

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Formerly
**'YOUTH for
SOCIALISM'**

VOL. 3, No. 9.

JUNE, 1941

ONE PENNY

END THE TRUCE! LABOUR TO POWER!

At the Labour Party Conference held in London at the beginning of June, numerous leaflets were issued to the delegates, which included one by the Communist Party, the Peoples Convention, and the I.L.P. The Statement we reproduce below was issued by "Workers' International News" (Trotskyist) and is the only statement which gave the conference Opposition to the truce an alternative programme and directive which could rally the organised Labour and Trade Union Movement as well as the mass of the British People.

COMRADES!

The Labour Party Conference meets in the second year of the Imperialist World War under the clouds of the gathering storm. Symbolic of the impasse in which the working class of Britain finds itself today are the actions of the Labour leaders. "Democracy is at stake!" they appeal. And then refuse the elementary democratic rights to the members to put resolutions and amendments to those proposed by the Executive itself. Even though with the block vote of the trade

necessary to police not alone Italy and Germany, but the whole of Europe. In other words that Nazi forces of occupation would be superseded by British. If the German workers rose in revolution, overthrew their Nazi slave-masters and attempted to establish a workers' Government, Churchill and the ruling class would attempt to forcibly reimpose some form of fascism as he did when the Russian workers took power in the last war.

Strike Act Used Against Workers

Swift Scales Workers Charged

At Willesden Police Court on May 16th seven shop stewards charged with illegal strike action were committed for trial at the Old Bailey. Six of them are members of the A.E.U. and the seventh, a woman, is a member of the T.&G.W.U. The case follows close on the heels of the Lancashire apprentices who were bound over. It is the thin end of the wedge of wholesale prosecutions which will be instituted by the Government and employers if they are allowed to get away with it.

The strike began as a result of the dismissal of the chief convener of shop stewards on April 17th for alleged bad time-keeping. In solidarity with the strikers a deputation from the factory, supported by men from other factories representing 12,000 workers went to the Ministries of Labour and Aircraft Produc-

Worker's Committees Control Canteens

A Shop Steward Speaks

The slogan, "Workers' Control" is one whose potency is being more powerfully demonstrated every day. The accuracy and timeliness of this slogan can be judged by a review of some very striking recent incidents in connection with it in various large factories.

At the present time it is in the distribution of rationed and limited supplies of food from the factory canteens that the incompetence of the boss class is made most obvious to the workers. The discontent of the factory workers where the short supplies are unevenly distributed, with the bosses getting the lion's share, creates inevitably a situation fraught with ugly possibilities for the bosses. It does not take the worker long to realise that "NO SMOKES", "NO FOOD", "NO TEA" has only one answer—"NO WORK". One would imagine that the bosses would grasp this before the workers did and, for their own sakes, take steps to see that some sort of equality of distribution was maintained. But, as the boss class has never understood the mean-

approached the Food Control Officer in the district and demanded that the permits for the supplementary supplies be handed over to them directly. This was done, and the Shop Stewards then bought tea and sugar from the local Co-op and distributed it with meticulous exactitude and without profit to the workers.

This lead has since been followed in many big factories in various parts of the country. In one particular factory in Yorkshire the management refused to hand over the supplies of tea, sugar and cigarettes to the Stewards. A factory meeting was called by the Stewards in the dinner hour and the following resolution was drawn up:

"We, the Shop Stewards Committee of the above works, having been refused participation in the equal consumption and distribution of tea, sugar and cigarettes by the management, hereby officially notify the Ministry of Supply and the Works Management that, failing satisfactory settlement of our just demands within the next 48 hours from the time and date given above, a three days complete strike will be called.

democratic rights to the members to put resolutions and amendments to those proposed by the Executive itself. Even though with the block vote of the trade union leaders they are certain of a formal majority in any case. They are afraid of the reaction of the rank and file to their actions, in the light of their promises at the last Party conference. Delegates must demand that the democratic rights of the members must be restored.

The aim of the Labour leaders at this Conference is to justify the actions and record of the Labour leaders in the Cabinet—the policy of support for the National Government.

But the principle issue with which the workers of Britain are faced at the present time is **the war** and all the problems connected with it.

The result of the support given by the Labour leaders to the Tory and Liberal representatives is clear. The power of the small clique of millionaire trusts and combines over the economic life of the nation has been enormously strengthened. Profiteering on an unprecedented scale, chaos in production, corruption, inefficiency, inequality in food distribution; the glaring contrast between the position of the rich and the position of the masses, all this is becoming clearer as the gulf between the position of the workers and the position of the employers widens. This or top of the series of staggering defeats which British imperialism has suffered at the hands of the Nazis.

But, say the Labour leaders, this "compromise" of "national unity" is the only alternative to the victory of Hitler. We are pledged to "war to the complete destruction of Nazism and fascism", all the sacrifices which the working class are making are necessary for the struggle against barbarism, for the further progress of the workers towards Socialism.

This is a lie!

The workers are for the destruction of Hitlerism and any other form of fascism, but this cannot be accomplished under the control and leadership of the capitalist class and its politicians.

The City of London and the British ruling class backed, financed and re-armed Hitler as a support for world capitalism. They were compelled to fight Hitler, when he became a menace to their Empire, to the super-profits which they were drawing from the exploitation of the colonial peoples. They are not interested in fighting fascism but merely in the extension of their domination of the world. Churchill has openly stated that war aims are not published because it would disrupt "national unity". Or in other words that the masses, especially the Labour masses would not be prepared to give "blood, toil, tears and sweat" for the venal and selfish desires of the ruling clique of bankers and capitalists.

Even if Churchill and British imperialism defeat the Nazis it would not mean the destruction of fascism. On the contrary it has been openly admitted by ruling class spokesmen, the Dean of St. Paul's, for example, that "after" Hitler and Mussolini were defeated it would be

striker's a deputation from the factory, supported by men from other factories representing 12,000 workers went to the Ministries of Labour and Aircraft Production with a memorandum which charged the firm with inefficiency and with attacking the union. The memorandum states that:

Not only that, British imperialism has already lost the war. Either Germany or America can win if the war remains a military struggle. Britain has been reduced to the status of 49th State of the U.S.A. Morrison and Greenwood have openly talked about 7,000,000 unemployed after "victory" has been achieved. And the ruling class will introduce fascism in order to beat down the standard of living of the workers as they were compelled to do in other countries.

But France should be a lesson and a warning to the workers of Britain. Blum and the trade union leaders (at the conference last year Blum attempted to justify his policy and was supported by the Labour leaders) justified their policy by the necessity of the struggle against fascism. But the French ruling class, rather than face their possible overthrow by the masses, betrayed the French people into the hands of Hitler. Faced by the same position the British ruling class would do the same.

The Hess affair has thrown a clear light on this. The capitalist press attempted to picture this Nazi thug as an angel of goodness, till the resentment and anger of the masses compelled them to change their tune. But its significance remains. They would make an agreement with Hitler tomorrow, as they have attempted to do with the butcher Franco, the perfidious Petain, the Japanese militarists, if they thought it were in their interests.

That is why revolutionary socialists are against this war as an imperialist war, which cannot be in the interests of the workers of Britain, Germany or the world. But the British workers and especially the workers in the Labour Party do not want to be conquered by Hitler. They wish to see this whole regime of barbarism completely destroyed. And their instinct is correct. Fascism must be destroyed if the workers of the world are to live in peace and plenty. The Labour leaders have taken advantage of this and betrayed the workers into the hands of the capitalists. Bevin and Morrison have introduced strike-breaking and repressive legislation which the Tories without their assistance would never have dared to do. They say this legislation is necessary for the destruction of the menace of fascism. But such steps can only lead to the victory of fascism, either of the German or British variety. The ruling class cannot fight fascism.

This ruling clique which subsidised Hitler and Mussolini now talk about the responsibility of the German people for the Nazi regime. But the only reason that the German workers accept their Nazi slave-masters is their fear of a super-Versailles, which would be imposed by the capitalists of Britain and America if they win the war.

