

# SOCIALIST APPEAL

Formerly  
"Youth  
for  
Socialism"

ORGAN OF WORKERS INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE  
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

## JOINT PRODUCTION COMMITTEES— BOSSES' TOOLS

### Swanson Puts Bosses' Case

AT A TIME WHEN THE GOVERNMENT IS CONTEMPLATING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COMPULSORY JOINT PRODUCTION COMMITTEES BETWEEN THE WORKERS AND MANAGERMENTS IN ALL ENGINEERING ESTABLISHMENTS, IT IS OF EXTREME IMPORTANCE TO STUDY THE ACTUAL WORKINGS OF ONE OF THESE COMMITTEES, TO SEE WHAT FUNCTIONS THEY ACTUALLY PERFORM, AND WHOSE INTERESTS THEY ARE INTENDED TO SERVE.

A Joint Production Committee has been in existence at Napier's, Acton, for a period of some months now. It was formed on the initiative of the convenor, Bro. Swanson and other Stalinist Shop Stewards, who have suddenly discovered the great merits to be accrued from "friendship and collaboration" with the bosses since Russia was attacked.

When the Committee was first formed it was accepted by the workers, including the majority of militants, in the belief that it would help to carry their struggle one step further; that it was a step forward in the direction of gaining the workers some voice in production. And indeed, this is how the thing was explained by Swanson and the stewards who take their lead from him.

But having lived a very mysterious life for nearly three months, during which time its existence had been almost completely forgotten, the Joint Production Committee has suddenly burst into public view with the first fruits of its labour.

A mass meeting of workers was called to discuss some urgent proposals from the Shop Stewards Committee. The Management was to attend as well. It is an evidence of the deep concern of the workers over the chaotic state of production in the factory, that the meeting was attended by about 800 workers. But imagine their disappointment and chagrin when the only concrete proposal laid before them was for the introduction of the pass-out system during the hours of overtime. The management, with its usual shrewdness did not turn up, knowing that its case would be put far better in its absence by Bro. Swanson and his followers of the Communist Party.

#### THE PASS-OUT SYSTEM

The proposal for the pass-out system was made under the pretext of the need for increased production. It means that any worker who desires to leave his work between the hours of a quarter to five and a quarter to seven must obtain the permission of the foreman. That is to say that any worker desiring to work overtime is compelled to stay a full two hours, unless he receives special permission from the foreman to leave sooner. This is placing a dangerous power in the hands of the foreman which is only the thin end of the wedge to be followed by compulsory overtime.

The sponsors of the motion had expected to rush through the resolution without any discussion whatsoever.

decision for further discussion. On the next day at a further meeting again they were forced to postpone the decision due to the opposition.

In the course of the discussions, it became evident to the most advanced workers that the pass-out system was not even intended to remedy the basic problem of waste and under-production which is causing increasing concern

By AJIT ROY

among the workers everywhere. It was pointed out from the floor that the problem of production would not be solved merely by compelling the workers to work overtime when in many cases, more overtime simply means more waiting time and more waste. It was no use shouting for more overtime when the whole policy of the government and the bosses acted in the direction of discouraging overtime. If the government and the Tories were more interested in increasing production than making the workers bear the burdens of the war, they would abolish the income-tax on overtime, and secure the amount lost by conscripting even a minute part of the wealth of the capitalists.

It was also pointed out from the floor that the pass-out system is already in existence in many factories, and nobody would suggest that the number of working hours were any greater than those prevailing at Napier's at the moment. Further, its introduction would in many cases lead to consequences directly opposite to those intended. For many a worker who intended to work only a part of the overtime period, would now decide to knock off after 8½ hours rather than have anything to do with the foreman. Another speaker pointed out that the problem of the production in the factory could not be solved by attacking the rights of the workers and attempting to dragoon them, but by extending their rights and securing workers' control of production through the trade

## STALIN THREATENS NEW TURN

### Anglo—U.S.A. Imperialists Fear Soviet Victory

By E. GRANT

A WORLD, ALREADY ASTONISHED AT THE DIZZYING TURNS OF STALIN'S POLICIES, WITNESSED A NEW THREATENED ORIENTATION IN STALIN'S ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 55 ON THE OCCASION OF THE 24TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RED ARMY.

In it Stalin seems to have made the discovery that there is a difference between the German people and Hitler. "It would be ridiculous," he said, "to identify Hitler's clique with the German people and the German state. The experience of history shows that Hitlers come and go whereas the German people and the German state remain."

This is in striking contrast to what Stalin and his supporters have been saying in their propaganda in the last few months. Whereas in the beginning of the war between Germany and Russia the Kremlin leaders, although not issuing a call to internationalism, did make a distinction between the Nazi gang and the German people. Gradually, however, the propaganda of Stalin became more and more indistinguishable from that of his "democratic allies". Indeed it became even worse, arousing protests from even the

the heading of the Red Army paper, the *Red Star* with the words "Death to the German Invaders." Innumerable examples appeared in the press such as the one we reproduce whose authenticity is guaranteed by its appearance in the official Communist Party publication "World News and Views."

"How can the German people not be held to pay for these terrible crimes? And if one states: the German people have nothing in common with these murderers, then the question arises, what proof of this can the German people present?"

## TROTSKY'S ROLE IN THE RED ARMY

### Why the Press was Silent

In the entire course of the war, there is nothing that has sent so much enthusiasm through the ranks of the British workers as the mighty and inspiring resistance of the Red Army. Against the advancing tide of Hitler's fascism the Red Army has set a spirit, a fighting quality and a self-sacrificing heroism that have lit up the dark seas

three terrible years of famine and starvation, the interventionist armies of 14 different nations.

In the early days of the Revolution no one would have dared to raise his voice and say that the Red Army was fighting a "national" war.

No voice was raised against Trotsky when, in making his report on the



Nazi gang and the German people. Gradually, however, the propaganda of Stalin became more and more indistinguishable from that of his "democratic allies". Indeed it became even worse, arousing protests from even the liberals and labour lefts. Stalin's national chauvinism was epitomised in the symbolic replacement of the words "Workers of the World Unite!" on

## NO INTERNATIONAL APPEAL

Has Stalin dimly remembered the traditions of Lenin by his newly voiced discrimination between the Nazis and the German people? Nothing could be further from the truth. For there is no mention of socialism or internationalism in the whole speech; there is no appeal to the German workers and soldiers to unite to establish a socialist Europe and world. Under these circumstances, the assurances of Stalin, that German soldiers who surrender will be spared their lives does not carry much weight. The British imperialists and the American imperialists have done no more and no less to their adversaries. What effect can this be expected to have on the Germans who have been led to believe by Stalin's propaganda that they are fighting for the preservation of Germany against another Versailles? Turns cannot be made overnight and expect to reap response. The mischief

## DESTRUCTION OF FASCISM—NOT STALIN'S WAR AIM

Veiled behind Stalin's speech is contained a threat to the democracies of a peace with the German state—another Soviet-German alliance—this time not necessarily with Hitler, but if need be with the German militarists.

Stalin did everything possible to avoid the conflict with Hitler and would just as readily return to the policy of German-Russian collaboration. Any terms, any pacts, any alliances—Stalin's sole concern is the preservation of the privileges and power of the Russian ruling caste.

Stalin's war aims, as outlined by himself, are no longer the destruction of Germany, or even the destruction of German fascism, but merely: the restoration of Russia's 1940 frontiers. In the course of achieving these aims, he states "It is very likely that the war for the liberation of our Soviet land will result in the ousting or destruction of Hitler's clique. We would welcome such an outcome..." We would welcome such an outcome, mark you! Not that the overthrow of Ger-

"How can the German people be held to pay for these terrible crimes? And if one states: the German people have nothing in common with these murderers, then the question arises, what proof of this can the German people present? After all these are not isolated cases of men ravaging Russia like Huns. Hundreds of thousands are involved."



TROTSKY REVIEWING THE RED ARMY WITH HIS STAFF IN 1918

rendered by previous propaganda has resulted in a desperate resistance of the German soldiers against the advances of the Red Army—even in the face of complete annihilation.

man fascism is an intrinsic part of the fight for freedom of the peoples of the world!

The more sober capitalist press has seen the warning and understood its meaning, unfortunately, better than the majority of the advanced workers. They have understood that Stalin is concerned only with the preservation of the borders of Russia and the maintenance of the ruling clique in its present position of power. The *Economist*, of 28th February, 1942, states:

"... the spectacle of the leader of the Socialist Mecca rousing his people to 'a war of patriotism, of liberation, a just war', without a single reference to internationalism, the world-wide solidarity of the workers, and the inevitability of Communist revolution, must be rather like hearing the Angel Gabriel sounding the Last Trump on a Swanee whistle. Stalin has restated in the most uncompromising terms the war aims of the Soviet people. They are: to liberate Soviet soil, Soviet lands, from the foreign invader—and the Soviet lands are carefully enumerated: White Russia, the Ukraine, (Continued on back page)

British workers as the mighty and inspiring resistance of the Red Army. Against the advancing tide of Hitler's fascism the Red Army has set a spirit, a fighting quality and a self-sacrificing heroism that have lit up the dark seas like a beacon. The tide has been checked, and even turned. Against the monotonously regular defeats which is all the British ruling class

In the early days of the Revolution one would have dared to raise his voice and say that the Red Army was fighting a "national" war.

