socialism libertarian justice is, in order to claim my rights to liberty and freedom and be granted a tardy reparation. The capitalist law and justice are more than sufficient for my need and claim—If their masters and dealers would recognize the evidence.

In my person are denied, offended, violated, insulted, and mocked the most elementary and inalienable rights of Man, as likewise the most fundamental principles of justice; to the point that the Supreme Judges of Massachusetts used the law to outlaw us, that being their only possible way to hand us to the executioner. I submit to mankind their two "decisions" on the case. For the proved facts and undisputable reasons, above mentioned, I believe that all those who believe that no person shall be punished for a crime of which he is innocent; all those who do not wish to see the constitutional system turned into imperialistic and plutocratic feudalism; all of them have good grounds and reasons to array in our defence. And I respect also the humanitarian principles and sentiments which prompt many a person in our behalf. All considered, it seems to me that the ideal way to meet our tragic contiguity is to let each one, honestly and in good faith, be coherent to his own plans and do what he deems better to be done, as he best can and likes. This
suggestion is indeed an old abused generality to which all agree as long as no one tries to find out how it shall be applied—for then all agree to disagree with each other. This does not exclude suggestion, rectification, denial, etc., from those more near to us of whatever seems wrong, detrimental, or unjust which might be said or done in good faith by whomever.

I knew of the universal solidarity in our behalf, regarding which I repeat that the best part of manliness is doing for us what once would and could only have been done for kings and saints, and that the people of France, and of Paris in particular, stand among the bravest and most generous in this precedentless, greatest solidarity of history. But we do not know the particular details of that; we know it only summarily and generally. Consequently, I cannot give an opinion of the particularities of your brave efforts or of your way of treating the case though I studied all of your spoken and written words in your letter to me, and in your communications.

But, I believe, you base your defence of us on facts, evidence, proceedings of the trials, appeals, motions, and decisions on the case which expose the nature of the times and the events as a perpetual battle between reaction and revolution, reaction and progress, tyranny and liberty; rather than the inevitable mistakes of particularities or of interpretation, so you are doing what I deem is the right thing. In fact, I cannot see how you could do otherwise, for the nature of all things in the case reveals so self-imposingly the truth, that even the most conservative and moderate of our American defenders base their denial on it, confessing they act to safeguard the good reputation and honor of this Commonwealth in asking that Sacco and Vanzetti shall have a new trial—for it would be a great disgrace to execute them on their unfair original trial, so marked by hatred and bias, (it must be specified that this is the language of the most moderate). On the one hand, it was a gross mistake, but a consciously and criminally deliberated frame-up by Thayer, to become judge of the Supreme Court; by Katmann, for a professional career; by police Stewart, for greed of money. Later on I will prove this by reasons and facts. But the chief cause of our framers' conduct was their hatred and revenge upon us as Italians, anti-militarists, and anarchists.

Nearly the best of America (and of the earth) for vigor of blood, form, goodness of heart, and greatness of intellect, are with us. But we were, and are, tried and persecuted by the worst of America—a Thayer and a Katmann; a Williams and a Wilbur; twenty-four narrow minded, fanatic provincials in the dress of jurors, turned intolynchers by the criminal misleading of the judge and of Katmann, a down perjury professional; as Goodridge; three harlots moral defeatists as Peck; and the black-gowned valets of Massachusetts' plutocracy, called the supreme justices, and the drear of rural, state, and federal police of our murderers. But they have the power in their hands and, abusing it in the most evident and criminal way, they defeated us twice after time, so that now, after seven years and two months of hopeless struggle and an impeachment that was the slowest and cruellest execution imaginable, they have us in a cell of death, with the grand prospect before us of 28 other days of solitary confinement before being buried alive to death.

Thus urges them; and I, leaving aside many things of the past, will only try to give you my opinion of the actually essential phases of the case.

Because hope and confidence are inherent to normal psychology—because the Governor began his inquiry, named a commission, and postponed for a month the date of execution, from history's greatest protest against a death sentence—and because the evidence of an unfair trial and of our innocence is self-imposing as the noon clearness, you and all our friends and comrades, far from the scene, re-open your hearts to hope, and cheer us with words of confidence and optimism in the final outcome of the case.

Not so our local comrades who have learnt by an unspeakable experience of seven years of disillusion, death,
and defeat, who and what our enemies are and what they did. To those who knew our enemies, the thought of August 9th and of the fate of their once-hopeful cause, must have been intolerable to be heard; that's all. Because we have undergone some something that inside the irreparable) in far worse and more numerous and bearing than to be quickly killed, many friends believe that we will not be executed. I say to you that in journals and in private and public halls, these color-hearted Puritan worshippers of Massacre are talking of our execution after seven years of incarceration, as more impossible, by God, and mundane action of life on every day's work. And this is done even by the capitalistic shills of Boston, which kept the "yes" and the "no" seem and seem not to be in our favor. If the Boston press would tell what it knows of the case positively, we would be free before August 10th. As for our country, they would tell us another 50 years of our imprisonment, if we could not be executed before. I have understood this from the day I was found guilty at the Plymouth trial. Just to try to imagine what these seven news have been to me. My only hope has been in a shifting of history's course, which did not happen.

Hencefore, I have exclusively referred to my known proven enemies—not to the Governor or to the members of his commission. Because the day of our sentence approached and we learned through a comparative calm and silence, our enemies thought that we had been given up our defense and that they could at last have its brilliant new hands without further effort and struggle; and therefore, the universal storm of protest and execration that pointed to Boston, from the 32 winds of the earth, against the sentence, universalized them beyond words. They now also wish us to turn for the deceitful and shame that their persecution brought upon the name of this place, they would not explicitly. Running blindly to the counter-offensive, they dropped pretences, rant, and much, appearing at last, just what they are, and saying just how they feel, how they think and what they want. Probably you read their counter-petition to the Governor; their letters and talks on the case. But to the facts, if the facts be least informed, I give here some samples and get the worst of it.

A hitherto-thirty counter-petitioner wrote from New York to the Governor: "A nice hanging every little while is a mighty good thing for the people."

A born hanger who knows not the least thing of us or the case, warned the Governor: "If there is no case in Massachusetts who has the nerve to depatch Sacco and Vanzetti, let me know it, and I will come!"

A lawyer from Vermont State, writes: "I am so disgusted with the propaganda for Sacco and Vanzetti, that I think it the duty of all good American citizens to let the Governor know that they are all with him. If their execution is stayed, so that it will never be carried out, it will be the greatest victory for the 'reds' all over the world!"

