Workers of all Lands Unite!

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Organ of the Revolutionary Communist Party

BRITISH SECTION OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL (TROTSKYIST)

No. 67 FEBRUARY, 1949 Price 2d.

LABOUR'S ELECTION PROGRAMME

ALL OUT FOR NATIONALISATION AND WORKERS' MANAGEMENT OF INDUSTRY

By R. TEARSE

THE attention of every political tendency in Britain, from right to left, will be directed towards the Whitsun Conference of the Labour Party. The programme adopted at that Conference will be a basic factor in determining the results of the next General Election.

The rank and file of every Trade Union branch, Labour Party Ward—the working class movement as a whole—has the duty to participate and make its ideas known in the discussions that will take place. The time to organise for these discussions is NOW, not after events have taken their course.

It is possible to get an indication now of the form the proposed Election Programme will take. It is understood that, in the report of the sub-committee of the Labour Party Executive, charged with the responsibility of working out the future nationalisation policy, the Imperial Chemical Industries, Insurance, Shipbuilding, the Aircraft industry and Water Supplies are on the short list for nationalisation in the next programme.

Differences Between Labour Leaders

However, this is only at the sub-committee stage, and it is known that a section of the Labour Party tops are opposed to some of the aforementioned industries being placed on the nationalisation list. Speculation is rampant on the possibility that in the last analysis it may only be Water that remains, which wouldn't even worry the Tories.

Whatever form the final draft takes, it is clear that the basic controversy will range around the extent to which the Labour Party in office will be prepared to take industry out of the hands of private enterprise. And, although the discussions have not really opened out, some indication can be gained of the arguments that will be put forward.

According to the "Observer" (9/1/49): "... *it is known that several influential members of the Party are doubtful about the wisdom of nationalising shipbuilding. They argue that while it is very prosperous at the moment, there is every likelihood that there may be a slump in* 1951 *or* 1952. *The depression would then coincide with taking over the industry—hardly an ideal time to begin State-ownership.*"

"*A decade ago the movement still believed in the old slogan—the nationalisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange. While many members of the Labour Party would still say that this is the ultimate goal, the movement as a whole has come to feel that there are many variations on straight nationalisation.*"

This latter statement could refer to proposals that are apparently raised by some Labour leaders regarding the Aircraft Industry. They argue that there is no need for nationalisation as the Ministry of Supply has sufficient control already, although the industry is in private hands.

But one of the most illuminating statements has been made by Sir Stafford Cripps in a speech at Workington on January 9. Stating that we were "*living in a mixed economy, and the majority of our great export trades are still run on the lines of capitalist, though controlled, economy,*" he proceeded: "*That means that we must—if we are to succeed—avoid unnecessary interference with their ways of production.*"

Determining Factor is Extent of Nationalisation

The question of slump, of the maintenance of production, or the development of unemployment, a question which constantly haunts the working class, will be resolved *precisely by the extent to which the Labour movement is prepared to take industry out of the hends of the capitalist class.* If the programme stops at the nationalisation of Water, or even at the short list put forward by the sub-committee or somewhere between the two, this will not eliminate the con-

(*continued on page* 4)

BEHIND THE DURBAN RIOTS

THE scope of the native rioting against the Indians in Durban is shown by the figures: 105 killed, 1,000 injured; damage to property amounted to £250,000.

The trouble threatened to spread to Johannesburg where Africans were complaining about prices charged by Indian shopkeepers.

In the Union of South Africa there are 250,000 Indians, 2½ million whites, and 8 million natives and coloured people.

GEORGE MADONDO

The 15-year-old Zulu boy whose rumoured death at the hands of an Indian trader started the riots.

Most of the Indians are concentrated in Natal, and in Durban itself, the figures are:

European	**95,000**
Africans	**90 to 100,000**
Indians ...	**110,000**

The majority of the Indians are poorly paid plantation workers, menial labourers and clerks.

The immediate cause of the friction between Indians and Africans lies in the fact that in the native quarter most of the small shopkeepers and traders are Indians. And like all traders, the big Indian shopkeepers and landlords, who largely own the hovels rented by the natives, fleece them unmercifully.

Divide And Rule

Observing the well-tried imperialist maxim of "divide and rule," the Indians have been given a few more privileges than the downtrodden blacks. The lower strata are nevertheless, only one step removed from the oppression of the natives.

The natives are denied licences for trading and transport; they are debarred by colour-bar law from the skilled trades. The Indians have gained certain rights in this respect. In Durban, 53% of trading licences are held by Indians.

The growing resentment of the oppressed Africans has in this instance, been directed against the Indian traders and shopkeepers. But the white Herrenvolk are only too well aware that this manifestation is one which may be directed against them in the future. For it is the white rulers who exploit the African peoples who are the root cause of the trouble; the exploitation of the Indian shopkeepers is a secondary factor.

Blood On The Moon

Noel Monks, the correspondent of the reactionary "Daily Mail" admits:

"*When people, particularly natives, are ill-housed, packed into filthy, congested areas, denied educational or recreational facilities, subjected to economic exploitation, and not given any say whatever in their own interests in the Government of the Land—then there is bound to be blood on the moon!*

"*Durbanites are breathing freely today in the knowledge that the native blood-trek was not directed against them. It could be, some day, while the Union's politics remain so deeply sectionalised ...*"

Groaning under the slavery imposed on them by the industrialists and landowners, the position of the African is now further worsened by the arrogant oppression of the Malan administration. Liberal sections

(*continued on page* 3)

KRAVCHENKO CASE

ZILLIACUS ON RUSSIA

VICTOR KRAVCHENKO is suing the French Stalinist weekly "Lettres Françaises" for libel in asserting that he was not the author of his book, "I Choose Freedom," and was a "bigamist, a drunkard, an embezzler and a traitor."