The Labour leaders in a self-righteous way have now adopted the position of Churchill and Co. that the German masses are responsible for the crimes of Hitler. They have forgotten, or rather attempt

(continued on back page)

striker's a deputation from the factory, supported by men from other factories representing 12,000 workers went to the Ministries of Labour and Aircraft Production with a memorandum which charged the firm with inefficiency and with attacking the union. The memorandum states that:

"Negotiations to avert a stoppage both before and since the workers left the factory having been repeatedly refused by the management, and the whole experience of the directors' and managements apparent breaking up trade union organisation and conditions, together with their deliberately provocative and anti-democratic attitude to the men and women workers and youths, leads the workers to press for an inquiry into the antecedents and connections of the directors and management."

At the court 33 factories were represented and the plea by the prosecuting council for the case to be held in camera was refused. Attempts were made by the

(continued on page 2)

DODD'S DIARY BLOWS THE GAFF

William E. Dodd served as United States Ambassador to Germany from June, 1933 to December, 1937. During those fateful years preliminary to the Second World War, Dodd had an unexcelled opportunity to observe the inside workings of capitalist diplomacy, particularly of the democratic nations, Great Britain, France and the United States. These he recorded in a daily journal. He died soon after. Under the title "Ambassador Dodd's Diary 1933-1938" (Gollancz), Dodd's intimate private observations have just been published by his son and daughter.

The diary has been hailed by the American bourgeois press reviewers as a further justification for participation in the war for "democracy". To do that, however, they glossed over or ignored the most vital portions of Dodd's revelations: the equal guilt of the capitalist "democracies" with that of the fascist imperialists for the present war, and the aid which the "democracies" gave to Hitler.

Long before Hitler came to power, France and England began preparations for the war. Dodd indicates this in many passages, including the following:

"French politicians have for ten years violated the spirit of the disarmament clauses of the Versailles Treaty. The German Social-Democratic movement was ruined by French policy. Now, after the German Nazi uprising in protest, the Germans are trying to govern themselves by autocratic methods, alienating the world by their indiscretions . . . Wrong and right are so mixed and confused everywhere."

"France played a sad game in 1919 and then continued her mistake under the League from 1930 to 1932. That helped to give Germany Hitler . . . Now, as Sir Eric (Sir Eric Phipps, British Ambassador to Germany, 1933-38) says, all Europe must watch Germany day and night, living under an encirclement system which may even bring economic collapse."

"I think the Goering air programme is truly belligerent but France, Italy

(continued on back page)

ers did and, for their own sakes, take steps to see that some sort of equality of distribution was maintained. But, as the boss class has never understood the meaning of the word "equality", the workers are finding that "Workers' Control" through the medium of the Shop Stewards is the only guarantee of even distribution.

The method followed by the boss is simple in theory and easy in execution. Managers, under managers, foremen, under-foremen, office staff, etc. are supplied with as much as they want for their use at work, with a "little" over to take home. What is left is exposed in the canteen for the workers to scramble for. The result is, of course, that only a few of the workers get anything at all—despite the fact that these supplementary supplies are for "Workers, Industrial Grades" only.

The first known instance of the control of supplies by the Shop Stewards took place over the distribution of tea and sugar at a big factory in Barrow in Furness. The Shop Stewards Committee

satisfactory settlement of our just demands within the next 48 hours from the time and date given above, a three days complete strike will be called, following which no overtime will be worked until such time as adequate supplies of supplementary rations, as promised by the Government for industrial workers, are forthcoming. We consider that the withholding of the workers' supplies in this factory by the management is tantamount to deliberate sabotage of the war effort, and we call on the Ministry of Supply to assist us in our effort to call this management to order."

It was decided that one copy of this be sent to the Ministry of Supply and one to the management. Twenty minutes after the management received their copy the Convener and Secretary were sent for and told that in future the distribution of supplies would be left to the Shop Stewards.

Other Factory Committees have gone further than this with the control of canteen supplies. One committee found it (continued on page 2)

A.R.P. Compulsion Must be Fought

Changes of far reaching importance are about to be introduced into the A.R.P. service. Following the introduction of the new National Service Bill in the House of Commons on April 2nd whereby men in the late 30s who are below the army medical standard may be compulsorily called up for any of the Civil Defence Services; it is becoming clear that an all-round tightening up is contemplated.

A recent incident at one of the largest A.R.P. depots in the Wandsworth area is a good example of what the Government brass-hats mean by the new changes. For some time past it has been common knowledge amongst the men in this depot that a "comb-out" was on the way as a prelude to breaking up the existing form of A.R.P. organisation in preference to the development of mobile squads who could be transferred to any part of the country at a moments notice. How this was to be accomplished, however, was not known, until the other day a local bureaucrat looked in with some forms in his hand, asking for volunteers who would be willing to travel to blitzed areas in other parts of the country. It was clearly intimated that all those who did not sign were due for the sack at the first available opportunity. On top of this, if they did sign they would be expected to sacrifice if necessary their off-days for those who had gone away or during the time when they themselves were away.

This attempt at coercion on the part of

(continued on back page)

SOCIALIST APPEAL

EDITORIAL

The crisis of mankind in general and of Britain in particular, approaches with seven league boots. Workers give their lives while capitalists accrue the greatest profits in history and the giant monopolies extend their control through direct government intervention in the economic management of the nation.

This process is evolving in the midst of indescribable chaos. Unlimited profits coincide with unlimited chaos.

Voices from the ranks of the working class are demanding that an end be put to this situation and a wide movement is slowly but surely crystallising which sees the solution in the control being taken out of the hands of the bourgeoisie and vested in the hands of those who can run industry efficiently and in the interest of the community—the working class.

This awakening of the workers to the graft and corruption of the bourgeoisie, and their inability even to run their own industries efficiently, is extending, to become a general mistrust in the political leadership of the ruling class.

The initial reactions of the capitalist press to the arrival of Hess in Britain has imbued the workers with the suspicion that after all, there is a *class* solidarity between the rulers of Britain and their German opponents which may result in a compromise peace intended to fasten the chains of reaction on the necks of the British as well as the European working class.

Meanwhile, the Emergency Powers are enforced to prosecute shop stewards and worker militants who are fighting in the interests of the working class, and to introduce a regimentation aimed at stifling any working class opposition to the existing regime.

At this period, the press of the working class has steadily deteriorated. Pass-

G.P.U. Obtains Release of Siquieros

The G.P.U. does not forget its agents. With its vast resources it has succeeded in corrupting Mexican justice and liberating David Alfaro Siquieros, the leader of the G.P.U. gang that made the machine-gun attack on the Trotsky home on May 24, 1940, murdering Trotsky's young guard Robert Sheldon Harte.

Siquieros has not been fully liberated as yet. He has, however, been freed on bail. The bail bond required was the sum of £200 (4,000 pesos). Unless within Mexico there is a reaction to this perversion of justice it is easy to predict that Siquieros will be completely liberated or suffer a slight fine or small sentence.

After the attack on May 24th the Communist Party and its fellow travellers, trying to throw people off the track, demanded that the culprits guilty of the attack be apprehended and dealt with severely. They then raised a howl that the attack was organised by Trotsky himself.

Unfortunately for the G.P.U., some of the gang participating in the attack were caught and it became clear that the G.P.U. was directly responsible.

SIQUEIROS' GUILT

Siquieros was named by his accomplices as the leader of the attack. After much criticism and authorities finally succeeded in locating his hiding place and captured him. During the hearings he claimed that he had charge of the "external" side of the attack but had nothing to do with the machine-gunning of Trotsky's bedroom.

It was proved, however, that Siquieros came to the scene dressed in the uniform of a major of the Mexican army; that he directed the tying up of the policemen or guard at the house.

About 300 bullets were fired into Trotsky's bedroom and other rooms of the house. Incendiary bombs were hurled into some of the rooms. Robert Sheldon Harte, the young guard, was kidnapped and murdered.

HIS ABSURD ALIBI

Siquieros made the preposterous claim that the purpose of the attack was to get some documents to prove that Trotsky was a "counter-revolutionary."

Was it necessary to fire 300 shots from machine guns to get these documents? Did it require the murder of Harte to get the documents? And why were no documents taken by the gang? Did Siquieros know where those documents were?