A minister from Philadelphia, who is a professional red hatter, and who knows us and the case, as I the Saccoist, placed himself against the most eminent clerics of this country and the quasi-totality of those of Massachusetts who petitioned for us and said: "By their own confession, Sacco and Vanzetti are communists of the rankest type. They have been repudiated by the army, as they have done and said enough crooked things to desert completely milita-

The means of revenge, in case of their executions, made by their friends, prove that they are murderers at heart."

A Mr. Greyhill, publisher of the Commonwealth Acts and Supreme Court decisions, who had already published a pamphlet against us, after the sentence, happened to read the above quoted words of Rev. Hanger, and he found nothing to do against us than to hurriedly copy those words and send them in a communistic letter to the Governor, as a mighty argument for our execution. By this we may guess what his former pamphlet was. But we know that Mr. Greyhill is a defendant of the legislature and of the judicial Supreme Court of Massachusetts (both deadly enemies to us), and we would like to know if Mr. Greyhill's malice and hostility are due to his moral perversion, or
if he acts so because Thayer or some of the Supreme Justices
or someone else pulls the strings.

Mr. Moorfield Storey, a Bostonian, an old and distin-
guished lawyer with good acts to his account, just happened
to be present, and he pointed out that the government
exemterize their seed, and was consequently not too long
Schro and Vanessett. And since the nature of our case ren-
dered impossible to any person to honestly oppose us, Mr.
Moorfield Storey was led by his hostility to acts and words
that stain and disgrace his venerable white hair. He is the
author of the preface of Louis Post's book, "Deportation
from the United States," and he is a notable exponent of
constitutional violations and the excesses, violence, brutality, and cruelty
committed by the Federal agents upon the non-existent or real reds, during the
terror of the Palmer administration. It is known that Palmer spent millions of dollars
from the Federal treasury, in persecuting supposed and real radicals to save America from revolution and bolshevism,
with the secret aim of gaining by this the candidacy
of president of the United States.

Well, Mr. Storey was vehement in his preface and wrote
that"American citizens must black with shame at the
thought of what has been done by the Federal Department
of Justice and Federal agents." But when our defense
proved by the undisputed testimony of three ex-Federal
agents, what the Department of Justice and its agents have
done against us, did Mr. Storey come forward with a
public letter to state that "it is unbelievable that the non-exist-
Federal agents could have committed such things." Some-
one answered him by submitting to him his own former
words. But he did not stop.

When the Defense, the Defense Committee, thousands of
petitioners and finally, I myself, asked with unmistakable
clearness of language the governor to conduct a public and
thorough investigation of all the facts of the case and to
appoint a commission of honest and competent men to help
him in the inquiry, lo! Mr. Storey, writing again a public
letter, signed by six other lawyers, to the effect that the
Governor could not appoint such a commission, because
"the law of our Commonwealth invests the Governor with
supreme executive discretion but forbids him to transfer
upon other persons the said supreme discretion." In writing
so, Mr. Storey and his co-partners knew perfectly well that
none had asked such a thing; but it was the only possible
way to oppose in the name of the law, by a conscious falsi-
face, the demand for the appointment of the asked com-
mission of investigation and Mr. Storey did it. His but
faith witnesses itself.

Then came the Dean Wigmore controversy with Prof.
Frankfurter. All who read it knew the vilifications of
Wigmore against his opponent; his misstatement of facts;
his atrocious insult to the anarchist movement, which he
affirmed the most criminal of all the criminal associations
of the world. He asked our execution because of what our
friends and comrades have done abroad in our defense and he
attempted to prove the fairness of Thayer by quoting
one of our defense counsel, Jeremiah McAnarney, who said,
during the trial, to Judge Thayer himself, that he was
honest and fair. We all know that mutual inconsistency is
a universal practice in forensics and a common trick of
strategy to obtain some wished-for thing. To produce a
shameless falsehood in defense of one thesis is a symptom of self-conscious weakness. But he said also that if the Su-
preme Justices would have been willing to give us a new
trial, they could have found a way (which is positively true), and that, therefore, the denial was due to their
conviction of our guilt (which is positively false). He was
gradually silenced by Prof. Frankfurter's factually.

Mr. Goodwin, the Boston registrar of motor vehicles, let
loose a venomous attack on all those who do not ravage
after our blood. "They are all sob-sisters, soft-hearted
and soft-hearted stupid people whom we must stifle. No investigation com-
mission shall be appointed." Challenged by the State con-
gressman, Rev. Mr. Sawyer, to a public discussion, the re-
counter, Mr. Goodwin, declined with ridiculous excuses.
In June 19th, in a speech pronounced on June 19th, at Charleston, helped his friend Mr. Gouvernour in disarming our defenders and destroying and taking our currency. Phelps' Banker and Deep found he either sold and
promotions who preach and practice the doctrines which must destruction to all those ideals for which the men of
River Hill fought!!!

The kernel of his talk is that those who believe that the
sacred unseen and strong and progressing in this country are
right: "You how they ignored the will in the Sancti-Van-
netti case", that there is a real "red peril", and therefore
San and Vanelli must be expunged.

Politics Cory, characterized Charles Lindbergh as a
the typical American boy", who has not been "poisoned
with the character of the doctrines preached in some univer-
sity or college" or some magazine in this country, believing that
Lindbergh's father was a "patriotic and extremely ap-
palled to war, for which he was heroically mustered and
his premature last day.

Our estimate assumed the same logic by Judge Thayer in
the Modler's conviction. Since Modler's "has begun to roll
from his saddlestool, was bouncer in a roll-horse of bad
reputation, in jail several times, and killed to rob the charity
of the Wrenchman bank; It cannot be believed that he par-
ticipated passively in the Baltimore crime, as he confes-
sed. He says so to help by the friends of Salvo and Van-
etti and so delay or avoid his execution.

So that if Modler had an immaculate record, was known
as a model citizen, a saint in goodness and behavior, then
our enemies would believe that he knows the underworld,
is broken in every crime, and participated in the South
Bankitsee until otherwise enter some logic on.

Only a few days after the Boston World wondered that
I did not begin to act as a clown and a buffoon since I was
confined in this cell of death and it acknowledged that Mod-
ler's had prolonged already his life a year by his confes-
sion. Oh! these God fearing law abiding Americans! It is
time to explain this thing.