No voice was raised against Trotsky when, in making his report on the Red Army to the First World Congress of the Comintern, he said:

"I can assure you that the worker-communists who comprise the core of this army feel they are not only the guard of the Russian Socialist Republic but also the Red Army of the Third International." (Continued overleaf col. 1)

# FOR A SOCIALIST BRITAIN— Demand Labour Leaders End Truce and Take Power

On the basis of the campaign for a Socialist Britain Now, the I.L.P. is increasing its support throughout the country.

But the programme and the campaign suffer from the weaknesses in all the methods and ideas of centrism.

## Fatal Weakness in I.L.P. Campaign

It does not take as its starting point as Marxism always does, the existing consciousness of the working class. At the present the overwhelming majority of the workers are passively accepting the collaboration of the Labour leaders with the Tories in the Government because they cannot see any alternative. That does not mean, as the certain measure of success of the I.L.P. campaign demonstrates, that they are not dissatisfied with the present situation. The gathering anger and disgust which is growing among the working class cannot fail to have revolutionary repercussions. The workers are seeking for some alternative to the impasse in which they find themselves and this opens up the possibility for a Marxist party to arouse wide echoes.

But the I.L.P. does not offer the alternative in their Socialist Britain programme. Their programme fits in neither with a revolutionary situation in which the masses are striving directly towards the conquest of power, nor with the period as at present, when mass disillusionment is just beginning to be reflected among the working class.

The continual reiteration that Socialism alone can solve the workers'

foreman to leave sooner. This is placing a dangerous power in the hands of the foreman which is only the thin end of the wedge to be followed by compulsory overtime.

The sponsors of the motion had expected to rush through the resolution without any discussion whatsoever, as they have been in the habit of doing at past meetings. But this procedure was made impossible in this particular case by the considerable opposition to the proposal. In fact so great was the opposition that at the first meeting the stewards did not dare put the motion but were forced to postpone the de-

problems does not show the workers the next step forward. Many, if not most of the workers who voted Labour in the elections would no doubt agree with this if the problem were posed to them. But, they will say, what must we do now?

The I.L.P. has not suggested the organisation of Soviets round which the workers can gather, because obviously this would not meet the requirements of the present situation. But nor have they explained precisely the nature of the Government which a "Socialist Britain" would inaugurate, and how this change is to be achieved. Would it be a government of the I.L.P.? Perhaps with some of their Labour "left" friends added? On this the programme is ambiguous. And here is the fatal flaw in the policy of the I.L.P. which arises from the theoretical incapacity of the leaders of the I.L.P. to work their policy out to their conclusion.

Further, they have refused to come out courageously and consistently with a campaign of exposure of the labour leaders and of the role of Stalinism within the Labour movement. They explain the rejection of the slogan of "Labour to Power" among their own members by pointing to the reformist position of the labour leaders.

The invitation sent out to all working class bodies, trade unions, co-operatives, etc., reveals the nebulous and unreal character of the campaign. The overwhelming majority of these organisations, with any roots at all among the working class are associated in one way or another with the Labour Party. If the idea of the Conference is to get the Labour Party workers and supporters to break with the pre-

have anything to do with the foreman. Another speaker pointed out that the problem of the production in the factory could not be solved by attacking the rights of the workers and attempting to drag them, but by extending their rights and securing workers' control of production through the trade unions and shop committees. The motion was carried with approximately 60 to 70 workers voting against. This is a significant contribution in a factory renowned for its complete Stalinist domination. A motion demanding the abolition of the (Continued overleaf)

sent programme of the labour leaders then this must be clearly and openly conveyed to them. But this is not—as the invitation appeals to—aside all organisational differences and to join in this great united effort for a Socialist Britain Now! In other words membership and support of the mass organisations is to be continued just as formerly, with their present policies.

But in that case how is the Socialist Britain to be achieved? What organisational form is the movement to take? The labour leaders are certainly not prepared to take any action whatsoever.

The whole conception is a failure of the campaign which the Socialist Britain waged for a "Peoples Government" when they "opposed" the war. It is as vague and ambiguous as the Labour Party has not even the vigour which the Convention systematically assailed the treacherous leadership of the Labour Party (without pointing to a practical alternative). The same old leftism is to be observed in both. The Socialist Britain Now conference has only have an effect on those who have already become disillusioned with the Labour Party reformism and in that sense (from the I.L.P. point of view) cannot achieve anything. These workers who support it would in any case support the I.L.P.—they do not already do so. With the difference that because of the confusion engendered in the programme, they will now be unclear as to how a Socialist Britain is to be achieved, especially as the campaign is completely silent one way or the other as to the role of the Labour leadership. The result must be that the I.L.P. will succeed in getting (Continued on back page)



# TROTSKY AND THE RED ARMY

(Continued from front page)

Neither the Capitalist nor the Communist party press so much as mentioned the name of Trotsky—Trotsky, who forged this weapon in the very heat of battle and led it so brilliantly to victory in the wars of intervention. For Trotsky's name represents the true spirit of the internationalism of the Red Army as against Stalin's, which epitomises the narrow nationalism which has been the fruits of his theory of "Socialism in One Country".

Here is a statement made in 1919 by Jacques Sadoul, a member of the French Military Mission in Russia who joined the Bolsheviks and later became a leading figure in the French Communist Party. He played an important part in the revolt of the French armed forces at Odessa. This was published in a pamphlet by the People's Russian Information Bureau, a Soviet sponsored body, and it gives a true picture of the role of Trotsky in the building of the Red Army.

"The manoeuvres (of the counter revolutionaries) have forced Russia to create, hastily and anyhow, a new military organisation. A Herculean task after three years of war, and after a revolution made precisely in opposition to the war!"

"My letters have, from day to day, given the history of the painful and laborious formation of this new army. That history is the history of the will of one man. As Carnot organised the armies of the French Revolution, so Trotsky is the father of the Red Army; and one could not express sufficient admiration for the extraordinary work done during the last nine months in the most varied spheres by this remarkable statesman—worthy colleague of Lenin. Having started with the voluntary system, Trotsky procured the swift acceptance of the great principle of compulsory service for all workers. Leaders were lacking. Trotsky forced the officers of the Tsarist army to give their services to the army of the Social Revolution. Many proved traitors. Trotsky had foreseen it:

but he would not dispense at first with the services of those ci-devants. He was neither surprised nor discouraged by treachery. He was able gradually to eliminate traitors and enlist loyal officers. At the same time he had opened throughout Russia military schools of instruction where the proletariat developed military leaders taken from its own ranks. The Prussian discipline which dominated the old Army had finally killed all discipline by reaction. Trotsky had laboured; and now, in the streets of all the towns, at Moscow, you will meet comrades of the Red Army which drill excellently. What do the reverses of today (July 1918) matter, This Army is now learning how to conquer, as Peter the Great learned at Poltava; and victories will come."

The Red Army was and always will be associated with the names of the great leaders of Bolshevism—Lenin and Trotsky. Not only the leadership and building of the army, but the initiative for its formation came from Trotsky. The decree instituting universal compulsory military training was adopted on April 22, 1918 by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the Soviets on the basis of Trotsky's report to this body. Within two weeks after the formation of the Supreme Military Council in March 1918, Trotsky was appointed its chairman. When this body was superseded in September by the Revolutionary Military Council, he remained Chairman.

Precisely because Trotsky's name is inseparably bound up with the formation and life of the Red Army, its history is being suppressed and falsified. Those who understand nothing of Marxism reduce the problem of the Red Army to purely military terms. For us, the military achievements of the Red Army represents one of the greatest political conquests of Bolshevism.

## NAPIER'S JOINT PRODUCTION COMMITTEE

(Continued from front page)

on overtime was unanimously passed although it was felt by many that nothing short of an actual embargo on overtime would effect a change in the policy of the ruling class.

Such, in brief, is the life-history of

Three meetings were called but due to the resistance of the workers, the same as on the day shift, which necessitated a postponement, it was only at the last meeting that the Stalinists urged for a decision on their suggested changes. After the vote had been

# WORKERS PAY FOR BOSSES' WAR

By J. SMITH

As the war continues, the lie of 'equal sacrifice' becomes more and more glaring. While fabulous profits are being made out of war profiteering by the capitalist class, the actual burdens of the war are thrust onto the backs of the workers. The published total profits for 2,017 companies in 1941, exceeded by £14,000,000 their total profits in 1940, altogether these companies and their myriads of parasitic coupon-clippers grabbed £389,000,000 of the national wealth for their private bankrolls in 1941. Yet the working-class are faced with increasing difficulty in even maintaining their already low standard of living!