Siquieros' fantastic story was enough to convict him before anybody. He was guilty of many crimes—the most serious being the attempt on the life of Trotsky and the murder of Harte.

But the G.P.U. is stronger than Mexican justice. It has limitless amounts of money and tremendous influence.

MAY FREE ASSASSIN

And now that Siquieros is out the G.P.U. is already mobilising its forces to liberate Kacson, the assassin who killed Trotsky on August 20, 1940. It sounds fantastic but let no one be surprised if the G.P.U. succeeds in "proving" that Kacson was insane at the time he attacked Trotsky or became insane afterwards.

There must be many Mexicans hanging their heads in shame at the spectacle of G.P.U. murderers going scot-free. But it is not enough simply to be ashamed. An active campaign against the G.P.U. is necessary to prevent the greatest travesty of justice.

Young Workers Advance

For the first time in the history of the Engineering apprentices' and youths' struggle a national conference, representing all the leading districts, was held in Manchester on Sunday, May 11th.

40 delegates representing more than 47,000 engineering apprentices and youths

considered by all that a **national** slogan was necessary, a slogan not based upon the intricate and complex system of percentages, but a slogan that would affect all youth, a slogan that all youth would understand. It was therefore decided to make the central slogan "3d. per hour

A Shop Steward Speaks

(continued from page 1)

impossible to work with the management at all, and set up their own canteen. They received their supplies direct from the wholesalers and employed a staff. They now cook and sell their own hot meals inside the factory at such competitive prices that the factory canteen has since gone out of business.

In a factory in the Midlands a committee has been formed by the Shop Stewards consisting of two representatives from the management's side and six from the Shop Stewards' Committee. All dealings with the Food Commissioner and the wholesalers are done through this committee. Decisions reached by it are passed on to the manager of the canteen as instructions. No interference from the management is tolerated. The committee give the instructions, the management pay for the supplies, and the committee ration the goods and fix the prices. All invoices are scrutinised by the committee. No person can obtain any short supplies from the canteen without a signed chit from the section steward. This goes for the management as well as the workers. The control is complete and the rationing scrupulously fair.

There have been attempts by various Shop Stewards Committees to control not only canteen supplies but factory output. The most classic example of this has so far been that of the works committee of a big factory in Liverpool. Apparently the management, working on the cost-plus-percentage-profit system, were more concerned with increasing the cost than with increasing output. The Shop Stewards, sickened by this and by the apathy and lack of organisation, demanded some sort of control in the factory, their object being to increase output and lower costs.

The management, of course, refused to co-operate. A deputation was then formed by the Stewards and sent to London to interview, amongst others, Beaverbrook and Bevin. After being pushed around in the usual way the deputation eventually managed to see Beaverbrook, who was forced to agree that the Stewards were right. But apparently he could not see his way to do anything about it.

One of the bosses of the firm, after seeing the deputation, promised to "look into things", since when, of course, nothing much has been done. It is worth noting here that the Shop Stewards promised to clear up the mess and gave a definite promise of a large increase in output if sufficient powers were extended to them. The bosses, however, made it quite clear to the workers that output was a secondary consideration by refusing to co-operate. Who can doubt that if the Stewards had been able to show the management how to double their profits without increasing the output the suggestions would have been readily accepted?

It is more or less generally agreed by the workers, particularly in Government factories, that the "war effort" is retarded by effete and hopelessly incompetent

was being lost by men waiting in a queue for tin hats being issued by the management. The Steward, on investigation, found that a line five hundred strong had been formed under the management's instructions and were being served with tin hats by one man. This man was supposed to fit and obtain a signature for every tin hat he served out. Some of the workers had been waiting for as long as three hours and were afraid to leave the line in case they lost their turn. The Steward at once drew the manager's attention to this and pointed out that the loss of time would be colossal. The manager said he would "look into it". Of course, nothing was done about it, and twenty one days later the distribution of tin hats limped to a close. Results: 12,000 hours lost in machine time; £6,000 lost in production and machine time. As the Steward pointed out, the whole distribution could have been carried out at a cost of not more than £20.

There are many lessons to be learned from the limited data given above. The most important is the role being played at this stage by the Shop Stewards. This is the stage where the Steward has to cement himself in with the workers. By the very nature of his job he will find himself ironing out the day to day troubles over which minor strikes could and would develop. But these strikes would have very little real significance—that is, political significance. He will, if he is an intelligent Shop Steward, use these differences to show the workers that with an organised front in the factory and good leadership the bosses are invariably forced to give way. In brief, the ruling class can do with the workers just what the workers allow them to do, and no more.

These are difficult days for the truly class conscious Steward. There is no political movement in the factories yet, and the Steward has to fight on many fronts. Against the ruling class boss, against the bureaucratic traitor union leader, against the long established, local, opportunist union officials, and last, but by no means least, the tendency of the more backward workers to quit their respective unions because of the continual and almost monotonous sell-outs of the I.U.C. on such hard won rights as the Factory Acts, now almost completely abandoned and replaced by the E.P.A., the Essential Work Order, etc.

I have heard complaints quite recently from militant Shop Stewards that the character of their work tends to make them develop along reformist lines of thought as well as action. This, unfortunately, is quite true. And more unfortunately still, there is no alternative. The worker takes his complaint to the steward, not because he wants to strike, but because he wants the complaint or case settled in his favour.

The acid test of a good workshop Steward is whether or not he wins his case.

At this period, the press of the working class has steadily deteriorated. Passively accepting the restrictions imposed by the bourgeoisie, the traditional organisations of the working class have drastically cut down their press. This deterioration finds graphic political expression in the press of the Communist Party and its attendant organisations. At a period when all the conditions demand a fighting organ for the working class, the struggle to free the *Daily Worker* from Morrison's ban is conducted through purely legal channels, while the paper of the Young Communist League, *Challenge* almost entirely eradicates political directive from its pages in favour of jazz, swing, and other distractions.

It is in this situation that the decision is taken to broaden the scope of *Youth for Socialism*. To face up to the historic tasks confronting the working class and particularly the vanguard, "Youth for Socialism" appears as the *Socialist Appeal*, enlarged in scope and in format.

That this step will be welcomed by our circle of readers and supporters is confirmed in advance by the numerous letters reaching us requesting that such a step be undertaken. The new name and set up cannot but appeal to a wider section of workers than it was possible to reach on the former basis of limiting our call to *Youth*.

The process of capitalist decay finds a parallel in the disintegration of the reformist working class organisations and theories; it extends to the Stalinist parties, whose policies are based on the shifting sands of the Stalinist bureaucracy's diplomatic and military needs. Under the hammer blows of history these Parties will be shattered in Britain as their brother parties have been on the Continent of Europe. A new fighting revolutionary leadership must be forged by the working class if it is to emancipate itself and lead mankind from its present impasse.

Continuing the life-long struggle of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, the *Socialist Appeal* sets itself the task of crystallising the growing need from the ranks of the advanced workers for the development of such a leadership.

* * *

40 delegates representing more than 47,000 engineering apprentices and youths were present. The districts represented were London, Manchester, Clydeside, Lyneside, Bristol and Liverpool. The only big industrial district not represented was the Midlands. The vast majority of the delegates present were Y.C.Lers.

A good political level was revealed by the delegates present, not in the sense that they were revolutionaries but in the sense that they had a very good understanding of the Trade Unions, their leadership and their role. This was revealed very sharply in the discussion that lasted 5 hours—a very lively 5 hours.

The reports from the various delegates showed that in all the above mentioned districts, except Liverpool and perhaps Bristol, a very good basis for organisation existed. In some districts thugs and scabs had been employed by the bosses to beat up the leading lads. Dissatisfaction existed amongst the majority of apprentices and engineering youth on the new wage agreement, since, (1) They do not cover the lads under 16 years of age; (2) They do not correspond to the increase in the cost of living; (3) No recognition of apprentices by the bosses and no representation on wage-fixing committees; (4) In some districts lads are receiving less since the agreement. In other words, no room has been made for the local fluctuations, as in the case of the men's agreements, and a vast number of local or district conditions which make the agreement entirely unsatisfactory. It was con-

SWIFT SCALES WORKERS

(continued)

police to take the names and addresses of those present but when Mr. Stephen Murray, who appeared for the defence, protested to the bench, this was stopped.