There is not a single witness in all the states who does not
understand that all the Massachusetts authorities and
most important are disposed against us and our friends be-
cause all the public attorneys and writings of the author-
ties and politicians as well as all their proceedings in our
case make it most evident. The people believe that Gover-
ner Fuller has not convicted the death sentence of the
three men convicted of the Waltham ex-sheep murder and
executed them last Winter, in order to provide no precedent
and no chance for our friends to ask for our consideration.
Indeed, the Boston press is enrolling the question of the
time between Fuller and a journalist, which was published in "The
Success Magazine" on November, 1926, under the title
"Why I believe in Capital Punishment" that said that the Gov-
ernor's words regarding all the cases of death sentence,
including Salvo and Vannetti, gave evidence that Fuller
continued his intention to send all of them to their doom.

Jerry Godelman, condemned to the and confined in the space
next to mine, thinks and feels in his heart that he was de-
ned a new trial, and will be denied a commutation, because
the State authorities want to execute us and will not, there-
fore, commute our sentence. In order to do the same with us.

The 400 persons in this place, most of them have symp-
athy and respect for me in their hearts, but almost all
fear to speak with me in a way with appear
friendly, because they believe that if the State authorities
and the Parole Board learn that they are my friends, they
will deny them the release on parole and even their mini-
mum sentence, if possible.

It is said that Modler is somewhere intelligent and he has
certainly more than sufficient experience of Courts and pris-
ons to plainly understand that his confession would have
lost all opportunity of an acquittal, a new trial, or a com-
mutation of death sentence to life imprisonment by the
Governor. He was in Dedham Jail when he confessed and
knew full well how drastically Sheriff Copen is against us.

If I remember well, Modler, was willing and ready to con-
fect before his first trial; he was certain so before his
second trial, in spite of how much it could have hurt him.
No one knew better than Madeiros himself that his confession would doom him and what help or profit could he have expected for it, from our side, when he was to be executed? The truth is that Madeiros is fully convinced that he will be executed; that he is sick, buried alive and cursed with death—that will deliver him from misery. That this is the truth is proved by what followed. The three convicted of the earlier case, were convicted in this place, after they had been brought from the County jail into the deathhouse and their execution was delayed by a last, desperate legal effort of their brave counsel. Well, when they were transferred again to the death-house, Madeiros, from his g-pence next to theirs, heard the noise of it and understand what was going on and he broke his inventories against the officers: "You see or—you kill people who have not killed". (The horrible had been committed by one of the three, after the robbery and when all the co-conspirates were out of the place of the crime). "You kill innocent men. Why don't you kill me instead? I have committed all sorts of crimes."

Recently when Governor Fuller waited until the last minute to announce the later postponement of Madeiros execution, Madeiros urged repeatedly: "For Caesar's sake, don't delay any longer—at this be the end."

But in vain! Did Rev. Murphy, priest-chaplain, and Mr. Brooks of the Parole Board, question Madeiros again and again on his confession; they only obtained its repetition. But in face of all this, our enemies cling desperately to their logic as the only way to triumph upon Madeiros' confession, to arrive at our execution. And, oh! they call it "justice", the agency of a sick, hopeless man, embittered in pain and waiting for his final torture. Oh, the civilized people!

I close this fragmentary exposition of our enemies' infamy, by calling your attention to the fact that among the counter-petitioners there is one big stockholder of the Plymouth Corrugating Company, who was its manager at the time of its workers' strike, 1913, in which I participated actively and honestly.

I would be able to collect, in a single document the counter-petitions and the verbal letters and talks against us which have been published in the Boston Herald or in other local journals: A documented material of bias, prejudice, hatred, fear, sophisms, cruelty, ignorance, of voluntary mis-statements, altercations, inversions, and falsification of facts, evidence and points of law; of conscious and unconscious perversion of logical feelings, a criterion of insincerities, meanness, and obscene bigotry, fanaticisms, and mental, psychical and moral degradation of its authors; the whole provoked by a mere mob of the nearly 200 townsmen.

I would present it to all the nations of the earth to prove that by their own clear and unmistakable words, they rave for our blood because: "Sacco and Vanzetti are foreigners, slackers against war, bolsheviks, radicals, communists, anarchists, enemies of our institutions, unbelievers in our gods, Mennon and Mohol, and, therefore, they are murderers at heart; because the reputation of our courts must be upheld; because there are a few people here who believe that we are progressing in our country; Sacco and Vanzetti must be punished because their friends have done in their defense; if they escape execution, it would be the greatest victory for the rest all over the world so they must be killed to save our reputation, institutions, and country."

Some three ago a prominent and reputed citizen confessed in a public letter to be 'willing to forget the shock I received when I heard for the first time people saying that on the evidence you have I believe that Sacco and Vanzetti be executed rather than the faith of the people in our institutions be shaken by a new trial for them.' (Thus demonstrated what a new trial could reveal). In short: A legal murder for State reasons, confessed by their authors.

Since our sentencing our enemies have made theirs the motto: Let the law have its course. They oppose desperately an investigation of the case by the Governor; the appointment of a commission and a reprise of our execution. They persecuted our friends; remunerated our slanderers,
denied permission for meetings on public grounds and parades in our behalf, denied all the public or private halls in Boston; affirmed that our case is a domestic affair of the State (in order to depreciate the world-wide procès) and undersold at the same time, at the little against us, coming from throughout the State. Then, when their efforts apparently failed, they brought us here. I can tell that the Governor granted us a reprieve before June 1st, believing and intending that it would have postponed our sentence, and that the dirty deal of it is solely due to Sheriff Capez, backed by the Attorney General Reading; two of our mortal enemies. I wish I knew the truth, for if the Governor participated in this, then we would know positively what to expect from him. However, just think of it: these two men have persecuted us to death for our seven long years: now they feel positive that we will be executed as August 10th, after midnight, and yet they transferred us here, just to deprive us for a month, of a little refreshment and of sunlight, of some visits; just to inflict upon us 30 days more of solitary confinement, in the midst of summer, in a low, smoky, dreadful place, before bringing us to death. And they did it; they pretend for no other motive than because of their honest conviction of our guilt.

Here follows the Defense Committee's statement on their cruelly:

"The hatred of the Norfolk County prosecution against Sacco and Vanzetti at midnight June 30 found expression in an evil, heartless act. At the clock struck twelve, Wednesday in July last, Governor Fuller and his assistants entered the cells of Sacco and Vanzetti in the Dedham jail, awakened them, ordered them to dress, shackled them, put them in waiting automobiles and whisked them to the Cherry Hill Section of the State Prison, the antechamber of the death house.