Rationing, increased travelling costs, deduction of income tax and the high cost of living generally, reduce to a farce the claims of the capitalist class that the workers are receiving more wages. The fact is, that while sections

ists, industrial magnates and the capitalist class generally. To the Railway companies alone, the Government is now giving £43,000,000 annually for 'rental' of the different railways, this figure does not include the yearly subsidy of £1,000,000, a free gift poured into the laps of the Railway owners and their idle shareholders. The 5 chief transport companies between them, netted £44,607,924 total profits in 1941! But we have an entirely different picture when we examine the present plight of thousands of rail-workers, men and women, who are now demanding increases in their basic rate to a £3 per week minimum. March-

soap margarine and by-products manufacturers, made in 1940, a record profit of £12,442,573. It is worthy of note that a head director of this gigantic combine, holds a post in the Government food rationing control board. Standard Motor Co., report a published profit of £463,890 for 1941, an increase of £140,711 over their 1940 profits. Albion Motor Co.'s net profit for 1941, is £121,498. Lancashire Cotton Corporation Ltd., made a total clear profit of £694,977. Imperial Tobacco Company's profits for 1941, £7,981,241.

But these examples of greed and war profiteering by no means represent the whole picture. While the Government and the Labour leaders exhort the workers to 'save more' and 'spend less' to 'work harder' and 'eat less', while they rob the worker's wage-pocket by weekly income tax deductions, the capitalist class are robbing the national wealth by 'legal' taxation evasions. Millions of pounds in profits are 'hidden' and spread-over by various methods; E.P.T. is cynically flouted and affects only a minority of the capitalist class. The 'Economist' in a recent article on profits, stated that: "Directors make their allocations to hidden reserves, they treat taxation arbitrarily, making no attempt to observe a standard practice in this and many other items, like depreciation. Even E.P.T. standards, for the most part, are not disclosed to shareholders." By such means as this do the capitalists save millions of pounds of their profits from tax liability, and the burdens of the war are thrust onto the workers' backs.

The organised workers must demand through the trade unions that the secret accounts of Big Business and the capitalist profiteers be published. Trade union committees under the workers control must have as a special task the examination of the profit accounts of the bosses. Hidden profits will be exposed when the organised working-class demands that the books of the capitalist class be opened for the workers' inspection, and the lie of 'equal sacrifice' will be clearly revealed. The slogan must be, 'Open the books of the Capitalist class!' For the working-class Churchill can but promise a future of 'blood, toil, tears and sweat.' Against this, capitalist perspective of unending mass misery, our programme of transitional demands must serve as the rallying point for the workers, against the greed and oppression of the capitalist war profiteers. Real wages of the working-class must be brought up to the actual cost of living. We demand that the trade unions fight for a sliding-scale-of-wages, plus a trade union basic minimum. Committees under the control of the unions and workers must be set up to determine



of the workers have won various meagre increases, this 'advantage' has been wiped out by the higher cost of living. "Wages", claim the capitalist press, "are now up by 9 per cent, bringing wages up to 26 per cent above pre-war level". But, in reality, with the cost of living now at 29 per cent above pre-war level, real wages are thus actually down by 3 per cent since 1939, and even this is an understatement of the actual drop in wages since the figures published by the Ministry

banks, General Secretary of the N.U.R. at the Railway Tribunal meeting where the railworkers just claim was up for hearing, stated that, "A man earning £3 a week when war broke out, would now require £3. 18. 0 a week according to official Ministry of Labour cost-of-living figures. Yet the lowest rated, was today, with 47/- a week, plus his war bonus, still 3/1d. below what was necessary to preserve his inadequate standard of living." 190,000 adult railway workers are on rates less than

## Our Programme For Power

An end to the coalition with the bosses. Labour and Trade Union leaders, must break with the capitalist Government and wage a campaign for power on the following programme:

1. Immediate despatch of arms and material to the Soviet Union under the control of the Trade Unions and factory committees.
2. Nationalisation of the land, mines, banks, transport and all big industry without compensation.
3. Confiscation of all war profits—all company books to be open for trade union inspection.
4. Workers' control of production to end chaos and mismanagement in industry to be exercised through workers committees.
5. Equal distribution of food, clothes, and other consumers commodities under the control of committees of workers elected from the distributive trades, factories, housewives committees and small shop-keepers.
6. Sliding scale of wages to meet the increased cost of living with a guaranteed minimum.
7. Repeal of the Essential Works Order and all other anti-working class and strike-breaking laws.
8. Clear out the reactionary pro-fascist officer caste in the Army and Home Guard. Election of officers by the soldiers. Trade union wages for all workers in the armed forces.
9. Establishment of military academies by the Trade Unions at the expense of the state for the training of worker officers.
10. Arming of the workers under control of committees of workers elected in factories, unions and in the streets against the danger of invasion or Petainism.
11. Freedom for Ireland, India and the Colonies.
12. A Socialist appeal to the workers of Germany and Europe on the basis of this programme in Britain to join the Socialist struggle against Hitler for the Socialist United States of Europe.

## The Campaign of Violence Continues!

The Stalinist campaign of violence continues. Throughout the country our Appeal Army is being attacked by members of the Communist Party.

Space does not permit to deal with the numerous reports we have received—we give only one example of many, which speaks for itself.

"Five comrades turned up to sell



on overtime was unanimously passed although it was felt by many that nothing short of an actual embargo on overtime would effect a change in the policy of the ruling class.

Such, in brief, is the life-history of one of the most loudly boosted Joint Production Committees in the country. Its main activity has consisted in being mysterious. While it has been extremely tender to the privileges of the bosses, it has shown great determination and valour in imposing new restrictions on the workers; restrictions which do not assist production, but certainly swell the profits of the bosses. Under the glorious cost plus profit system, the capitalists are not paid by what they produce, but on how much they spend. More overtime may not mean increased production, but it certainly means more profits.

Will these committees help to create enthusiasm in the factories or kindle the flame of ardour in the workshops for increased production as all the champions of class-collaboration from the Tories down to the editorial Board of the New Propeller are loudly claiming? Far from it. When the workers learn, how, in practice, the most-boasted, the most-widely-advertised committees work, and what insignificant and sorry result they achieve, then they become more disillusioned and more apathetic than ever before.

The workers alone hold the key. Only they themselves, taking control out of the hands of the bosses and establishing workers' control of production can bring about the fullest mobilisation and the highest organisations; we need no new committees. Within the framework of the existing working-class movement, within the trade unions and the shop committees we have all the organisations ready to bring order into industry and to revitalise the economic life of the country.

## Swanson Suffers First Defeat

Due to the low number of hours worked, the Communist Party shop stewards called a meeting of the night shift to discuss the position. The reason for the low hours, is of course, lack of work and the heavy burden of taxation.

Instead of stating the truth about the causes of the situation and putting forward the only real solution—control by the workers through the shop stewards—they tried to induce the workers to accept an arrangement which would have meant their working extra time.

\*The proposals were that instead, as was the custom with the night shift, of the workers having their supper break from 9.30 p.m. to 10.30 p.m., the break should be altered to 11 p.m. to 12, or perhaps to 12 to 1 a.m. This in order to prevent the custom which prevailed on occasions that workers, instead of coming in at 7.15, clocked in after the supper break.

\*The workers objected to coming in for extra hours because they stand around idle waiting for work even during the present hours.

Three meetings were called but due to the resistance of the workers, the same as on the day shift, which necessitated a postponement, it was only at the last meeting that the Stalinists urged for a decision on their suggested changes. After the vote had been taken it was announced, despite protests from the workers, that the decision had been carried by the narrow majority of 112 votes to 92. There was a widespread disbelief in the correctness of the figures given; in fact most of the workers claimed that the vote had been adverse. As a result one of the workers drew up a petition demanding a review of the situation, especially since the meeting had been unrepresentative of the workers on night shift.

Becoming alarmed at the restlessness among the workers, the Stalinist stewards were compelled to call a special meeting to "clarify" the situation. The convenor, Swanson, came specially to the meeting to persuade the men "to honour the majority decision." But sensing the mood of the men he soft-pedalled the talk about "co-operation with the management" and argued demagogically that by the refusal to accept the decision, the men were playing into the hands of the management! To his surprise and dismay he was greeted for the first time since his election, to a running fire of interjections and interruptions. The workers had had enough of the glib talk, which since the change of line of the Communist Party, had succeeded in imposing restrictions on the workers in the interests only of the bosses. The workers angrily demanded after some uproar, that the meeting should vote on the matter. Swanson bureaucratically refused to put the matter to a democratic decision, but in spite of all his efforts, he was forced against his will to leave the decision in the hands of the men and to vote on the question. But before doing so, he stated that this meant a vote of no confidence. Seeing that the meeting was hostile Swanson attempted to play on the loyalty of the workers to the organisation they had so painfully built up. To reject the decision would mean putting a resolution of no-confidence in the night shop stewards. He attempted to bluff the workers that a reversal of the vote would mean the break-up of the stewards and shop organisation, thus leaving the workers at the mercy of the management. This made the workers hesitant. But as Swanson insisted that such a vote was the only course for those who opposed the previous decision, one worker proposed the resolution, which was seconded. Discussion took place before the vote was taken. Caught in his own trap and realising that a majority would vote in favour, Swanson beat a hasty retreat. He suddenly realised that there was an alternative method of getting the previous decision altered. A resolution could be moved that it be rescinded. This was done and carried overwhelmingly. Immediately after a resolution was moved fixing the meal break back to the previous time. So big was the majority that the vote was not even counted.