This action on the part of the authorities is being recognised by ever growing circles of trade unionists as one which has the wholehearted backing of the trade union leaders and the government. It is reported that at a secret meeting of the A.E.U. executive with their organisers and at a similar meeting of the Confederation of Trade Unions, discussions took place on how the executives should cooperate with the government, to discipline the workers, deal with absenteeism, "subversive elements", and facilitate

understand. It was therefore decided to make the central slogan "3d. per hour increase, £2. 15s. for last year lads in the first six months and £3 in the last six months". Along with this central slogan comes the slogan "100 per cent T.U."

On the question of this slogan for a "100 per cent T.U." one or two of the delegates revealed a tendency that becomes very strong in backward youth, owing to their direct conflict with the Union leaders, especially when it comes to strike action. This tendency was expressed clearly by the secretary of the A.E.U. Apprentice Section when he said: "... The question of 100 per cent T.U. should only be a side issue, for we are going to build the broad, sweeping movement that will encompass all youth outside the trade union movement." But on this question too the other delegates revealed their clarity on the role of the unions and the need for a 100 per cent T.U.

It was decided that the next National Conference should take place on August 10th, and that during the interim a meeting of the local districts should be called to survey the development. It was also decided to turn the Clydeside apprentice paper "Apprentice Mag" into a national apprentice paper, but that the running of it would still be left to the Clyde lads. The Manchester Apprentice Committee would act as the National Committee until this was elected at the next National Conference. Johnnie Moore was elected chairman.

J. D

(continued from previous column)

the introduction of dilution.

On May 17th a conference organised by the Defence Committee was attended by over one hundred shop stewards representing 90,000 workers. It called for resolutions from trade unions, trades councils, factory meetings and all labour organisations to give the utmost publicity to the case. A defence fund was to be launched and it was stated that such a fund already existed in 37 factories.

The organised trade union and workshop movement throughout the country must rally the whole of its forces against this monstrous encroachment on their democratic rights. The Swift & Scales strikers case must be dismissed and the "Prohibition of the Right to Strike Act" immediately repealed.

It is more or less generally agreed by the workers, particularly in Government factories, that the "war effort" is retarded by effete and hopelessly incompetent bosses. Whereas attempts to force the bosses to organise their factories into a state of efficiency were at one time being made by most factory committees, this stage is now passing and the workers, more and more aware of the inability of the ruling class to organize their factories for output, as apart from profit, are beginning to treat the inefficiency as a joke. "If the bosses aren't concerned with output, why the hell should I be? I've got nothing to lose anyway". That is rapidly becoming the attitude of mind of the average worker. I recently had the pleasure of hearing a Steward, exasperated at the red tape and waste of time over the execution of an otherwise very simple job, put his feelings into very plain words. "If the Government are running this war like you are running this factory, it's no wonder we are getting so many defeats!" Significantly, the manager to whom the remarks were addressed, agreed!

At another factory in Lancashire a Steward received a complaint from one of the workers that a great deal of time

because he wants the complaint or case settled in his favour.

The acid test of a good workshop Steward is whether or not he wins his cases. If he wins, he is a good Steward and worthy of support. If he loses, then he is no good as a Steward. A Steward must of necessity exercise vigilance on the workers' behalf. He must find working agreements to cover over the "sore spots"; threaten, cajole or entice the bosses into capitulation or compromise in matters that might otherwise develop into mild local action in which the local union officers would in all probability let him down, and therefore cannot be risked.

But of course there is another side to this. Provided the Shop Steward keeps his head above water politically and does not fail the workers in these minor issues, the reputation he can and will build for himself today will be a guarantee for the future. Obviously, if he cannot handle the minor cases at least as well as the reactionary Steward, he will not be called upon to see the workers through their major troubles.

One day the workers are going to ask the bosses for something that the bosses will not give them. What then?

SHOP STEWARD.

Railworkers Restive

The deep anger of the rail workers at the long delay in dealing with their application for a 10s. per week wage increase to partially compensate them for the steep rise in the cost of living made as far back as November last, was amply revealed at a conference of London rail shop-stewards, local representatives, and Branch delegates called by the London District Council of the N.U.R. and held at the Memorial Hall on Saturday, May 10th.

One delegate told of a short strike or "holiday" in his area at an important centre over the protracted nature of the wage negotiations and the Government's intervention.

Wage increases, fire watching (business premises), women in industry, industrial conscription and food distribution were the chief items under discussion. In short all major questions affecting railwaymen today.

The delegates soon revealed the chagrin of the rail workers in general over the delay in calling a meeting of the Railway Staff National Tribunal which is the arbitration body for railwaymen, and above all that the decision of this body should be binding on the Unions. In this connection it is interesting to note that a resolution calling for a break from the R.S.N.T. is on the Union's A.G.M. Agenda for this year. With its specious talk of impartiality it has failed to convince one railway worker. (This Tribunal has now "found" in favour of a 4s. per week increase in response to the demand for 10s.).

A resolution moved by a Southall Branch delegate expressed concern at the spiral of wages fruitlessly chasing prices and called for a check on the latter. It also condemned those responsible for delay in dealing with the railwaymen's modest demands and rejected the "binding" principle of the Tribunal.

In moving the motion the delegate pointed out the railway workers were amongst the lowest paid in any industry and many thousands received only 57/- per week which was scandalously low in view of the present prices. The N.U.R., he said, could take little pride in its boasted organisational strength unless it was prepared to abolish this state of affairs. The railwaymen had to think in terms of action if they were to receive any increase in any way commensurate with the actual cost of living and more speedy methods of obtaining that increase than the Tribunal afforded. Anyway, the Government had interfered and showed the workers that wage increases had ceased to be confined to the realms of industrial activity and raised sharp political issues which must lead them to a position where they had to remove the parasites who lived on their labour from their position of control and ownership.

A resolution on Fire Watching condemned Morrison's Order, showing that before this infamous order the rail owners were quite prepared to pay for the job but had been permitted by a so-called representative of the workers in the Gov-

(continued on back page)

WORKER MILITANTS VICTIMIZED IN ARMY

In the past few months a number of known leaders of the working class movement have been thrown out of the army and Home Guard without being given the slightest reason for their dismissal. Almost without exception these men have been proficient soldiers; have won promotion in the ranks, and have been commended by their commanding officers. Without exception they have been opponents of fascism, despite the false and incorrect policies upon which most of them based their fight.

The two most recent cases are Ted Willis and Mick Bennett, Chairman and Secretary of the Young Communist League before they were called up. The officer in command of the unit of the Royal Fusiliers from which Willis was discharged, was astounded at the order to kick him out which came from the upstairs departments of the War Office. Bennett, a War Substantive Corporal, had been promoted twice since the beginning of the year and had been commended by the C.O. in charge of manoeuvres only a few days prior to his discharge.

Why have these working class youth leaders been kicked out of the army and victimised? It cannot be because they are likely to give assistance to fascism!

Just as the bourgeoisie attack and victimise militants who take an active part in the struggles of the workers in the factory, so in the army the same system exists, but here it is found in a more vicious and concentrated form. No matter how proficient a worker-soldier may be in the art of bearing arms, if he protests at the system of inequality between officers and men; at the inadequate standards of pay; at the bad feeding arrangements, and demands that the mess committee should function democratically instead of being composed of a gang of picked lickspittles of the commanding officers—he is immediately put on a political dossier, suffers imprisonment, and is either put in a position on the front lines where death is certain or is drummed out of the army without being given the right to protest. Above all, the capitalists and their pampered officer caste will not have in the ranks—if they can avoid it—a soldier who takes an intelligent interest in the affairs of his class, and who gives a socialist interpretation to the events of the day.

Indeed, the **Army Manual** specifically states that:

"No officer, or soldier... is permitted to take part in the affairs of any political organisation or party, or in any other manner..."

ies by the workers—the genuine anti-fascist fighters are kicked out and victimised.