"The general understanding was that the suspects granted our two friends by Governor Fuller would act as an automatic check against the transfer of the two prisoners. It was said that was why Governor Fuller granted it before July first, when the law required that Sacco and Vanzetti be removed to Charlestown.

"Sacco and Vanzetti were not forewarned of the move. They were not told why they were being taken. They were not given enough time to gather up their letters and books in their cells. Their counsel was not notified of the move beforehand so that he might argue the interpretation of the statute under which the Norfolk County officials say they acted despite the suspects.

"The action was taken with the sinister alacrity and stealth of bitter prejudice in the face of a general assurance that the men would not be moved to the hell-hole, Cherry Hill section, in Charlestown. Only one interpretation can be put upon the action—the Norfolk County prosecution acts for the blood of our two friends and is determined to have it.

"The Cherry Hill section of the State Prison is a symbol against which even strong minds falter. In solitary confinement, surrounded by the most depressing environment, without the chance of conversing together, or of seeing their friends, our two comrades must now await the Governor's decision. A few steps away is the death house. The Norfolk County prosecution has made up its mind to push them to that chamber of death. It hatred is fierce and vehement. It knows neither the reasoning of the brain nor the reasoning of the heart.

"We ask you as fellow members of the human family to join our protest of this act that dishonors our common heritage."

THE SACCO-VANZETTI DEFENSE COMMITTEE
Boston, Mass., July 1st, 1927
Actually our enemies are working frantically, day and night, exploiting all their means, setting in motion all their agencies, all machinery of the State to persuade the Governor to reconform the Thayer sentence and execute us as quickly as possible, for many reasons. They have no need to be false and noisy; they are familiar with him and of his own class and circle. So for what do you think they will stop?

Countries, remember the experience of the centuries, so highly voiced by the great Jefferson: "The reach of fear is the only motive that holds the hands of our tyrants."

All that we have asked, all that we are asking for, was, and is, a new trial. I did not write my petition because I have hope in Governor Fuller. I knew full well that he cannot have any understanding of, and sympathy for us. He is a new rich; not a scholar; a super-patriot, religious and conservative; hating and fearing and despising our ideas and person (this to a degree); and, he had been encouraged, by our enemies; and he had out-spoken his Torquemadaque feelings and criticisms, publicly; a man that could not be impartial with us, not even if he wanted to be.

I wrote my petition out of respect for Messrs. Thompson and Elrman who had confidence in it and out of solidarity and gratitude to the thousands of petitioners who had asked for "a complete and public investigation of the case"; asking the same thing; and because I was told that if it be granted, I would have an opportunity to talk again in my defense. Would it, I asked, had it been granted, be equivalent to a new trial? And I asked it because I am positive that "a complete public investigation and hearing of all the facts of the case", would have compelled the Governor to release us even against his own will and brought (if wanted) our persecutors into the cage of the indicted. None knows this truth better than our enemies and our persecutors themselves. It was denied.

The State of Massachusetts claims it has been and is ready to do everything, to give us every chance, except what we ask for, a new trial—et pour cause. Maybe our request to the Governor has few precedents in this State or in this country, but the universality of the request itself, proves that also our case has few or no precedents and its nature requires such a step.

The Governor is conducting a thoroughly private investigation of the whole case; they say reading all the documents and he is interviewing privately, all the witnesses involved; the very different from the commissioners. He is inviting to form the commission, are of good reputation. When two of them declined he asked President Stanton and Judge Grant to join President Lowell as members of the commission. Because Judge Grant was (and still is) suspected by many of partiality and even hostility toward us, the Governor questioned him before appointing him. Then he concluded that he does not know, considered it prudent to investigate, advise, and report privately and separately from his own inquiry. He then decided upon release of 30 days for our execution and did so before July 1st, intentionally, we are told, to let us remain in Deuelham jail for another 30 days. Finally, he conceded to us, and to the other two, sentences to death, Madelon and Geizbom, to have a morning session to announce the sentence, and that he had been inclined toward us, and that he, the Governor, had been sincere in assuring our friends that if our case reached his participation, he would give it due consideration, and that he had no preconceived or defined predilection on our case. We will see. A scholarly and highly reputed American of old Massachusetts family, wrote to me:

"I have always liked Governor Fuller. He is narrow minded in some respects, but I believe he is an honest and courageous man, and would have been enough to pardon you and Sacco, if he were convinced of your innocence. I do not see how he could fail to be convinced on a fair presentation of the evidence; but nobody knows what perjured testimony may be introduced at this private inquiry. Of course the reason for the privacy was the mistaken idea that anyone who gave evidence against you would expose
himself to assassination, although none of the perjured wit-
nesses at the original trial have been assassinated in seven
years since. It ought to have been public. This is causing
me great anxiety”.

In fact the Governor himself declared that what matters
is not if Sacco and Vanzetti had a fair or unfair trial,
but “if they are innocent or not”. By his own words he
seems to prove that he does not realize that he all who had
not been ocular witnesses of a crime and reported the sin-
cerely conviction of having positively picture-memorized the
author or authors, there is but one way to reach a convic-
tion of guilt or innocence of men convicted of the said
crimes. Men who only wish us to study their case out and
they were rightly or wrongly tried— and more else. When
the journalist John J. Leary came to Massachusetts to study
and write a review of the case for the New York World,
he interviewed all the principal participants in the case, in-
cluding District Attorney Wilbur, worthy successor of
Katzmann and as he is thirstier after our blood, Wilbur
held Leary: “I don’t think that Judge Thayer will grant a
new trial, for there is absolutely no reason for it; but if he
does, I am sure I can get a well. I also inspected the de-
fendants, for I have new witnesses who will prove their
guilt absolutely. The time is gone when people were afraid
to come forward and tell what they know of Sacco and
Vanzetti”.

When I read Wilbur’s words in the New York World, I
realized that he is as Katzmann, morally rotten. See his log-
ics? When we were almost alone and no real or unreal
protests, manue or reticulations against our would be mur-
ders, then the people were afraid to testify against us.
Now, after 7 years, according to Wilbur himself, the friends
of Sacco and Vanzetti have reduced in one half the work and
terrorized mankind, and to his disgrace, the protest is uni-
versal. New Wilbur wants you to believe that “the time is
gone, when people were afraid to come forward and tell
what they know”.