Napiers workers must draw the correct conclusions and fight for a genuine policy in the interests of the workers, through new militant shop stewards.

to official Ministry of Labour cost-of-living figures. Yet the lowest rated, was today, with 47/- a week, plus his war bonus, still 3/1d. below what was necessary to preserve his inadequate standard of living." 190,000 adult railway workers are on rates less than £3 per week, 200 grades, including women, receive, excluding war bonus, less than £3 a week. And the total weekly wage of some 70,000 of the railway workers is well below £3.

As the continuation of the war depresses the living standards of the working class ever lower, for the bosses it is proving very profitable. Profits in fact are rocketing skyhigh. Some examples reveal the extent to which the capitalist class are cashing in on the war. Lever Bros., and Unilevers,

the cost of living now at 29 per cent above pre-war level, real wages are thus actually down by 3 per cent since 1939, and even this is an understatement of the actual drop in wages since the figures published by the Ministry of Labour index are based on outdated statistics. Food prices alone have increased since 1939 by 68 per cent; cost of industrial materials and articles for sale increased 55 per cent. These items do not include the increased cost of transport, a vital item in the weekly budget of all workers.

The Government is spending at the colossal rate of £13,000,000 a day. The great portion of this is finding its way into the capacious pockets of the bankers, the war profiteers, the monopol-

# JAIL THE BOSSES—NOT THE WORKERS!

The campaign to pile the responsibility for low production on the shoulders of the workers and to cover up the real culprits—the owners—is not confined to mere words. Workers are receiving savage sentences for trivial offences which have little if no effect on production at all compared with the thousands of hours wasted by the capitalists through their mismanagement and deliberate sabotage. If the so-called "offences" of the workers on the left hand column deserve sentences of 20 and 30 days imprisonment, then the crimes of the capitalists on the right hand column merit sentences which are beyond all computation.

"Overcrowded transport, which prevented him getting to work in time, was the excuse put forward by John Wilson (18), an iron worker, of 107 Florence St., Glasgow, in Glasgow Sheriff Court yesterday, when he admitted charges of absenteeism. He was fined £2."

"Samuel Doak, 37 Balbeg Street, Glasgow, said he had been late for work because his nine-month-old baby, who was teething, had kept him up all night. He was sent to prison for 30 days."

"Robert Turnbull, 34 Dover Street, Glasgow, was originally sentenced to 30 days imprisonment, but after he had been recalled, and a trade union official had explained that Turnbull's absenteeism was due to the fact that employees who were 15 minutes late were locked out, the sentence was reduced to one of 20 days' imprisonment."

"Gateshead Colliery No. 2 has been closed and there is still 5 million tons of coal to be worked. The reason given is that it is uneconomical—in other words it does not produce enough profits.

Faludhouse Collieries now em-

ploying 700 men, are threatened with closure. Reason given is

## LONDON MEETING FOR WORKERS' CONTROL

One hundred and fifty workers from factories in all parts of London attended the meeting at Holborn Hall on 22nd February called by Workers' International League on "Workers Must Control Production".

Three militant trade unionists addressed the meeting, each dealing with his specific trade and the chaotic conditions which are in existence. The comrades were Sidney Bidwell, prominent member of the Southall N.U.R., Harold Atkinson, well-known member of the Willesden No. 3 Branch of the A.S.W., and Ajit Roy, leading Trotskyist and member of Acton No. 5 Branch of the A.E.U. Comrade Bill Elliott was unable to be present due to his attendance at an important Conference in Nottingham.

All the reports of the speakers dwelt on the one theme: the absolute subjugation of the interests of the workers—and of the "war effort" by the employing class to the lust for profits.

The closing speech, drawing the political conclusions and showing the only progressive road out of the chaos and mismanagement by means of workers' control of production, was given by Comrade E. Grant.

At the meeting was one of the Betteshanger miners whose presence was

that the coal company is in financial difficulties. There is still coal existing in this area to keep these pits working for another 15 years. Production is being retarded to the extent of 200 tons daily due to lack of machinery."

Wm. Pearson, President Lanarkshire Mineworkers Union.

In a Scottish factory when women workers raised production to 200 shells per shift down to 143 and that they could they were told to cut the number more or less knock off after this.

Report at Scottish Women's Parliament.

a happy augury for the support which our industrial policy is gaining among the most militant sections of the workers. Although he was unable to participate in the meeting, he informed us that the report of Betteshanger strikers' case in last month's issue of the "Socialist Appeal" was considered the best report which had been published in any paper.

During the discussion the questions of the Communist Party supporters as to whether we are interested in defeating Hitler were effectively dealt with by Comrade Grant, who showed that the Trotskyists alone had consistently offered the programme for the defeat of Hitler fascism—even before his seizure of power.

Comrade Healy in the chair made the collection which realised £12. 10. 0. A large quantity of literature was sold. Particularly in demand were Leon Trotsky's pamphlets dealing with centrism and the I.L.P.

Since the action of the Stalinists on the Southall Trades Council against Comrade Sid Bidwell, the meetings of that body have considerably livened up by the attendance of indignant workers and by the mustered support of the Stalinists. The attendance at meetings leapt to almost double the previous attendance.

Space does not permit to deal with the numerous reports we have received—we give only one example of many, which speaks for itself.

"Five comrades turned up to sell outside the Aston Hippodrome," writes a comrade from Birmingham, "where Peter Kerrigan and Rose Smith spoke. Within five minutes of their appearance they were told to clear off and take their "fascist rag" with them. Our comrades stuck to their rights and attempts were made to tear the papers out of their hands. One comrade received slight cuts on the neck and also bruises as a result of a tussle with the Stalinists. Leading participant in the attack was Sam Blackwell, Divisional Organiser of the local C.P., who used obscene language. Another participant an ex-member of the British Union of Fascists. The police intervened in one of the tussles and urged "both sides to use tact, after all there is free speech in this country." Stalinists appealed to police nearby to clear us off, who refused saying they could not interfere with our rights."

Not only *Socialist Appeal* and *New Leader* sellers are subjected to these assaults—we learn from a comrade in Oxford that *War Commentary* sellers too, were physically attacked and abused selling outside a C.P. meeting.

Wherever these incidents have occurred a spontaneous united front has sprung up between the sellers against this anti-working class activity of the Stalinists.

## What to Read . .

- PAMPHLETS BY TROTSKY WAR AND WORLD REVOLUTION 2d
- TRANSITIONAL PROGRAMME OF THE 4th INTERNATIONAL 6d
- TRADE UNIONS 1d
- STALINISM & BOLSHEVISM 2d
- I.L.P. & THE 4th INTERNATIONAL 2d
- ONCE AGAIN; THE I.L.P. 2d
- SECTARIANISM, CENTRISM & THE 4th INTERNATIONAL 2d

DOES RUSSIA'S ENTRY ALTER BRITAIN'S WAR? by A.Scott 2d

ORDER NOW!

## J. P. CANNON'S TESTIMONY

in U.S.A. Frame-up 1/-

Owing to technical difficulties this booklet has been delayed, but it will be ready shortly.



## SOCIALIST APPEAL

FORMERLY YOUTH FOR SOCIALISM

ORGAN OF WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE  
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITOR: E Grant, 61 Northdown Street, London N.1.

## Cabinet Reshuffle

With every day that passes the crisis deepens. Fresh disasters are brought piling one after another upon the British workers. The ruling class makes use of each twenty four hours only in order to prove more conclusively than on the previous day that it is helplessly incapable of solving the titanic problems that loom up in quick succession.

The problems of the war, of supply, of production, have been presenting themselves now for solution during more than two and a half years. In face of the gigantic events, which they do not even understand, the British ruling class has behaved no differently from savages confronted with an eclipse of the sun whose cause they cannot fathom. Only, instead of banging drums and beating tom-toms they have gone through the mumbo-jumbo of changing their Cabinets, of shuffling their generals, of appointing new heads of departments.

But unlike an eclipse the crisis does not pass by. For it is not a crisis of the heads of departments, of generals, or of Cabinets. It is a crisis of the entire people and the whole organisation of their life. To believe that Churchill can solve it by making his Cabinet smaller, or by freeing its members from "departmental duties" is to believe that a fever can be cured by scratching the spots from the victim's skin.