And in the Home Guard this situation also exists. Workers who speak out are discharged, while the control is vested more firmly in the hands of reactionary Blimps. In the recent appointments of commanding posts, out of 319 appointments only 19 are without titles. Many of these titled gentry are known to have been closely associated with Mosley, while most of them have been associated with reactionary anti-working class organisations.

But while exposing the anti-democratic character of the army and the victimisation of its members, the Communist Party have no alternative programme with which the workers must fight back. In his articles in "Challenge", Bennett sums up the Communist Party's position thus: "But lots of people will want to know why such deliberate and obvious political discrimination is being made, and by whose orders these anti-democratic measures are being carried out." The answer to such a banality is obvious—at the instruction of the capitalist government and class. No directive is given as to how to combat this "political discrimination".

Towards the end of the last war, Soldiers and Sailors Unions and Committees were set up in different parts of the Forces to protect the interests of the rankers in uniform and defend them from victimisation. The "Daily Herald" of Jan. 11th, 1919, reports one incident as follows: "On Saturday a great procession of the soldiers concerned, swelled by now to about 10,000 marched through the town (Folkestone) and everywhere the townspeople showed their sympathy. At midday a mass meeting decided to form a Soldiers Union. They appointed their spokesmen and chose their spokesmen". When the Soldiers and Sailors and Air-men's Union was set up later it had delegates from as far afield as the forces in France.

Already voices in the forces are demanding some form of protection for the rankers. Reflecting this, "Labours Northern Voice" quotes the MR. VIEW the organ of the Manchester area postal workers on the question and finishes on the following note: "If the Army cannot stand trade unionism then there is something wrong with the Army." This is the way to protect worker soldiers from victimisation! But this is not sufficient.

The working class must face up to the

The New Rationing Racket

With a stroke of the pen Captain Lyttleton, the President of the Board of Trade has introduced hardship and suffering into millions of homes. The rationing of clothes, boots and shoes is by far the most drastic measure taken by the Government to restrict the needs of the civil population. As is usual with all such orders, the bulk of the sacrificing is to be borne by the poor whilst the rich with their tremendous resources may easily overcome any inconveniences.

We are allowed 66 coupons which must last a whole year. Whether they do or not depends solely upon the quality of the material which is purchased and the price paid. For example the suit purchased by Mr. Stockbroker in Saville Row for 21 guineas will naturally give better wear than the suit purchased by Mr. Workingman for a modest 70/-. Likewise the coat or costume purchased by Mrs. Stockbroker will undoubtedly stand up to much more wear and tear than that of Mrs. Workingman. But your coupons go just the same, the difference in return being the usual inequality between rich and poor. The new rationing will not affect the rich simply because they can buy better clothes to last longer whereas the working-people who have less money to spend are forced to use their coupons purchasing cheap shoddy material which will only last at the most a few months.

The most outstanding example of class privileges is the manner in which the order affects the armed forces. Officers of both sexes can purchase as much as they require without coupons whereas the ordinary ranks will have to make application to the War Office. The difference being as the "Evening Standard" explains "Officers are gentlemen and therefore can be trusted". Employees who in the course of their work have to wear a uniform will now be required to purchase that uniform out of their own coupons. This will undoubtedly cause a lot of unrest amongst workers whose only recreation from one end of the week to the other was to change into civvies. Now they will be lucky if they have any civvies to change into. Again, stockbrokers, bankers, and business-men, not to mention our well-dressed members of parliament with the usual over-stocked ward-

Belfast Labours' NO! to Conscription

The Resolution printed below was issued by the East Belfast Labour Party.

It reflects admirably the attitude of the Irish workers to conscription and gives some indication why Churchill was forced to abandon his plan to conscript the workers of Northern Ireland.

TO THE BELFAST WORKERS:

The Stormont Government demands conscription to relieve its unemployment difficulties, and as a means of utilising unorganised female labour to undermine Trade Unionism.

Conscripts, unlike volunteers, will have their jobs guaranteed, they say. Yet Greenwood, Cabinet Minister, predicts there will be seven million unemployed when peace returns. The frenzied war boom will cease. Victorious or defeated, Britain will emerge from the war with most of her former Dominion and South American markets lost to the United States. Foreign trade will dwindle and few ships will be required. How then will conscripted shipyard workers, for instance, get their jobs returned to them?

The British Government is coquetting with the idea of conscription here with a view to intimidating Eire into surrendering the Ports, or immersing Ireland in internal strife and fishing in troubled waters. British Imperialism and its puppet Stormont Government will bear the sole responsibility for whatever strife is provoked.

We stand for conscription of Labour by Capital neither under a green flag nor the Union Jack. The right to command Labour must belong to Labour alone. So long as the basic means of production belong to the exploiters, and the Civil

Service and armed forces are commanded by their representatives, we oppose conscription. For us the class criterion is all-decisive. The question is: Conscription of whom, by whom, and for what ends? A Socialist Britain or Ireland would probably need conscription to combat the blockade or intervention of world capital, but that would rather be the self-organisation of the producers, because no parasitic class would exist to oppress or appro-conscripated, but that began before the private.

True, the British workers have been war. At this stage, when the mismanagement and rapacity of British Imperialism are opening the eyes of the workers on both sides of the Channel, it would be shameful to submit like sheep. The working class, independent and self-reliant, must lead the struggle against conscription.

The post-war collapse of industry will drive the capitalists everywhere towards fascism. Passively to accept conscription now would be to cultivate the habit of surrendering positions in advance.

But are we not opposed to Hitler's victory? Yes; we are against the Hitlers everywhere, including those at home. The only way to victory over fascism lies through victory over capitalist imperialism, which breeds fascism. The capitalist class—look at Vichy!—will betray us to Hitler or strive to impose their own brand of Hitlerism upon us whenever it is in their interests to do so. Smash Hitlerism at home first. Demand Workers' Control of the banks, factories and armed forces. Until then, a militant class front against conscription!

East Belfast Labour Party.

25/5/41

"No officer, or soldier... is permitted to take part in the affairs of any political organisation or party, or in any other manner, until he... has resigned or been discharged."

This safeguard is, of course, applied only to the working class politicians in the army. The blind eye is turned to the hundreds of officers who are members of, or participants in the activities of the fascist party or other reactionary organisations. Mosley openly boasted that he had a wide support among the officer caste; but we never heard of a purge among these gentry. But this fear of socialists in the ranks does not apply only to British imperialism. It is characteristic of capitalism under whatever label it hides.

Among the recent documents taken in the Lofoten raid and published by the Government, there is an interesting communique from the German High Command to the officer in charge of the troops of occupation in the area. This document admonishes the C.O. to be particularly careful to see that his men are kept away from the local political movement, and to place the onus of political friction on the shoulders of the Gestapo. By such means, Hitler vainly hopes to inoculate his troops against the class influence which has destroyed the morale of every army of occupation in the past fifty years!

And no wonder the capitalist classes of all countries, Fascist, Democratic, or with any other label, are afraid of the common soldiers' interest in politics in general and socialist politics in particular. A working class which is untrained in the art of arms and pacifist in outlook, or is without support in the army, is fairly easily disposed of in a struggle. But a working class which has been trained in the use of the most modern weapons of warfare; which has class conscious cadres deeply embedded in the armed forces and is prepared to use these arms in the cause of its emancipation, arouses before them the spectre of successful revolution.

Churchill, in his book "World Crisis and Aftermath" gives some indication of the fear of the British capitalist class arising out of the mutinies of British soldiers who demanded immediate demobilisation at the conclusion of the last imperialist blood bath. He relates how picked machine-gun troops were so disposed as to ruthlessly slaughter, if necessary, the 1,500 unarmed and defenceless soldiers who demonstrated in Whitehall if they refused to go back to their barracks as instructed. It is that nervousness which paralyses British capitalism today and which urges them to take all measures to rid the army of class conscious workers.

France has shown us that the armies of "democracy" are shot through and through with fascist officers. It is reliably reported that French officers fraternised with the Nazis during the period of "Sitzkrieg". And this is confirmed by the close collaboration between the French and German officers of command at the present time.

While the armed forces have thousands of officers, who, like Hamilton—to say the least must be suspect of fascist sympath-

way to protect worker soldiers from victimisation! But this is not sufficient. The working class must face up to the situation. It is impossible to trust our fate to the officers of the ruling class. Nor can we allow the monopoly of military knowledge and control to rest in the hands of the capitalists as a class.