As for his boasted new witnesses, I thought that since
not all the harlots, whose and crooks of Massachusetts had
perjured against us at the original trials, possibly Wilbur
and his Sewart might have bribed or compelled again, none
of the rubles to be ready to perjure against us. And
knowing my persecutor, but that would not
But Wilbur, being at that time positive that Thayer would deny us
a new trial and be upheld by the Supreme Court, he
felt sure that he would never be compelled to prove, by
producing them, the veracity of his affirmations of having
new witnesses. He was simply lying for the holy purpose of
convincing with his lies the readers of the New York World
—and thus make them hostile to us. This seems to be the
fact.

When the Governor began to interview privately the
witnesses, the Defense requested to be at least permitted to
assist at his interrogations of the State witnesses, not neces-
sarily from distrust in the Governor’s honesty, but because
of what such kind of persons can say against us, when they
know that there is no one present who can question their
falsehoods and that what they say will remain secret. The
Governor refused the Defense request, upon which Mr.
Thompson asked the Governor to, at least have him present
if new State witnesses were to be heard, and the Governor
parried him, but we decided not to bow. After all the
witnesses have been interviewed, the State ones first,
and Mr. Thompson assured me that “no new witnesses were
produced by Wilbur, except a ridiculous would-be fire-arms
expert from New York” Then Wilbur was lying? Or was
Mr. Thompson misinformed on this matter? Or is Wilbur
keeping his possible new perjurers for the last of the in-
quiry and to be used as fireworks on the Governor’s impres-
sionability?

I only know that all who have testified or will testify
against me on these two crimes are or will be murderous
perjurers. Yet my Boston friend who wrote me of the
Governor’s motives for a private instead of public inquiry,
is not a person to state such serious matter without due
knowledge. Was the Governor, then, told by the prosecu-
[11]
tion that there are new witnesses who do not dare to testify, except secretly, for fear of assassination? My opinion is that the prosecution, fearing a public inquiry and hearing of the case, which would have brought disgrace and ruin to them, harped insistently to the Governor on this supposed danger. And if he believes so, it is a proof that he believes all the friends of Sarco and Vanetti dangerous murderers: and such a brief cannot help to influence him to disbelieve all those defence witnesses who are his enemies.

I was the last to know if the Governor has not the same opinion of Thayer, Katzmann, Williams, the perjurers against us, Sheriff Capen and all our other persecutors and murderers. Because if he is inclined to believe that our friends are dangerous murderers and our witnesses liars, and he thought of our perjurers, persecutors and murderers as 100 per cent ideal American citizens and truthful persons—then he is absolutely arch-bigoted and arch-prejudiced and in an unmitigated state of mind and emotions to discover the truth and give an impartial opinion.

All in all I believe that his motive, named by my friend, for the private inquiry is only partial, and that another motive for the privacy is that the Governor is convinced that our trials were most unfair and their exposition will disgrace the State's reputation, and complete our release or a new trial—while he only considers if we are innocent or guilty.

Yet, I know myself and the case a little and these secondary, big or small things do not scare me. What I fear is that the Governor, cannot or will not understand our case and his own case is not partial, for he is no longer possible to hate stopping of our seven years, slow murdering I will tell why I fear so, later on.

On July 8th, the advisory commission came here and interviewed us in a conversational form, out of politeness I guess—but one had little chance to express what he wished to, because any one of the three present might interrupt with a new question on other matters, thus swerving and mixing topics. Then they interviewed Mather.

President Lowell and President Stratton are said to be two great scholars and gave me the impression of men possibly impartial and well intentioned, who will not decide against us for any other motive than their honest conviction that the courts must be upheld. But the retired Judge of the Probate Court, gave me the impression of a type of man whose feelings are offended by the things and reasons which we are forced to say of the case in our defence. The Commission is contrary to our ideals and favorable to Thayer and company, being of the same class and ideas.

In fact more than the others Judge Grant gave me the impression of being of a mentality so contrary and hostile to us and our principles that he could not, if he would, be friendly to us and see the facts with unbiased vision. He insisted on the contrary when I stated that the radicalism was introduced by Katzmann and not by the defence in the trial. So that I had to tell him of the hand-bill for a meeting, found on Nick on our arrest and written by me—which Katzmann had translated in English and read to the jury. Since it was very radical and had no relation what- ever to the crime of the murder; Katzmann and we produced it solely to prove to the jury our radicalism. Then, Judge Grant said that the jury of Dedham did not know that I had been tried and convicted in Plymouth “because it was not told to them”. I answered “that the criminally hostile publicity of the press upon our arrests and of the Plymouth trial had informed all of it, so that it would have been public knowledge, at the Dedham trial, to form a jury of men who did not know it”. Then the truth of it is even worse. Katzmann broke an agreement of counsel and asked three witnesses of the defense if they had testified at the Plymouth trial.

When I said that the matter of radicalism had not been introduced at the Dedham trial by the Defense, as Thayer publicly insists, but by Katzmann, Judge Grant shook his head and answered that it was introduced by the Defense, Judge Grant, as well as the others, claimed he had already
read the Decham trial Record, which contains the following
hand-bill:

"Comrades and Workers:—

"You have fought and won all the wars, migrated through all the fatherlands, worked for all the masters. Have you harvested the result of your victories, the fruits of your work? What is the past to you? Are you satisfied with the present? Does the future smile and promise well to you? Have you found a hand of land upon which to live and die honestly?

"Sunday, May ______ Bartolomeo Vanzetti will speak on those and other questions, in a conference on "The Struggle for Life", to be held in the Hall ______ No. ______ Street __________, Brockton, Mass., at ______ p. m.

"Bring your women with you. Free admission and free speech for all."

I wrote it going to West Bridgewater on May 5th, 1920. It was found on Scozo on our arrest, for I had given it to him and Judge to have arranged everything for the meeting. It is in the trial record because Katzmann had it translated and read to the jury long before we took the stand. I challenge though vividly radical, it has no relation whatsoever to the crimes of Bridgewater or of South Braintree—except to show that we would not espose ourselves as spokes in a town very near to the scenes of both the crimes if we had been the bandits. In introducing it, Katzmann could not have had any other purpose than to show our radicalism to the jury in order to excite chauvinism, but their false pride and so make them hostile to us. Judge Thayer understood it and therefore let it be produced without uttering a word of his afterward feigned doubts, as to our radical boundenness.

Judge Grant claimed he had studied the trial record containing that hand-bill when he denied my statement on this aspect of the case and insisted that the Defense, not Katzmann, had introduced it. After my explanation he asked again, so that either he intends to deny all that is favorable to us or does not understand the plainest facts of the record. What is still worse than this is, that from the attitude of the other two members, whom I believe very much more intelligent than Judge Grant, they gave me the certainty that not even they had grasped this self-imposing matter in their study of the trial record—if as they said, they had studied them.