## "Quiet Boy! Your Honeymoon is Nearly Over"

The ruling class itself knows that the present crisis will only be followed by another and another. No less a representative of the Tory Party than Lady Astor let the cat out of the bag when she turned angrily on Randolph Churchill in Parliament with the words "Quiet boy! Your honeymoon is nearly over. You and your father will soon be out." This outburst also serves to show who are the real makers and breakers of Cabinets and Prime Ministers. Not the people but the Tory Party caucus.

The shuffling process has gone on ever since the fiasco of Norway when Chamberlain was replaced by Churchill. After Greece, the British workers were given Beaverbrook as "Minister of State" and Moore-Brabazon as Minister of Aircraft Production. After Singapore, Beaverbrook hops off to America and Moore-Brabazon is replaced by Colonel Llewellyn who has filled three Government jobs in three weeks. Who believes that this "round the mulberry bush" farce has any real effect on Production, on the war or

# ALBERT GOLDMAN PUTS THE PARTY'S POSITION ON HITLERISM

WE REPRODUCE BELOW AN EXTRACT FROM THE BRILLIANT FINAL ARGUMENT OF THE CHIEF DEFENCE COUNSEL AND DEFENDANT, ALBERT GOLDMAN, TO THE JURY IN THE RECENT U.S. "SEDITION" TRIAL. IN YEARS TO COME THE DEFENCE OF THE AMERICAN TROTSKYISTS WILL BE READ AND STUDIED AS A MODEL BOTH OF A PRINCIPLED DEFENCE OF THE RIGHTS OF WORKING CLASS POLITICAL MINORITIES, AND AS AN HISTORIC EXPOSITION OF THE IDEAS OF MARXIAN SOCIALISM. THE SECTION DEALT WITH BELOW OUTLINES OUR POSITION ON FASCISM AS THE PRODUCT OF THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM, AND THE SOLE MEANS OF DEFEATING IT THROUGH THE SEIZURE OF POWER BY THE WORKERS.

## FASCISM IS PRODUCT OF DECAYING CAPITALISM

Even assuming that Hitler should be defeated, fascism will not be destroyed because fascism is not a product of Hitler but is a product of a decaying capitalist system. Dislocation of economy is bound to follow this war; millions of men will be thrown out of work, misery and suffering will be their lot and in such a situation fascism is bound to flourish. It is in such a situation that the fascist demagogues of Germany succeeded in gaining power. The German people, crushed and humiliated by the Versailles peace, not given a chance to work and live, were thrown into the arms of Hitler. Should capitalism continue to exist after this war, fascism is inevitable unless the masses of people take their fate into their own hands and create a socialist order.

Should war last a long time, the possibility of a peace between the imperialist nations is very great. The British ruling class and the American ruling class can easily come to terms with Hitler if they cannot defeat him, but not so the working masses; they must fight Hitler to the very death—especially the socialists who know the fate that awaits them if Hitler is victorious.

The prosecution statement that in a war between the United States and Germany the defendants will prefer a victory of Germany is made either because of complete ignorance of our position or because of a malicious intention to falsify our position. Mr. Anderson said that in his opening statement. At that time, he did not perhaps know our position with reference to this question. Let no one dare however, to stand up before you now after the exhibits have been introduced and say that we want a Hitler victory.

## OUR PROGRAMME TO DEFEAT FASCISM

We say that to defeat Hitlerism it is necessary for the masses to assume leadership in that struggle.

What is the fundamental reason for Hitler's victories? Is it simply because he has been preparing for a longer time? How could he win his victories if a large section of the German people did not support him? To say that the German people, a great

truthfully: The British ruling class has a monopoly on the wealth of this world; we ought to have our share of it. When he attacks Churchill and the British ruling class, he is speaking the truth—at least 90 per cent of the time; when he talks about his own intentions he speaks nothing but lies. The same is true of Churchill who tells the truth only when he is attacking Hitler.

The situation would be entirely changed if in England the workers would establish their own socialist government and if in the United States a Workers' and Farmers' Government would displace the present capitalist government.

Socialist governments in England and the United States would proclaim to the German people: "We have nothing against you; all we want is that you join us in creating a co-operative commonwealth throughout the whole world. We have no ambitions against your territory and we shall not do anything to deprive you of your liberty; revolt against Hitler and establish your own Socialist government." Hitler could not last one week after such an appeal. He would be destroyed by his own people.

This is our solution to the problem of Hitlerism. Unfortunately we are as yet too small a group really to influence the thought of the masses. It is not we who will create difficulties for the ruling class in this country; it is the war that will create those difficulties. Let us assume a war which will last five or even more years; the cost of living will be going up; over 50 per cent of our productive efforts will go for war purposes; the people in this country will be suffering as well as the people in England and in Germany and in Italy; and we hope that the day will come when all the peoples of the various countries will fraternize and put an end to the conflict which is now being fought to guard the interests of the ruling cliques.

## THE CLASS STRUGGLE WILL INTENSIFY

It is nonsense to think that a small party like ours can, by its agitation, create dissatisfaction. What will create dissatisfaction is the war and we are not responsible for that.

The class struggle will go on during the war whether we agitate for it or not. We have very little influence in the labour movement but the struggle goes on right now. With the cost of living going up, the workers are bound to strike for higher wages and he is indeed foolish who thinks that, by putting us behind bars, strikes will cease. Neither will a revolutionary situation be prevented by putting

trial—a mass trial that is characteristic of trials in Italy and in Germany.

I do not mean to say that fascism is here; we still have a chance to argue before a jury, but the very fact that a large number of people can be dragged into court because of their ideas and writings is an indication that the monster of fascism is coming ever closer to us.

"Revolutionary defeatism" is another expression that the prosecution points to as something terrible to contemplate. I expressly defined that phrase in the column that I referred to before, published in *The Militant* of March 29, 1941. It simply means that we continue to advocate the class struggle during the war. By that is meant that if the workers have any grievances, they should demand the settlement of those grievances and if no settlement is made, they should go on strike. Will that interfere with the military effort? The responsibility is not that of the workers but of the employers who refuse to settle their grievances.

## WHAT POLITICAL OPPOSITION MEANS

In that same article I state that we want to carry on our agitation and gain a majority even during the war. But so long as we have no majority, there is nothing for us to do except to submit to the majority. "To submit to the majority," ladies and gentlemen, that phrase is found several times in my column. Do the prosecutors expect us to change our ideas because there is a war? Do they want us to stop thinking? Yes, we want to convince workers and soldiers that our ideas are correct and until we convince the majority, we are willing to submit to the decisions of the majority. For any government to demand anything more than that means practically introducing fascism.

In that article I expressly state that our party opposes sabotage, opposes any individual or group action which would obstruct the conduct of the war. If the prosecutors were fair and had the power to dismiss this case, they would do so without hesitation the moment their attention was brought to this column. He who would contend, after reading that article, that we are in favour of a victory of Hitler or that we would practice sabotage, does not want to read correctly.

Of course, under Mr. Anderson's theory, to teach socialism constitutes, in and of itself, sabotage. He stated that, but he does not claim that we would try to sabotage the army by doing something to the rifles or to the planes or cannons so that they could not



British workers given Beaverbrook as "Minister of State" and Moore-Brabazon as Minister of Aircraft Production. After Singapore, Beaverbrook hops off to America and Moore-Brabazon is replaced by Colonel Llewellyn who has filled three Government jobs in three weeks. Who believes that this "round the mulberry bush" farce has any real effect on Production, on the war or on any other aspect of the crisis?

"New blood" has been introduced this time, it is claimed, in the person of Sir Stafford Cripps. But even if this "new blood" were not the water that it is, the transfusion into the hardened arteries of this system could have no effect. Cripps' real job in the eyes of the capitalist class and of their Press which is almost lyrical about his "statesmanlike qualities" will be very different from what has been advertised. Just as the Labour leaders were introduced into the Government to give the impression that the workers' interests were really being considered, so Cripps, standing to the "Left" of Attlee will be used as the crisis deepens: not to give the workers a genuine lead in finding a way out of the present situation but to cover up the reactionary policies of imperialism.

## The Programme is the Same— Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat—

The programme of each successive Government combination has been essentially the same. The blood, toil, tears and sweat of the masses have been mobilised to the last ounce, the profits and privileges of the capitalists have received unconditional exemption. Each new minister has bemoaned the "absenteeism" and "slacking" in the factories; and called for "a new spirit" and further sacrifices in hours and conditions; no new minister has even mentioned the super-profits that are being coined from the war and the way in which the whole profit system together with its additional ornamentations such as the cost-plus-percentage scheme are holding up production a thousand times more effectively than any "absenteeism."

No new combination of capitalist ministers has been able, and none ever will be able, to win the masses of India and the East as enthusiastic allies in a genuine struggle against fascism and Japanese imperialism. The only way in which this could be done would be for Britain to give freedom to all those peoples who now live under the sway of British imperialism.