At the present time the masses of workers and soldiers in their overwhelming majority are primarily interested in the answer to the question of defence against Hitler. But the ruling class officers have shown as in France that they can find a common language with Hitler with the greatest of ease. To trust the fate of the soldiers and workers to these gentry is to court certain disaster. Only under the control of officers from their own class can a guarantee be found by the workers that they will not be betrayed into the hands of Hitler. Had worker-officers and soldier committees been functioning in France, the ruling class would not have found it so easy to betray the French nation into the hands of the Nazis.

Even if they succeed in defeating Hitler, Churchill's record is ample testimony to the regime of terror which he will impose on the workers—if he can. We believe, that the special problems which our class has to face in the present period can only be solved with arms in our hands. It is therefore necessary for us to seriously set about the task of organising ourselves on a working class military basis. Not only must we fight for the ejection from the army and the Home Guard of officers who are known to be close to the fascists and for the election of officers from among the rank and file, but we must fight for a workers army or militia under our own class control. The history of James Connolly and the Irish Citizen's Army are testimony that it is possible for organised trade unionists and socialists to build their own military organisations.

Organised in this way under the leadership of our own organisations and militants, no fascist army will attack us with impunity and we can be confident that our officers will not stab us in the back as the French officers did in France. We can also be confident that it will be impossible for Churchill and any other bourgeois tool to impose a regime of military reaction as undoubtedly is his plan. These primary steps must be taken by the workers if we are to survive fascist reaction and take power.

WE STAND FOR:

- AN ARMED FORCES TRADE UNION OR SOLDIERS COMMITTEES TO PROTECT WORKER-SOLDIERS' RIGHTS;**
- EJECTION OF KNOWN REACTIONARY OFFICERS FROM THE HOME GUARD AND ARMED FORCES;**
- ELECTION OF OFFICERS FROM THE MEN IN THE RANKS.**
- THE FORMATION OF A WORKERS' MILITIA UNDER THE CONTROL OF LABOUR AND TRADE UNION ORGANISATIONS.**

bankers, and business-men, not to mention our well-dressed members of parliament with the usual over-stocked wardrobes will always have a variety of expensive clothes to wear whilst the workers have to go without.

The people who are really going to benefit from this new order are the big combines such as Wolsey Ltd., I. & R. Morleys and Woolcombers Ltd., in whose hands Captain Lyttleton has placed the whole of the woollen trade. From now on the bosses of these concerns will be able to dictate at will what quality of material you will get and what price you will pay. No doubt the slogan of PROFITS first will be rigidly adhered to. The small

Stalin made a pact with General Simovitch in Yugoslavia. Stalin's paper "Pravda" hailed Simovitch as a great leader of the Yugoslav people. We were told that he was the heroic leader in Yugoslavia's war for freedom and national independence.

No sooner had Moscow given its blessing to the corrupt, reactionary Army officers of Yugoslavia than the Stalinist leaders in this country changed their tune. Prior to Stalin's pact with the Simovitch gang, the British Stalinist leaders had quite correctly pointed out that the workers and peasants of the Balkans could not fight Nazism under the leadership of the ruling class of their countries. "Challenge", for example, the paper of the Y.C.L., denounced the Simovitch Government as an agent of the British and American bankers and capitalists. Palme Dutt in "Labour Monthly" described the war in Greece and Yugoslavia as a "war of liberation", and "World News and Views" described the "feeling of relief" in Yugoslavia when the new government of Simovitch "which enjoyed the confidence of the people" was formed. It painted the war as one of the greatest that the Yugoslav people had ever fought for their national independence and freedom.

But what are the facts? Certainly the workers and peasants when they rose in revolt against Prince Paul's government were ready to fight for the independence of the nation. But the reactionary military leaders who used the popular revolt to seize power were no more interested in "freedom and independence" than Prince Paul and his gang. Where the latter had sold themselves to Hitler, Simovitch and his gang sold themselves to Roosevelt and Churchill.

Neither cared for the independence of

long as the basic means of production belong to the exploiters, and the Civil

(continued from previous column)

shopkeeper and the working people will have to put up with what they can get whilst the ruling class and their friends will continue to live as usual.

The only way to remedy this glaring injustice is to introduce consumers control now. Consumers committees consisting of delegates from the factories, housewives, small shopkeepers and office employees must take over the nation's supply to

East Belfast Labour Party. 25/5/41

ensure a fair distribution. If it is left in the hands of big business, then nothing will be done. The trusts must be forced to place their books at the disposal of these committees in order to expose the behind the scenes swindling which is being carried on against the interests of the workers. Only in this way will the workers and small shopkeepers get a square deal.

CONSUMERS MUST CONTROL.

STALIN'S 'SECRET DIPLOMACY' BETRAYS BALKAN MASSES

the country. This is clearly shown not only in the composition of the Simovitch Government but also in the way they conducted the war against the invading German army. Simovitch was the Premier. But who was the vice-Premier? Palme Dutt did not tell us that. It was the same Dr. Matchek who, as a Premier in Prince Paul's government had signed the sell-out pact with Hitler.

Did they give freedom to Croatia? The Croats had always resented the rule of the Slav landlords and capitalists. The first thing which a Yugoslav government which was genuinely fighting for freedom would have done would be to give freedom to the Croatian minority. But we know that even while the German army was marching into the country, a whole section of the Slav army was busy in Croatia keeping the Croatian peasants down. Simovitch and his fellow scoundrels were more interested in fighting their own slaves than the foreign conquerors.

Did they arm the people? They dared not arm anybody but the soldiers under their own control. Even in the face of the impending disaster they would not arm the workers and peasants. Today while Simovitch luxuriates in the comforts of the Egyptian capital along with King George of Greece and dreams of the rewards which he and his class will receive when Roosevelt and Churchill win, the workers and peasants of Yugoslavia are fighting almost unarmed a heroic guerilla war against the Nazis in the valleys and hills of the Balkans. No, Simovitch did not fight for freedom. He only fought as an agent of Anglo-American finance-capital. He was a traitor no less than Prince Paul.

We wonder what the working masses of Yugoslavia who put their faith in the

Simovitch gang to save them from Hitler think now of Stalin and his henchmen of the Yugoslav Communist Party.

Before the streets of blood-soaked Belgrade had had time to dry, Stalin drove out the Yugoslav Legation from Moscow along with the Belgian, Dutch and Norwegian Legations. These governments, having fled their countries, did not represent the people any longer, Stalin said. It will be interesting to see whether the same principle will apply to Rashid Ali's government which, given recognition by Stalin, has now fled.

Once again we find that the Stalinist leaders have no principle except the principle of serving their Moscow masters. Government and wars are supported or opposed according to Stalin's moves in diplomacy. Tomorrow, if Stalin decided to support Roosevelt and Churchill, then Palme Dutt, Pollitt and Pritt will declare that the war has changed its character and ask the workers to support the American and British capitalists.

The workers in this country cannot fight successfully against the menace of Hitlerism or of British Hitlerism under such unprincipled "leaders". The role which the Stalinist leadership will play in the coming revolutionary movement in Britain has already been assigned to them by history. Having destroyed the revolution in Russia, Stalin has no other way but to betray it everywhere. If the workers allowed the Stalinists to lead them the Socialist revolution will be betrayed no less than if Attlee, Morrison and Citrine led it. The workers will succeed in taking power into their own hands and use it in their own interests only to the extent that a new leadership with absolute loyalty to the interests of the working class and socialism is developed and strengthened.

A. R.

Mansions Empty While Homeless Wander Countryside

"Pathetic human derelicts, old men limping along holding on to the shoulder of those not so lame or so feeble, young mothers with tiny babies, toddlers clinging to their skirts, and grandmothers clutching a rug or shawl, salvaged and brought in an attempt to keep warmth in their shivering bodies."