(July 17th, yesterday, I had reached this point when Mr. Thompson and a comrade came to see me and what I heard and understood from them made whatsoever hope or confidence herefore expressed of men and things related to the case, simply ridiculous, and compelled me to a different language, attitude and conduct. Yet, I keep on with this report to you of my impression of the commission just as I had in mind before.)

What makes worse the mental blindness of the commission, is that when we took the stand we did not introduce radicalism or say anything which could have compelled or justified Katzmann's introduction of it, but the commission did not perceive this.

On the stand, we admitted to having been at the Johnson garage on the 5th of May, 1920, in West Bridgewater, to take Bovis's automobile with the intention of using it to carry the boys. In our friendly radical literature, because we had recently been informed that the Federal agents were about to make other raids on the "reds" and we knew their finding of radical literature meant anything from arrest to death for its possessors. And we told bow and where and when we had met together and decided it; also how we went to and left from the Johnson house; admitting we feared arrest as radicals, having been informed of the intention of the authorities.

Every normal person understands that this is not an introduction of radicalism—as Thayer and Katzmann like to believe—but a statement of facts related to the case. Hence, all that Katzmann could have honestly done was to have cross-examined us as much as he pleased on everything he could have deemed capable of proving that what we testified to was untrue. Our statements were entirely clear, had no
relation to radicalism in itself—but related to what we did, why and how we did it, and where we had been before being exiled. Medical the Katzenmann cross-examination on enlisting registration, our trip in Mexico; measuring our love of America in dollars and pennies; in a word, cross-examination on this matter was as abusive and unfair as it was fatal to us. It had no relation to our testimony, and was Katzenmann’s second introduction of radicalism in the trial, with no other purpose or need, except to get a conviction on our radicalism. As for Katzenmann’s remark about Thayer’s reason to allow it; namely, that they doubted our bonafide wish to examine us on the topic to ascertain the truth, it only proves the moral objection and mental dishonesty of both of them—because it is now proved that they knew of our radicalism since our arrest. How could they have not known of it? All this matter is written in the trial records, affidavits, newspaper editorials, etc., of the case, and yet, lo! we have here little Judge Grant who denied it and two scholars like Prof. Lowell and Prof. Stratton seemingly unaware of it, instead of being disgusted and indignated by its iniquity.

Since the year 1923, when Mr. Thompson allowed the extreme deterrentness of this most unfair deed of Katzenmann, Thayer kept repeating what Grant is now insisting on: “The Defense introduced radicalism.” Yet Thayer told in a private conversation with Mr. Thompson and other members of the Defense, “Katzenmann, introduced radicalism.” But Thayer’s hypothesis tends to be publicized and made to appear if I myself warned the defense not to introduce radicalism in the case”; and I feel sure that, to say nothing of little Judge Grant, the other two members of the commission are inclined to believe this blasing lie. The truth is that Thayer knew before we took the stand that we intended to admit having been at the Johnson garage the night of our arrest and uttering the cry of “Katzenmann and Katzenmann”; it was the introduction of this, and not radicalism, that Thayer hinted he had defended the defense against doing. To name this by its name would have betrayed Thayer’s aim to doom us; so he called it radicalism. This fact would require a lengthy explanation for those who know nothing of the case, but with you I will be brief. At that time Katzenmann and Thayer knew they had utterly failed to prove their case against us. Their few criminals, degenerates and hooligans perjuring against us had been outmaneuvered, discredited and destroyed by truthful witnesses for the Defense, most of them working people. Ourcroft was unanswerable. There was no material evidence against us except the framming-up of our revolvers. Please, pay attention now: The only circumstantial evidence was that we had seen Dodd and Orciani, had been with them at the Johnson garage 20 days after the crime and had taken an automobile which had been in that garage continuously. The defense insisted that it could not have been used in the South Braintree crime. As for Orciani, he was freed, having proved that he was working at the hour of the crime. Dodd is in Italy and nobody bothered him. It is then clear that our having been at the Johnson garage could not be used as evidence against us. But it was the only thing the prosecution had to depurify. The prosecution was then speculating on two things against us: hatred, fear and prejudices of the jurors as buttressed by its theory of our claimed “consciousness of guilt,” drawn or claimed to be drawn from “our suspicious behavior at the Johnson house,” and from “our lies told to the police on our arrest.” (We have already explained that we mistaken the police to avoid arrest and truth for some of our conversations.) And to get our conviction on this theory, the prosecution would have had to make the jury believe that we acted so, solely and exclusively, because we were afraid of being arrested for the South Braintree crime, for, if it
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had been for any one of a million of possible other things, then their gratuitous "theory" would have gone to the winds.

Glenn

Dence, when Thayer and Katzenmehr knew that we were going to admit that we were at the Johnson house to take the automobile, they understood that we would also tell why and how we went there, and why we wanted the automobile, and that this would have smashed the "theory" of their alleged "consciousness of guilt of the Braintree crime." But because this reason, they had another one, they hoped we would deny being there. Our pleasure was that the Johnson house had been of all the prosecution's claims the only one properly and sufficiently to be believed by a normal person in the position of a juror, and if we had denied it, the jury would have thought that our being there must be related to the Braintree crime or to some other one, and our denial of such evident fact would have destroyed entirely our credibility in the eyes of the jury. To discredit us by every means and ways had been the steadfast effort of Thayer and Katzenmehr, from the beginning of the case to this very day, to discredit us and our witnesses.

These are the real things Judge Thayer tried to avoid by "wriggling and advising our lawyers not to introduce radicalism into the case." So that the truth was and remains that we never introduced the discussion of radicalism into the case, but claimed to be radicals and to have been at the Johnson house and told the reason why. All this cannot have required our ever justified Katzenmehr's assertions into radicalism in his cross-examination. All he was entitled to do was to grill us in every line of the defense of the defense and the other facts we stated on the stand were untrue, so as to show that we were not because of consciousness of guilt of the Braintree crime. This being evident, his cross-examination was his second, entirely arbitrary, utterly unjust, introduction of radicalism into the case, made with the sole aim of exciting the jury's antipathy against us. This truth shines in the record pages as the sun in the sky, but here we have Judge Grant shorn that "introduced radicalism," and the other two members seem to me sincerely unaware of this most evident and fatal fact.