In the army itself the same ministers have done their utmost to cover up a leadership no less spurious than that in industry, a leadership which has not only no interest in fighting fascism, but which has so much in common with fascist ideology; a leadership so utterly incompetent that it has led the worker soldiers into one battle after another not only with outdated and inferior weapons, but with the methods of another century.

In every sphere the leadership and control of the capitalist class has proved to be the greatest obstacle in the way of the real aspirations and demands of the workers. The failure of each new Cabinet has proved the need, not for another trip round the mulberry bush, but for a completely new leadership which genuinely represents the interests of the masses of the people. Such a leadership, taking complete power on the basis of the programme outlined in the Socialist Appeal would solve the problems of production and the war in a way which would smash the forces of Hitlerism and of British reaction in 'coir with the masses of Europe and Russia in laying the foundations of a real New Order—the Socialist United States of Europe.

We say that to defeat Hitlerism it is necessary for the masses to assume leadership in that struggle.

What is the fundamental reason for Hitler's victories? Is it simply because he has been preparing for a longer time? How could he win his victories if a large section of the German people did not support him? To say that the German people, a great and cultured people, willingly accept the violent regime of Hitler is to insult the Germans. They are, however, given no alternative; it is either supporting Hitler or suffering a crushing defeat at the hands of the British imperialists and they fear that more than they fear a Hitler victory.

Hitler can come to the German people and say

whether we agitate for it or not. We have very little influence in the labour movement but the struggle goes on right now. With the cost of living going up, the workers are bound to strike for higher wages and he is indeed foolish who thinks that, by putting us behind bars, strikes will cease. Neither will a revolutionary situation be prevented by putting us behind bars. It would be necessary to put the whole working class behind bars in order to assure the capitalists the kind of peace they want. Hitler thinks that by his methods of force he can bring to an end the class struggle and this trial is an indication that the same methods will be used in this country. The spectre of fascism haunts this

or that we would practice sabotage, does not want to read correctly.

Of course, under Mr. Anderson's theory, to teach socialism constitutes, in and of itself, sabotage. He stated that, but he does not claim that we would try to sabotage the army by doing something to the rifles or to the planes or cannons so that they could not be used properly. The prosecutors simply claim that, if the soldiers listen to our theories, they will not fight for the government. In other words, socialism is sabotage to the prosecutors regardless of the fact that we say over and over again that so long as we are not in a majority, we can do nothing but what we are told to do.

# Lessons of the Paris Commune

As the second world war reels forward from crisis to crisis, certain anniversaries take on a more than usual significance. The 72nd anniversary of the Paris Commune which takes place on March 18th, gives us the opportunity to draw lessons which are of extraordinary importance and aptness today.

The position of Paris in the beginning of 1871 had many points of resemblance with the position of that same city in May 1940. The Prussian armies under Bismark had smashed the French army at Sedan, owing principally to the fearful corruptness of the leadership of the latter, and were marching on Paris.

The Reynaud of that period, Jules Faure swore that he would "not cede an inch of our territory nor a stone of our fortress." But in a letter to Gambetta, the same Faure pointed out that what they were really defending Paris against was not the Prussian soldiers, but the working men of Paris!

But the workers of Paris did not wait for the inevitable sell-out to the Prussians. They armed themselves and took the defence of the city into their own hands.

"But," says Marx, "Paris armed was the revolution armed. A victory of Paris over the Prussian aggressor would have been a victory of the French workmen over the French capitalist and his State parasites. In this conflict between national duty and class interest, the Government of National Defence did not hesitate to turn into a Government of National Defection."

What is this but a precise statement of the motives and actions of the Reynaud-Weygand-Pétain gang of June 1940? Just as the Government of Thiers and Faure returned to Versailles to carry out their "collaboration" with the invaders, so did that of Pétain retire to Vichy—and for fear of the same proletariat. But with this difference, that in March 1871 the armed Paris workers took control into their

own hands and held out for 70 days, whereas in June 1940 an unarmed working class was left helpless and at the mercy of the invaders. In the intervening years the French ruling class had learned their lesson from the Commune. "Paris armed is the revolution armed." Rather than defend Paris that way they preferred to come to terms with Hitler.

The Commune was established on the 18th of March 1871—the first workers' government in history. Inexperienced, weak, unsteady on its feet, it made many mistakes. But nevertheless here in real life it existed, and even in its mistakes provided vital lessons from which Marx and later Lenin and Trotsky learned the lessons—lessons which made easier the path of the October Revolution in Russia 46 years later.

The Commune failed to take over the National Bank and undermine the economic power of Versailles—it displayed a gentleness to its enemies which allowed them to reorganise their forces for the attack; above all it lacked a genuine workers' party which could give organisation and centralised leadership to the revolution. The Commune provided Marx with a laboratory test which enabled him to draw the lesson that the proletariat cannot simply lay hold of the bourgeois state machine and use it for its own ends. It must establish the dictatorship of the working class.

Today, as in 1871, the workers of France labour under the double yoke of national and social oppression. Today, as in 1871, the invaders are served by the Thiers and Trochus of a new age—the Pétains, the Lavals, the Darlans. Marx's words, applied to the first, could just as fittingly be applied

to the second generation of Quislings:

"That after the most tremendous war of modern times, the conquering and the conquered hosts should fraternise for the common massacre of the proletariat—this unparalleled event does indicate, not, as Bismark thinks, the final repression of a new society upheaving, but the crumbling into dust of bourgeois society. The highest heroic effort of which old society is still capable is national war, and this is now proved to be a mere governmental humbug, intended to defer the struggle of the classes, and to be thrown aside as soon as that class struggle bursts out in civil war. Class rule is no longer able to disguise itself in a national uniform; the national Governments are as one against the proletariat!"

The national Governments of most of Europe have opened the gates to Hitler rather than arm and organise the masses for a genuine resistance. Throughout the Continent the "conquering and the conquered hosts" have fraternised not only for the massacre of the proletariat but also for the assault on the one state whose foundation rests upon the lessons of the Commune—Soviet Russia.

But the true lessons of the Commune in relation to the oppressed workers of Europe are not drawn or pointed out by the so-called representatives of the workers in the Second and Third Internationals. These deceivers and traitors urge the masses of the occupied countries to give their support to the governmental humbug—in other words, to join with the British capitalists against those of Germany. This is only the choice between one enemy and another.

Only a second Commune could have saved the French workers from Hitler. But their leaders in the previous period

had misled them, betrayed them and left them disorganised and demoralised in face of Hitler's attack and the sell-out of the ruling class. But already the spirit of the Commune is returning, and the French workers are lifting their heads and preparing once more to settle accounts with their oppressors of both the German and French variety.

For the British workers the lesson is clear. The "combination of the two tasks" which Lenin pointed out was

By A. SCOTT

the most original feature of the Commune is on the order of the day now as it was in 1871. The task of smashing Hitler's assault and the task of liberating the workers from capitalism are in effect one task. To give up the class struggle as the Communist Party has done in the name of 'fighting Hitler' is to do exactly the opposite and strengthen Hitler and his British prototypes. The Commune showed the way. The advance of the "national" enemy was only halted when the armed workers took power from the hands of the enemy within its gates.

The seventy stormy and inspiring days of the Commune's power stand out today upon the pages of history clear and bold. The lessons of those seventy days literally offer themselves for the situation today. Led by a party basing itself upon these lessons the British workers will achieve a Commune upon which will be based the real democracy and the lasting peace of the majority of the people who really possess the power. Together with the workers of the rest of Europe and the world they will leave barbarism behind and march forward to a genuine civilisation.



# IMPERIALISTS FEAR SOVIET VICTORY

## STALIN SILENT ON AID FROM ALLIES

(Continued from page 1)

Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Karelia. If in the course of ridding the country of the foreign invader, the Russians should drive out the 'Fascist Clique' in Germany all the better—but Stalin does not raise this point to the dignity of war aim. For the rest neither he nor the Russian people have any quarrel with the German people or with the German State."

It is noteworthy that not a single mention was made of the democratic "allies" throughout the speech. No felicitations were exchanged with the "grand old warrior" Churchill; no reference to the gallant war of the united nations against the worst menace of mankind. Last November on the occasion of the twenty-fourth anniversary of the October Revolution, Stalin boasted: "We now have allies forming

a united front with us against the German invaders." Last November Stalin promised the Soviet masses that his foreign policy would assure not only material aid, but a second front. He stated then: "But neither can there be any doubt that the appearance of a second front on the Continent of Europe—and it must appear in the nearest future—will render substantially easier the position of the Red Army to the detriment of the German army." But in his latest speech there were no boasts of the benefits of the alliance with the imperialists of Britain and America: instead a warning to the Soviet masses that they rely only upon their own resources to overcome the invader. "The German fascist army" says Stalin, "is directly supported at the front by troops of Italy, Rumania

and Finland. The Red Army, so far, has no such support."