This is how the "Southport Guardian" describes the refugees who thronged the roadways around Merseyside after the recent heavy bombings. It is the most damning indictment of the chaos and bankruptcy of capitalism that could be written. For years the Government and civil authorities had been warned about the possible effects of aerial bombardment. Grandiose plans involving the spending of hundreds and thousands of pounds of public funds had been drawn up and shelved. Regional and Special commissioners were appointed as "dictators" who were supposed to cut all red-tape in a co-ordinated plan for civil defence. Upper class socialites and society slummers talked themselves hoarse about what they would do for "these poor dear brave people". Yet, when confronted with harsh reality, the grim facts have been brought to light, that instead of organised planning there was muddle and disorder, instead of cosy reception centres there was lack of accommodation, overcrowding and bad sanitary arrangements; instead of nice hot meals there was bread and margarine. As Mrs. Margaret Towers, magistrate and member of the W.V.S. puts it: "Men were lying in utter fatigue on the floor. Women and young children likewise. The sanitary arrangements were in need of attention—a dozen things shouted for the same—there was confusion and a spirit of hopelessness . . . Those who were fortunate enough to obtain accommodation at the rest centre were given the magnificent meal of 'a cup of tea', and 'sandwiches' of bread with a scraping of margarine."

In Plymouth, the conditions were even worse, thousands of people had to sleep out on the moors. Fifteen months ago, the council asked that it should be made an evacuation area. Repeated requests were made after heavy raids but nothing was done. "Picture Post" of May 17th writes: ". . . only after five nights of concentrated bombing, some parts of the city were made evacuation areas, and the first few little groups of children began to leave for new-found homes. The line is drawn as authority happens to decide. One street is taken and another left

is offered for the problem of those men who work in Plymouth, who must live in Plymouth but who have no adequate shelter to go to when the bombs begin to fall."

In London the rest-centre population is steadily mounting and peak figures have been reached after the last heavy raids. In some of the worst hit areas it is almost impossible to find accommodation. Instead of throwing open the thousands of unoccupied houses and flats owned by the absentee company directors, shareholders and stockbrokers, the tendency is to billet the homeless on small householders, or in make-shift rest centres which are completely inadequate. The task of repairing homes which have been only partially damaged is again blocked by vested interests. Contractors more concerned with accumulating profits than catering for the needs of the "poor, dear, brave people" move their plant and labour about to suit their pockets, with the result that in several districts very little is being done.

This callous indifference on the part of the ruling class to the suffering endured by the working people can only be combated by a bold and fearless plan of action. The four most important tasks which must be tackled are food, accommodation, transport and repairs. A step in the right direction is the resolution of the Southport Trades Council instructing the Town Council to commandeer the nine golf clubs, empty houses, churches and cinemas, for living and sleeping accommodation, together with the provision of proper sanitary and toilet facilities and the mobilisation of local doctors for medical purposes. As it is clear from past experiences that absolutely no trust can be placed upon so-called "official" preparations, the organised labour and trade union movement must take the lead. The working class must have their own committees of action elected from their own ranks in the factories and the streets. The first task of these committees will be to requisition all available transport, empty houses, hotels, country mansions and clubs. Proper feeding and sleeping arrangements must be made and local bureaucrats who come along with lorry-loads of red tape should be sent about their business. There must be no foot-slogging into the country. All private cars, omnibuses and motor-lorries etc. must be placed at the disposal of the committees who would see to it that speedy transport to safe areas was arranged.

Force Labour Leaders to Take Power!

(continued from page 1)

after Hitler seized power, they attempted to justify the treacherous conduct of their brother party the German Social Democrats in not declaring a general strike, which could have been successful, because it would have led to civil war in Germany, as Citrine stated at the T.U.C. General Congress in 1933. In this sense they are responsible for Hitler and cannot unload the blame on to the shoulders of the German masses. Moreover if they conduct and only if they conduct a struggle against the capitalists who desire to load further chains on the German masses could they hope for a response and a struggle against Hitler from the German workers.

But the successes of Hitler on the continent give us the alternative, if the ruling class continues in power of either victory for Hitler, a compromise peace at the expense of the masses, or long years of war which even if British or rather American imperialism obtained the victory could only result in the victory of fascism and reaction in Britain and throughout the world.

Therefore the only way in which fascism can be fought is the breaking of the coalition with Churchill—the Tories and the waging of a campaign for Labour to take complete power. If the Labour leaders are sincere this is the only road which they can take. The alternative can only be disaster for the Labour movement.

Labour to power on the following programme.

- (1) Arming and organising of the workers under their own control to resist any danger from invasion or any Petainism at home.
- (2) Election of officers by soldiers.
- (3) The establishment of special officers' training camps, financed by the government and controlled by the trade unions, to train workers to become officers.
- (4) Expropriation of the arms industries, mines, banks, land and heavy industry.
- (5) Workers control of production.
- (6) Freedom for India and the Colonies.
- (7) A Socialist appeal to the workers of Germany and Europe for the Socialist struggle against Hitler.

Ambassador Dodd's Diary

(Continued from front page)

and England have armed in violation of the Versailles Treaty too." (March 17, 1935).

"DEMOCRACIES" SOUGHT WAR AGAINST USSR

The policy of British and French diplomacy after the rise of Hitler to power was to aid in the arming of Hitler for a war on the Soviet Union. Dodd reports the following about the attitude of Lord Lothian and the British ruling class in May, 1935. (Lothian died recently, while British ambassador to the United States.)

"Lord Lothian, who as Philip Kerr was secretary to Lloyd George during the World War, wrote me . . . a letter which I received today . . . He indicated clearly that he favours a coalition of the democracies to block any German move in their direction and to turn Germany's course eastwards. That this might lead to a war between Russia and Germany does not seem to disturb him seriously. In fact he seems to feel this would be a good solution of the difficulties imposed on Germany by the Versailles Treaty. The problem of the democracies, as he sees it, is to find for Japan and Germany a stronger place in world affairs to which, in his opinion, they are entitled because of their power and tradition. He hopes this can be accomplished without any sacrifice to the British Empire and with as little destruction to human liberty as possible."

BULLITT'S ANTI-SOVIET ROLE

William C. Bullitt, American ambassador to the Soviet Union, was also intriguing at the same time, with the French and British diplomats, to turn Germany and Japan to an armed attack on the Soviet Union.

"Ambassador Bullitt from Moscow came in this morning . . . His remarks about Russia were directly contradictory to the attitudes he held when he passed this way last year . . . But Bullitt is the heir to a great fortune and was known as a liberal contributor to the Roosevelt campaign in 1932 . . .

"Bullitt said Russia had no business trying to hold the peninsula which projects into the Japanese sea at Vladivostock. That is all going to be taken soon by Japan. I said: You agree that if the Germans have their way Russia with 160,000,000 people shall be denied access to the Pacific, and be excluded from the Baltic? He said: 'Oh that makes no difference.' . . . I was amazed at this kind of talk from a responsible diplomat who had done much to get Russia recognized in 1933. The President must know the man's mentality, but if so, how could he have appointed him Ambassador to Soviet Russia?"

On December 13, 1936, Dodd writes: "Later . . . when the new Italian Ambassador came here directly from Moscow, we were told that Bullitt had become attracted to Fascism before leaving Moscow . . .

"Last September, Mr. Bullitt was appointed Ambassador to Paris. He has made a good beginning there. But the story goes he is on the reactionary side. The Washington newspaper story says he is in full sympathy with Nazi ideas. This is hard to believe. However, yesterday Monsieur Marcel Knecht, editor and owner of *Le Matin* in Paris, came to see me, reporting that Bullitt, working for an alliance between France and Germany, had requested him to see me and ask me to advise the President to lend a hand in this. Knecht convinced me that he is an able but

... few little groups of children began to leave for new-found homes. The line is drawn as authority happens to decide. One street is taken and another left. Small wonder that the refugees out in the countryside speak bitterly, in the night times, of the red-tape and incompetence which had prevented any scheme being put into operation immediately, of officialdom which had neglected even to have registration forms ready, who have only arranged for a tiny fraction of the city's 20,000 children to be evacuated. And even now, as they point out, no solution

... must be placed at the disposal of the committees who would see to it that speedy transport to safe areas was arranged. The breaking down of the stranglehold of big business in connection with repairs, can best be accomplished by their expropriation under workers control. It is then the needs of the people would come first and prompt action would be taken to assist the most needy areas. Only the workers taking control can end the chaos of capitalism.