I would not wonder if this commission believes that Katzenmehr conducted and Thayer permitted, the cross-examination (let us call it so), on this matter because, as the two counsel said "we want to find out if Sacco and Vaenzetti are really radicals or only claim to be." They knew it since our arrest. When I told the commission that my previous conviction at Plymouth for a similar crime has been very prejudicial to us, Judge Grant shook his head and replied, "It cannot have hurt you because it was not told at the Dedham trial, so the jury did not know it." I had to tell him that his way of looking at things is to look at their superficialities instead of their substance, and that the tremendous publicity against us made by the capitalist press since our arrest had informed all of my former conviction at Plymouth, so that even if Katzenmehr would have been willing to form a jury of persons who did not know it, it would have been impossible, because everyone knew it in Massachusetts.

But I forgot to tell Judge Grant that Katzenmehr himself informed the jury of my former conviction, by asking in the jury's presence three defense witnesses if they "had testified for Vaenzetti in another trial," to which they answered positively "yes" and were doing. Katzenmehr solicited an agreement of counsel which was that: The Defense should not have produced moral witnesses of our good character and the prosecution should not have mentioned my former trial—a silly agreement, to be sure. Yet, Judge Grant insists that the jury did not know of it.

When we said that Thayer had always been against us, Judge Grant shook his head more than ever, and asked, "Why should Judge Thayer have been against you?" Well, I have tried to explain in detail that Thayer was always against us, and that the whole world knows that Thayer was very anxious to be appointed Judge of the Massachusetts Supreme Court. He claimed that in accord with the conditions and feelings of that time, to con-
vict and bury us quickly and quietly would have brought him to his goal. Therefore, he personally asked the proper authority to appoint him Judge in our case and since then he began working toward our conviction. Another reason why he is against us, is that he would destroy all the "reds", their seed and their ideals, if he could; but neither he nor anyone else can do it, he sure comrades. Judge Grant was not affected by my explanations.

When the conversation turned to my former defender at Plymouth, Judge Grant again shook his head and asked: "Why should Mr. Vaheny have been against you?" So, I was again compelled to explain—

The Plymouth Cordage Company is the feudal lord of Plymouth and its institutions, so that when the company is against anyone there its will is done. The company knew of all the defense of these two criminals, but it was wanted to eliminate me because it feared me as an incorruptible anarchist and for my capital crime of not having betrayed its workers during their strike in 1913, when they worked 54 hours weekly for a pay of 80.00—this in 1915, just think of it! My Judge Insoriot, John Vaheny, in the vestment of defense counsel, is a stockholder in the Cordage Company and a great friend of Thayer, even more of Kollmann, both deadly against me; now Kollmann and Vaheny are partners. Are not these explanations enough of why Mr. Vaheny should have been against me? But not for Judge Grant who shook his head at it and answered, afterwards, by referring to Vaheny as "a well known, distinguished criminal lawyer", which is a shameless lie. So I said, "I beg your pardon, Judge, I referred to Vaheny of Plymouth, not his brother in Boston (who has a certain declining reputation)". "I understand," replied Judge Grant, "and I know very well both of them". Yes, and he is their great friend, and he will hang us to uphold Insoriot Vaheny's reputation. Then I informed him how Vaheny dealt with me at that trial. No competent person can read the Plymouth trial record without perceiving how miserably Vaheny failed to defend me. We have here Judge Grant who studied that record, shaking his head and denying it. Hell!

In regard to Orciani, Judge Grant repeated several times that "Orciani disappeared", evidently intendedention to beat on a tender spot in the case. I got tired and told him that Orciani had shown his innocence of the Braintree crime, proving that he was working in a foundry when the crime was committed, and that thereupon he was released; that Orciani was around the Dedham Court house until the very end of the trial; that then, with his wife and their three or four children, he went to Italy on a regular passport. This cannot be called "disappearing." Judge Grant chewed bitterly at this.

The above given illustrations are but few of all the topics of the interview on which Judge Grant was openly against us in every way.

One of the two reputed scholars, members of the commission, said that he read Thayer's speech to the jurors and veniremen on "doing their duty like the American soldier boy, who fought and died for America on the battle-fields of France". And that from reading it he got the opinion that Thayer did not talk so, to excite the jurors' patriotism against us, but because all the veniremen were trying to escape from the service of juror and Thayer wanted them to accept it and form a jury. Well, I would like to know why did Thayer, after the jury was formed, keep on stoutly in the same chauvinistic language up to his very last words in the case. The last sentence of his charge to the jury is the most calculated and exciting incitement to the jurors against us, that could ever have been made.

Altogether, from the commission's interview, I felt certain that Judge Grant is premeditatedly deadly against us and the other two will fail to grasp the most evident viciousness of the case which should command our release. And I thought, e'd faro di cadere dalla padelle nelle bragie (from the frying pan to the fire).

This is the relation I had in mind to make to you before seeing Mr. Thompson and one of my comrades.
Before their visit, I was already pessimistic as to the outcome of this double inquiry of the case, because of the impression received from the commission's interview and information from Rosa Sacco and others, so that I had already begun the hunger strike on July 15th. From what I heard and understood of the words of these two visitors, I realized that we are lost. The infamy of our enemies has no limits.

On the 11th of July, the Governor interviewed Rosa Sacco. Afterward, she came to visit us, and informed us that the Governor had told her, “Vanzetti’s lawyers at Plymouth wanted him to take the stand. It was Vanzetti who refused to do so, and he sent a 12 year old boy, Beltrando Brini, to speak for him by reciting a lesson learnt by heart”. There are four falsehoods in the Governor’s words and part of them are the actual ones used by Katzmann to the jury at the Plymouth trial: “Beltrando Brini is a bright boy, whose parents have a right to be proud of, but here he recited to you a lesson learnt by heart”.

Then in a subsequent visit, Rosa told us that the Governor had interviewed Beltrando again, grilled him strictly, but at the end, his testimony remained intact and fortified. This fact proved to me that the Governor had not told this to Rosa merely to grill her, but that he was believing it. This knowledge induced me to begin the hunger strike — as I did.

Yesterday, July 20th, the same two visitors came again, and I was informed that the Governor, after his second interview with Beltrando, told someone that: “As Beltrando Brini says that he stayed with Vanzetti about five hours on the day of the Bridgewater crime, and left him at about 1:30 P.M., it means that Beltrando went to Vanzetti’s house at 9 A.M.”

(Since the crime was committed at about a quarter to eight, and from Bridgewater to Plymouth are some 20 miles, one could have had time to return to Plymouth at 9 A.M. This is what Iscariot Vahey tried so hard, and in vain, to obtain by presenting only those alibi witnesses who had seen me later on that morning.)