As we have consistently pointed out, Churchill and Roosevelt have rendered small aid to the Soviet Union. Compared to the herculean expenditure of Russian men and material, their aid has been derisive and insulting. The whole policy of the British and American ruling class has been to seek the destruction of the Soviet Union and the simultaneous exhaustion of Germany to the point where Anglo-American imperialism could overcome Germany with ease. In pursuance of this policy the Soviet Union has been left to bear the brunt of the most terrible war machine in history.

It is admitted even by the Communist Party that the "United States has failed to de-

liver more than 50 per cent of its commitments to the Soviet Union during the past three months.

Coupled with this the recent statement of Wendell Wilkie bears the greatest significance that he has "no confidence that Russia could really win this war in a definite way. And I have every confidence that the Americans would not like the peace very much if she did."

Their calculations have been upset by the unparalleled heroism of the Russian workers and peasants, and Hitler has failed in his objective. Meanwhile the British and American capitalists, while building up their forces for the crushing of Germany... in 1943, have looked on with complacency, shedding crocodile tears at the sufferings of the Russian people while Russia was being systematically weakened.

# Difficulties of German Imperialism

The difficulties of German imperialism are leading them to see the writing on the wall. The German general staff and finance capitalists see with apprehension the figures of the United States armament programme. In his fatal miscalculations, Hitler visualised a quick and easy victory in Russia which would have placed him in a position of impregnability against the democracies. Even if he succeeds now in over-running Russia in the coming year, his armies would be left exhausted and certainly in no position to face 7,000,000 fresh American soldiers with an overwhelming superiority of equipment. It is this which has dictated the numerous rumours of behind the scenes peace talks between Russia and Germany. Stalin does not base his policies on philanthropic considerations, but indulges in the imperialist game of power politics. Such an agreement is not entirely impossible, but it could only be realised by a coup d'etat in Germany because the policy

of Hitler is bound up with the war on the Soviet Union and it would be difficult to abandon the conquests without provoking a crisis in the regime.

Stalin has no intention of fighting to the last Russian soldier in the interests of a mythical "war against fascism." He is not concerned with the barbarous regime which Hitler has established over the German and European peoples—as little as he is concerned with the liberation of India and the colonies from the shackles of Anglo-U.S. imperialism. He is concerned only with the preservation of the unbridled clique who rule Russia on the backs of the Russian workers and peasants. To him it is a matter of indifference who rules the world—whether it be Anglo-American imperialism of German-Japanese imperialism, so long, as he now openly proclaims, he is left in peace. To such a degenerate state has the theory of Socialism in One Country reduced the Stalinists!

## REACTIONS OF BRITISH

## DEMAND A LIVING WAGE FOR SOLDIERS DEPENDANTS

The recent decision of the government to increase the proficiency pay of married men in the forces by 3/6 a week has invoked no excitement amongst soldiers and their dependants. The sentimental speechmaking of well-fed members of parliament about this paltry concession are a poor substitute for the empty cupboards in hundreds of thousands of soldiers' homes throughout the country. A "Daily Herald" correspondent on the lookout for signs of rejoicing found to his horror that the opinion of soldiers' wives in the East End of London was that "it means so little". Interviewing Mrs. Kitching, a mother of three children, he was told that she never had a dinner except on Sundays. Other days she is content if she can manage a mid-day meal for her children when they come home from school. During the week ends this family is forced to sit in the dark

### BOSSSES SEEK TO DIVIDE WORKERS AND SOLDIERS

Extreme bitterness is being felt amongst the men in the forces at such callous treatment of their dependants by the government. The soldier who was quoted in the House of Commons as saying "It seemed to him that cannon fodder was the only form of unrationed commodity available in unlimited quantities at pre war prices", sums up the keen discontent amongst the men.

In an attempt to sidetrack this feeling into a struggle between the skilled workers and their brothers in the army die-hard Tories are working overtime spreading lying stories about the so-called "good time" of the armament workers. Lady Astor suggested recently that "the better paid worker should subsidise his unfortunate comrade in the army". This aristocratic

## FOR A SOCIALIST BRITAIN—

# Expose Labour Leaders

(Continued from page 1)

the worst of both worlds—no support from those who continue to follow the labour and trade union leaders on the one hand; and no clear alternative for those who are disillusioned with them.

The Marxist attitude would be to table a series of demands and approach the Labour leaders with them proposing that they break with the Tories and wage a struggle for power. Simultaneously a campaign would be waged to draw the rank and file of the Labour movement throughout the country to achieve these aims and thus expose their leaders.

That this is possible is proved by the nervous attitude within different sections of the Labour and Trade Union bureaucracy during recent months. The tempo of the miners, generally in the vanguard of any movement among the working class, is reflected in the move of their leaders. The Miners Federation of Great Britain supported by the miners M.P.s have now come out for the whole industry to be "controlled" for the duration under what they term a

scheme of workers' control. Here was an opportunity for a party of the strength of the I.L.P., had it been a genuinely Leninist Party, to immediately challenge this shameful travesty and demand instead a full scale nationalisation of the mines and their operation under workers' control. Starting with questions such as these as a basis, there are innumerable problems in every industry and in every field with which the I.L.P. could systematically undermine the reformist position of the labour leaders. By these means a stirring and gathering into motion of the broad masses would become possible—and that, properly speaking should be the aim of any such campaign to raise the inert masses and get them into action.

If such action compelled the labour leaders to break with the Tories so much the better. This would be a prelude to a struggle for power. If they refused they will, at a slower or more rapid tempo, become discredited in the eyes of the workers and the way would then be clear to winning them to the banner of the I.L.P.

Fenner Brockway, in a recent article has referred to the "sectarianism" of the Stalinists in Germany in the period 1930-1933; but he has learned nothing of the tactic of the united front from that experience.

## F. A. RIDLEY "DISPOSES" OF LABOUR LEADERS

The reason for the failure of the I.L.P. leadership to demand that the labour and trade union leaders break the coalition with the capitalists does not arise from revolutionary intransigence, as they would have us believe. It arises out of the desire of the leadership to continue comfortably to mouth a few phrases against the war which cannot bring them into direct collision with the ruling class; it arises out of a desire to keep on as "friendly" a basis as possible with the labour bureaucracy—the differences after all, are only between friends!

This is seen by the statement of F. A. Ridley that this war will see the end of the Labour Party. In the "New Leader" of February 21st he wrote:

long ago. After all, even Christ gave up the dead as hopeless after three days."

Does he imagine that this historical assessment disposes of the Labour Party at present? Conditionally, we might accept this diagnosis in a broad general sense. But it is as if a doctor, having diagnosed a man as suffering from a disease which will inevitably kill him, were then to assume that the patient had already died. If the doctor expected to inherit his money, we would say the wish was father to the thought. But to win the masses from out of the grip of the Labour leaders is not so easy; it is not a matter of mere heritage. Ridley triumphantly assumes the job has been done. But we have not noticed that the masses are moving elsewhere, where all they



agreement is not entirely impossible, but it could only be realised by a coup d'etat in Germany because the policy

## REACTIONS OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM

Churchill has not been slow to react to the threat of Stalin, now in a vastly strengthened position. Moore-Brabazon so recently defended and supported to the limit by Churchill, has been hastily removed; and with him the other half-hearted proponents of the alliance with Russia.

The *Economist*, which not so many months ago, was arrogantly demanding that Stalin renounce claims to Eastern Poland, the Baltic States and Karelia, today talks in a different language. After the reference to the "mystery" of Russia's foreign policy, they state that Stalin's expressed war

## WHAT DOES ALL THIS MEAN TO THE WORKERS?

What does all this mean to the workers of Russia and the world? After the bloodiest war in human history—Stalin dictates that all the sacrifices of the Soviet people and the world working class are to be in vain. For even if Hitler agreed to restore the Russian frontiers, it is obvious that a terribly weakened Russia could not survive under the present leadership. In Lenin's time a weak Soviet state could survive the onslaught of capitalism because of the international sympathy and solidarity of the workers of other lands. To this support Stalin snaps his fingers. For him it is always a question of agreements with one or another gang of imperialists—never relying on the support and aid of the working class. The day before yesterday it was the world front against Hitler Germany; yesterday it was an alliance between the Soviet Union and Hitler Germany, "cemented in the blood of the German and Russian people"; today it is the "united front" with the Anglo-American imperialists for the imposition of another Versailles on Germany; and tomorrow . . . it can just as easily be an alliance with Germany again.

Instead of explaining to the workers of the world why it is that the imperialists of both sides are slaughtering and laying waste the entire globe, Stalin and the Comintern deceives them as to the real aims and interests of world imperialism. In Germany, whether it be Hitler or another figure at the head, the policy is conducted in the interests of monopoly capitalism. Likewise in Britain and the U.S.A. the fight is not for "democracy", but

a degenerate state has the theory of Socialism in One Country reduced the Stalinists!

aim; which includes the restoration of the above mentioned territory as Russian soil, "is not an unhopeful starting point for closer collaboration of a common Anglo-American-Russian settlement. Ideology need interfere with it as little as it is interfering with Premier Stalin. . . . In a word, it is an empty canvas on which a picture, either of collaboration or frustration, can still be drawn."