... A Socialist appeal to the workers of Germany and Europe for the Socialist struggle against Hitler.

The Labour leaders might argue that such a struggle for power would allow Hitler to win. On the contrary, opposition to such a programme would expose the hollow claims of the ruling class to represent the nation. It would arouse the enthusiasm of the masses in Britain both in overalls and uniform and once convinced of such a programme the masses could take power with comparative ease.

The power which Hitler has over the German masses would be destroyed, and the German and European workers would extend the hand of friendship to the workers of Britain and would overthrow the monstrous blight which now overcasts the entire Continent.

Delegates at the conference have a great responsibility. In Britain we have the last organised workers movement in Europe. If we do not learn the lesson of events we will suffer the same fate as our brothers in Spain, France and Germany. Under the leadership and control of the capitalists it is impossible to fight fascism. Only workers Power and Socialism can fight fascism in all its forms.

G. H.

● READ

Worker's International News

Monthly Twopence

RAILWORKERS RESTIVE

(continued from page 2)

...ment to get away with it gratis. The resolution backed up the E.C.'s attitude and called for continued resistance. At this stage an E.C. member told the conference of a meeting they had been called to with Morrison owing to their opposition. The other two railway trade Unions were inclined to accept the companies meagre offer of 1/6d. per night for 5 hours.

Some heated exchanges livened the proceedings when, on the resolution against Bevin's Essential Works Order depriving men of the right to hire their labour to the highest bidder, the assembly was informed by an E.C. member that they had dealt with the question and had informed the Minister that in view of the low wages received by many railwaymen who come within the scope of the order, that unless the railway companies could be made to pay a £3 per week minimum wage they (the E.C.) could not agree to the scheme. He was promptly asked how many members of the E.C. were trying to "rub along" on £3 per week? Here it should be noted that when on Union business E.C. members receive 29/6d. per day.

There was no mistaking the deep feeling on the distribution of food. Many motor driver members of the Union gave first hand experience of the way food was being maldistributed and urged the removal of Lord Woolton from his present position.

...f the most interesting features of the proceedings was the presence of women delegates mainly employed on the L.P.T.B. They expressed themselves strongly on the subject of women's em-

...ployment in cleaning men's lavatories on Tube Stations. As a result a resolution was carried calling upon all Branches to pester Headquarters of the Union with a demand that women should immediately be taken off this unsavoury job. Some women had already been dismissed for failing to carry out this job and one speaker herself was to appear before the Disciplinary Board for refusal. The male delegates welcomed their women comrades and called for absolutely equal pay.

The debates on all subjects reached a high level of understanding and those delegates who drew attention to the employing class character of the present Government and the class which it so faithfully served, received the most support. They insisted that the only way to secure justice for the worker was to remove the owners from his back. They pointed out that the Trade Unions were being forced to enter the arena of political struggle and must, under these circumstances, demand that Labour took power.

The attitude of the E.C. member who spoke of the apathy of the railwaymen who are in reality seething with dissatisfaction, typifies the treacherous behaviour and cover-up methods of the labour leadership who fail to understand—or if they understand fail to act upon the duty imposed upon them to act courageously in leading and interpreting the desires of the workers in industry. Positions of prominence and influence must be wrested from their control in the Trade Unions as a pre-requisite for the removal of the decrepit capitalist class from their positions as controllers of society.

S. B.

A.R.P. Compulsion Must be Fought

(continued from page 1)

The authorities is resented very much by the men. For the past nine months they have unselfishly devoted themselves to the saving of life and property in some of the worst air-raids, but apparently the Home Office Blimps are not satisfied until they introduce the old school-tie discipline into the service. The men have no objection to travelling to other areas for humanitarian reasons, but they do object to the high-handed coercive attitude of the authorities. In addition it has taken 20 months to train them fully for all emergencies at enormous public expense, and now after they have gained invaluable experience on the field of action along comes the red-tape men to say that they must obey or else. It is plain that here is an issue in which the working class must have a say.

If a clean up is to take place in the A.R.P., then it must start at the top, for it is here that the greatest muddle exists, not amongst the men who do the job. Compulsory call-ups and regimentation is not what is needed but the taking over of the whole Civil Defence services under workers control, in which the rank and file will have democratic voice in the running of the services. The men who are heroic enough to brave the worst blitz are the men who should be in command and not a lot of stripe-trousered office boys. The whole weight of the working class movement must be thrown in behind the struggle of the men against what is nothing more than a contemptible attempt at coercion.

...hard to believe, yesterday Monsieur Marcel Knecht, editor and owner of *Le Matin* in Paris, came to see me, reporting that Bullitt, working for an alliance between France and Germany, had requested him to see me and ask me to advise the President to lend a hand in this. Knecht convinced me that he is an able but very conservative man, perhaps a Fascist in France. A little while after Knecht left, a telegram from Bullitt urged me to see and talk with Knecht . . .

Leading British diplomats played the same role as Bullitt. They sabotaged all aid to the Loyalist government of Spain and supported Franco. Dodd writes, January 11, 1937, "Sir Eric Phipps was as discreet as ever, but he revealed more sympathy for the Fascist crowd in Spain than I had noted before. I believe now he is almost a Fascist, as I think are Baldwin and Eden." (Eden is now British Secretary of War.)

The Hoare-Laval agreement permitted Mussolini to invade Ethiopia without fear of the application of economic sanctions by the League of Nations. Dodd reports why: "I had heard previously that the reason for the Hoare-Laval proposition was the English-French fear that Communism might come to Italy in case Mussolini falls."

"DEMOCRACIES" HELPED ARM HITLER

Dodd's diary gives conclusive evidence of how the policies of the "democracies" toward Hitler was implemented by direct help in re-arming Germany.

"I visited Sir Eric Phipps and repeated in all confidence a report that Armstrong-Vickers, the great British armament concern, had negotiated a sale of war material here (Berlin) last week, just before a British Government commission arrived to negotiate some plan with Schacht for payment of short-term debts . . . due on current deliveries of British cotton yarn from Lancashire. It is impossible, Schacht said to me yesterday, to pay British debts. Yet, last Friday, I reported to Sir Eric, the British arms people were selling for cash enormous quantities of war supplies. And I was frank enough—or indiscreet enough—to add that I understood that representatives of Curtiss-Wright from the United States were here this week to negotiate similar sales. The British Ambassador pretended to be surprised . . ."

"Norman Ebbutt of the London *Times* came in to give me a report on the effects of the London protest to Hitler about re-arming—a protest made after England and the United States have sold millions of dollars worth of arms to Germany . . ."

Several days later, Dodd writes: "Ebbutt confirmed the report of mid-October (1934) that a British woman, connected with Hitler's inner group, was here just before the negotiations on Lancashire debts, to sell war equipment for Armstrong-Vickers. The British Ambassador 'had not known about it' according to previous conversations. I am sure now the British staff members did know."

"Colonel Edward A Deeds of Akron, Ohio, and New York City, president or director of twenty great American industrial concerns came to lunch today . . . Deeds had negotiated a deal with a German corporation for sending over our airplane patents so that the German company could manufacture and sell a hundred planes to Italy, the American company to share the profits . . . This sort of thing is done all the time in this European war atmosphere . . ."

"... Our Commercial Attache said, 'In two years Germany will be manufacturing oil and gas enough out of soft coal for a long war, the Standard Oil Company of New York furnishing millions of dollars to help' . . . Mr. Phillips (Under-Secretary of State, 1933-36) was amazed and distressed, although all this information has been going to the Department for two whole years."

At one point, Dodd is forced to the conclusion: "In the United States, capitalists are pressing in the same Fascist direction, supported by capitalists in England. Nearly all our diplomatic service people here have indicated their drift in the same direction."

These brief extracts, out of scores which might be quoted, give an idea of the real character of the war for "democracy" which Dodd discloses. The men who are shouting loudest for the war, and profiting most from it, are these same fascist-minded capitalists and diplomats, who armed Hitler and tried to turn him eastwards against the Soviet Union.