When Beltrando Brini learnt that the Governor had said so, he went to the State House, asked and obtained an interview with the Governor and said to him:

“I am told that you have said that I must have gone to Vanzetti’s house at 9 A.M. on the day of the crime. I said at the trial, on that day I saw Vanzetti at about 7:30 A.M. and went to his house at about 8 A.M., and I have said so both times to you.”

I am informed that the Governor showed little interest in the matter of the hours, but a great interest to learn from Beltrando who it was that had told him, that he, the Governor, had said it.

We realize that you and the French people know the case better than the reactionary puritan rattle of Mass.; so madly thirsty for our blood, therefore, I will only pray you to consider that if the Governor does not want to believe Beltrando Brini, he does not want to believe any of the other 18 defense witnesses who have been, talked to and others who worked in Plymouth, at the very hour and minute of the Bridgewater crime. All of them are working men and women who knew me for years, simple folks, rightly fearing “the men of justice”, expert in courts; people who not only could not give false testimony, but who fear even to go to testify to the truth, at least, the women.

This also means that the Governor wants to believe the five perjurers for the state who, the records show, testified one way at the preliminary hearing and another at the trial, and also, who after the Governor was well informed of it on the day of the crime, told a wholly different story and gave a very different description of the “shot-gun bandit”, the bandit’s automobile, etc., then the descriptions they gave at the preliminary hearing and at the trial.

One of the State perjurers, Harding, who at the trial described me better than the others, after the crime, told the police and detective that he could not describe the bandits’
faces because he had seen none of their faces. Yet, I repeat at the trial he described my face better than anyone else.

Continuation, July 25, 1927.

What Governor Fuller told Mrs. Sacco and how he dealt with Beltrando, might have been said and done by him to grill them; but we have reasons to believe that he does not want to believe or to understand what is most self-imposingly true in our defense, and wants to believe unbelievable things against us. This is the only way to justify and uphold the Thayer death sentence.

A few weeks before Beltrando had testified, his mother and sister had testified to the Governor. He is said to have received a very good impression from them and he took Beltrando to dine with him at a Boston hotel. Why then this sudden change of attitude? It could not be caused by his further study of the Plymouth trial record or by later interrogations of someone else of the few state perjurers at the trial—for the trial was such an obscure frame-up, that the more one learns of it, the more one detests it.

Then the Governor's change of attitude can only be attributed to the possibility that, since Beltrando's first testimony, he has been worked upon, influenced and changed by our powerful, all reaching, ever-intriguing enemies who have succeeded in persuading him to clean us. Useless to say that it was Iscarion Valley who prevented me from testifying at Plymouth, ignorantly abusing my ignorance of Court procedure and law.

He later testified to the Governor, the testimony was received. The State Defense was not present—we do not know what he said. But to the advisory commission, where the Defense was present, he said he did not oppose my wish to testify, he explained to me what it meant and let me do what I pleased and that I refused to testify. Miserable partner of Krumnow and Thayer!

All this bad news and these impressions plus the fact that everyone at the State House is saying that the Governor is set to burn us, and that our witnesses are openly disbelieved by the commission and the Governor—while they trust all the State perjurers—convince us that we are actually dealt with in the same way and spirit as we have been from the very beginning and that they are going to assassinate us. Therefore, I decided to protest and react against it and the only possible way remaining for us was a hunger strike, and I began it on the morning of July 19th. Nick followed me on July 17th.

A little while afterward we learnt that the commission had abused two Italian witnesses. The fact deserves to be explained. Messrs. Decorato and Bosco, with Prof. Guadagni had been Sacco's alibi witnesses at the Beltrando trial, relating that they had dined with Sacco in a Boston Italian restaurant on the afternoon of the 15th of April, 1920, and went together afterwards into a cafe. Asked how they remembered the date, they said it was because that day a banquet was given in honor of Mr. Williams, who had been nominated Commander by the Italian King, which banquet some of them had attended.

Now, recently, the commission sent for Bosco and Guadagni who related the same thing. Pres. Lowell of the commission looked over the Boston Transcript of April 15, 1920, to see if there was a report of the said banquet to Mr. Williams who, at that time, was editor of the Transcript. There was no such report. The member got suspicious; he looked in another Boston daily for it; there was nothing there. Then the commission communicated with Commander Williams, now in Washington, D. C., who replied that his first banquet in Boston had been toward the end of April, 1920. But the commission thought they had the proof that the whole Sacco defense was false. Yet, after further search, they inquired again of Commander Williams, who this time replied that he had only one banquet in Boston, and it was in May, 1920.

Commander Williams having lied thus twice, to send us to the chair, the commission believed him and sent for Bosco and Guadagni and abused them as perjurers.
It was proved afterward that the banquet had been on the 16th of April, 1920, and an apology was extended to the wrongly insulted. (The restoration of Buseo's and Guadagin's alibi testimony, President Lowell's apology to them and Mr. Thompson's argument to the commission on the matter were completely omitted by the official stenographer from the record of the proceedings—at Mr. Lowell's order, according to the stenographer.) But that shows the commission's tendency, which we had so well-detected when we were interviewed by its members. We know also that it is—or has been very hostile to the Defense. This fact reinforced our belief that they are going to murder us and it re-enforces our reason to react and protest by fasting.

Well, I believe that you know, or will know the subsequent facts of our case before you receive this letter, and, therefore, I will not state them here. Only this that we have now the proof that Judge Grant, a member of the commission, has always been against us, and wished our execution. In assuring the Governor that he was unbiased, impartial and open-minded, he lied to be appointed to the commission and thus to become able to influence the other members to give a decision of death against us.

From all that we have and can understand of what is going on, we are lost. Mr. Thompson argued today before the commission; later in the week he will argue before the Governor. There will be no public hearing.

The Defense requested the commission and the Governor to give their decision before August 1st, at which time unless there is a favorable precedent decision, we shall by law be brought to the death-house. If the decision is death, it does not make any difference when it is given.

I think, that we will be executed one after the other, immediately after midnight on August 10. Persisting in our hunger strike, we will on that date be in our agony even if they want to inflict on us the humiliation and torture of forcible feeding and our miserable enemies will kill nothing but two dead men.

Excuse my poor writing, I am already very weak and can do no better. Soon I shall be unable to write at all.

Lift your foreheads and lift them high as symbols of our beautiful and sublime anarchy. This letter is perhaps the last letter I will ever send you and with it I send you my brotherly greetings and my best wishes.

Yours,  
BARTOLOMEO VANZETTI