Stalin is prepared to come to a deal with whoever would be willing to restore his frontiers.

for markets, raw materials and colonial slaves. The aims of the Soviet Union are not imperialist, that is why we are for the wholehearted defence of the Soviet Union. But Stalin blocks the path to the extending of socialism throughout Europe. He does not use the difficulties of Hitler to stimulate revolution in Germany for the establishment of a Soviet Germany, which would lead to a socialist Europe and world, instead he uses these difficulties for a further horse deal either with the "democratic" imperialists or even with German imperialism.

All the calculations of the imperialists will come to naught—all the blind attempts of the Stalinist bureaucracy to save themselves at the expense of the workers. They will be swept aside by the coming revolutionary movement of history. The Russian workers and peasants who have so nobly fought for the remains of October will not tolerate the bureaucratic usurpers during a revolutionary upsurge which will be borne out of the present heroic struggle, they will not tolerate the Stalinist usurpers who have stolen and bespattered the banner of Lenin—they will move back once again to the internationalism of Lenin and Trotsky. The revolution will sweep aside Hitler and his clique and the power of the German capitalists. No less will the indignation of the British masses be when they realise the real intention and aims of their ruling class.

In place of the terrible imperialist bloodbath into which capitalism has led the world, will come the fraternal collaboration of all peoples—the Socialist United States of Europe and the World.

ing Mrs. Kitching, a mother of three children, he was told that she never had a dinner except on Sundays. Other days she is content if she can manage a mid-day meal for her children when they come home from school. During the week ends this family is forced to sit in the dark because there is no money left to put in the slot. This hard working mother will benefit to the tune of sixpence a day from the government's new allowances. No wonder there is little rejoicing. If anything, the discontent which forced this decision in the first place, will become more widespread.

### MEANS TEST FOR HEROES

Whether in peace or war the attitude of big business and its government towards the workers remains the same. The Means Test of peace time becomes in time of war the method of allocating War Service Grants to soldiers' families. Hard faced Civil Servants pry into the lives of these families on the lookout for some excuse to reject their claims and it is known that out of 70,000 applications, 14,000 were turned down. So frightened are the majority of women of this form of inquisition that only a small percentage have applied for these grants. Sir Walter Womersley argued in Parliament that "the small number of applications coming in shows that there is not the hardship many of us thought there was". It is only too clear of course to anyone except a callous Tory that it is impossible for a family to live healthily on the present pitiful scale of payments.

Many newly married wives have been forced to find jobs because it is impossible to live on the 25/- a week. Those who are unable to work because of illness are forced to suffer untold hardships. Many of them who find that technically they are entitled to a war service grant are in practice denied one. A case of this description was raised in the House of Commons by Mr. Collindridge who said:

"I have received a letter from my Division yesterday giving the weekly budget of a childless wife. She receives 25/- a week and her budget is as follows: Rent 10/6; Coal 3/-; gas and electricity 3/-; insurance and club 2/-. She has been married only 18 months . . . and she has to make hire purchase payments for the furniture of 6/- a week. She spends 1/6 on milk. The total is 26/- without any provision for food other than milk, and no provision for clothing, footwear or replacements. She receives from the country 25/- a week to meet these commitments."

In reply to this Sir Walter Womersley remarked: "Has she made a claim under the new scheme? If not I advise her to do so". Mr. Collindridge replied, "I have in my file here a reply received yesterday from the Department to the effect that this lady has claimed under the regulations and failed to receive one penny of satisfaction. How can she exist? It is not enough to say that she can go out to work. As a matter of fact, as was stated in the application made under the regulations, she has a sad bill of health. At the present time she is being helped by friends who allow her to make a pretext of doing work for them and for which they give a small payment to prevent her from going to the public assistance committee."

workers and their brothers in the army die-hard Tories are working overtime spreading lying stories about the so-called "good time" of the armament workers. Lady Astor suggested recently that "the better paid worker should subsidise his unfortunate comrade in the army". This aristocratic old lady whose fur trading ancestors acquired their fortune and "respectability" by debauching the Red Indians with liquor is always in the forefront with anti working class and pro-fascist propaganda.

To combat this anti-working class proposal, the Labour and T.U. movement must build up a lasting solidarity between soldier and civilian. The soldier who has no form of organisation in the army finds himself to a large extent isolated from the organised workers. It is up to the Labour and T.U. movement to break this barrier down by energetically waging a campaign for a decent wage for soldiers and their dependents. In this way any antagonism will be stifled at birth.

### THE DEMANDS OF THE T.U.C.

In September 1941 the T.U.C. demanded a flat rate of 40/- a week for a wife (including allotments) and 8/6 for each dependent child. The government's main argument against this was that it would cost too much. But when it comes to filling the purses of the armament profiteers, there appears to be unlimited supplies of cash available. The war is costing £13,000,000 a day. If the T.U.C. demands were granted it would mean an increase of £1,000,000 per year, or the cost of only 13 days of the war. The government do not mind paying out astronomical sums to the capitalists, but refuse to give even the crumbs from this rich man's swindle to the men who are fighting and dying.

The demands of the T.U.C. must be supported as the first step in the improvement of the conditions of men in the forces. But by itself it is not enough. **What is needed more than anything is a uniform Trade Union rate for the Army, Navy and Air Force.** Trade Unionists must press forward this demand through their organisations. A nation wide campaign must be undertaken to arouse all sections of the workers to the fighting men's need. A Trade Union wage for the forces backed up by the trade union movement would indeed be a real step forward towards lightening the burden of our comrades in uniform.

G. Healy.

## READ

# The Death Agony of Capitalism AND THE TASKS OF THE WORKING CLASS

By Leon Trotsky

THE PROGRAMME OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

48 Page Pamphlet

6d

This is seen by the statement of F. A. Ridley that this war will see the end of the Labour Party. In the "New Leader" of February 21st he wrote:

**In fact everything indicates that this war will mark the end of the Labour Party just as the last one did that of its Liberal predecessor, despite the valiant efforts of the Trotskyists to revive the fast putrefying corpse. The spirit died in it**

## TASKS OF I.L.P. LEFT WING

But the vital question which all sincere members of the I.L.P. must ask themselves is: If the I.L.P. leadership is convinced of the bankruptcy and lack of support for the labour leaders: **Why have no candidates been put up in the coming bye-elections against the Labour Party pro-war candidates?** The question stares one in the face. Here are six working class strongholds in which any "left" candidates opposing the class collaboration of the labour leaders would be sure of support. No possibility exists here of labour using the fear of a split vote which might let the Tory in; and the election of the Labour candidate cannot make any difference one way or the other. Apart from this purely the possibility of contrasting the advantages of the I.L.P.'s Socialist Britain programme with the programme of the Labour Party should not be overlooked.

A revolutionary party would certainly put up candidates against the Labour Party at such elections, on a programme which would include the demand that the Labour leaders break the coalition with the capitalist class and wage a fight for power. That is the difference between the Marxist policy and the opportunist policy of the I.L.P. On the one hand they reject the policy of demanding that Labour break with the capitalists and *simultaneously they refuse to place*

thought. But to win the masses from out of the grip of the Labour leaders is not so easy; it is not a matter of mere heritage. Ridley triumphantly assumes the job has been done. But we have not noticed that the masses are moving elsewhere—above all they have not moved to the address of the I.L.P. Consequently burying the Labour Party in the pages of the "New Leader" might seem a grandiloquent and revolutionary gesture, but it does not bring the class struggle one inch forward.

*candidates against the Labour Party at bye-elections!* This raises sharply the fact that the Socialist Britain campaign is completely unclear in its aims and methods; moreover, it demonstrates the lack of seriousness with which it is taken by its sponsors. How is the I.L.P. to achieve a Socialist Britain when they are not even prepared to challenge the Labour Party at elections?

Within the I.L.P. in recent months has grown a left wing, which extends throughout the country, mostly composed of young workers, attempting to grope towards the path of revolutionary Marxism. These workers must realise that the Five Point Programme of the I.L.P. does not present a clear-cut Marxist policy. Beginning with an analysis of one of the key question of tactics for the revolutionary party; its attitude towards the mass organisations; in Britain, towards the Labour Party and Trade Unions, they must realise that the centrist policy of the I.L.P. is completely unable to lead the masses to the revolutionary road. The I.L.P. is assuming some importance in Britain among the more advanced workers, it therefore becomes all the more necessary to demonstrate its vacillating character—that of a party standing between reformism and Marxism. The task rests on those workers in the I.L.P. moving towards the Left to fight for a genuine Bolshevik programme.