The case has become a battle-ground between Kravchenko and the Stalinists to capture French public opinion for or against the Stalin regime. In the course of the cross-examination of witnesses one thing is already established: that life in the U.S..S.R. is neither free nor democratic and that things take place there which are concealed by the world Stalinist press.

While it is true that Kravchenko has gone over to the side of American imperialism, nevertheless, his indictment of the crimes of Stalinism, unfortunately, is based on a great deal of fact. From these facts, it is necessary to draw revolutionary conclusions. But no cause of the working class has, or ever will be, served by hiding the truth.

Some grim aspects of Russian life under the brutal Stalin regime have been revealed in the course of the proceedings. Example:

How C.P. Slanders Opponents

"The first witness (for the Stalinist defence), a distinguished man of letters, M. Louis Martin-Chauffier, testified to the courage of the defendants during the resistance and gave his own opinion that Kravchenko was a traitor. He then admitted that a personal friend of his, killed in the first battle of France, M. Paul Nizen, the novelist, had been accused after his death, without any shadow of evidence, of having been a police spy and a traitor, because he had left the Party in protest against the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement of August, 1939."
(Manchester Guardian, 26.1.49.)

Further:

"Mr. Kravchenko's council then produced a text of one of Mr. Stalin's speeches, to prove that M. Fernand Grenier had been quite wrong on Tuesday in declaring that Mr. Kravchenko had mendaciously inserted a sentence of his own when quoting from it. M. Grenier, who was in the court, did not improve matters by airily declaring that Mr. Kravchenko was a liar anyway and declining even to notice, much less acknowledge, that he had been mistaken."

What Moynet Saw

Kravchenko's first witness was a French Air Force pilot named **Moynet**, now a Deputy in the French Parliament, who served in Russia during the war. He stated:

(*continued on page* 4)

Indian women huddling in terror near a Durban police headquarters during the anti-Indian riots.

MOSLEY'S MEETING

TIRADE AGAINST JEWS

ON January 31 Mosley's Union Group held a rally in Kensington Town Hall.

The rally was ostensibly called to inaugurate the Fascist campaign in the forthcoming election. But this was not the subject of the speech of Mosley.

He spoke for an hour and a half. He dealt at length with a justification of his stand in the war and of course, the major part of his time was spent in a tirade against the Jews.

Finally he dropped theatrically into his chair with his eyes closed.

Outside the Town Hall, anti-Fascists held a counter demonstration. The "43 Group" organised a platform. Unfortunately, their speakers did not put forward an internationalist class position, but indulged in patriotic utterances and anti-German chauvinism which cannot result in the crystallisation of a genuine working class movement.

A number of members of the Communist Party expressed dissatisfaction at the failure of their party to call an all-London demonstration against Mosley's meeting.

WHO CONTROLS THE CHEMICAL MONOPOLY?

THE nationalisation of the giant I.C.I. industrial enterprises will most likely be widely discussed throughout the labour movement in the coming months as a result of a recommendation by a sub-committee of the Parliamentary Labour Party to the Government to this effect. In any event it is an issue which Socialists in the Labour movement should press forward for inclusion in the operative programme of the Labour Government's coming election policy.

(From "Information Digest")

Such a demand, however, cannot be separated from the demands for — nationalisation without compensation — and effective participation in the operation of the industry by the workers and technicians through their trade union and factory organisations—beginning with workers' control.

The following item, from the City Column of the **Evening Standard** (11.8.48), gives a factual account of the financial control, and thus control of the industry itself., wielded by a handful of capitalist interests (G.N.).

"How £66,781 Control The I.C.I. Giant"

"I recently asked an investor who he thought owned the companies in which he was interested. "Why, the directors, of course," he replied. "They must own the bulk of the capital between them."

The impression that directors are automatically large shareholders in the companies which they run, I find, is quite widespread.

Actually the reverse is often the case, particularly when it comes to large concerns.

191,000 Shareholders

Take the case of Britain's biggest industrial company, the giant Imperial Chemical combine. I have just investigated the holdings of the 191,000 shareholders in the company.

No single individual owns as much as 1 per cent. of the £50 million of Ordinary capital. In fact, no individual, as opposed to nominees, appears as holding as much as 1,000th part of the capital, although two investors —neither of them directors— approach this figure.

The two people concerned are **Sir Felix J. M. Brunner,** who holds 47,896 Ordinary shares, and **Mrs. Constance Goetze,** of Regent's Park, London, who holds 43,000 Ordinary and 10,448 Preference.

Among the directors, **Mr. John Rogers** has the largest holding appearing in his own name, with 13,069 Ordinary shares, followed by **Lord Weir** with 9,000 Ordinary, and **Mr. Harold O. Smith,** with 8,750 Ordinary.

Chairman **Lord McGowan** appears in the latest share register as the holder of only 1935 Ordinary shares, while many directors are shown merely to hold the necessary qualification of 1,000 shares.

All told, the 22 directors of I.C.I. hold only 66,781 Ordinary shares between them out of the 50 million odd at present in issue, equal to approximately .133 per cent. of the equity. With this tiny holding these 22 men control the destinies of an industrial colossus whose assets totalled £161 millions at December 31 last (1947). For carrying out this job they were paid for the last 12 months a total sum of £268,177.

In this case, therefore, we have the paradox of 22 of Britain's big business men being effective owners of this country's largest combine, when their disclosed financial stakes in the undertaking are a good deal smaller than the shareholdings of many other of the 191,000 part-owners.

There are, of course, a number of large nominee shareholders. Biggest of these is **Baring's Nominees** whose holdings of 2,792,516 Ordinary shares, I understand, represents the stake held in I.C.I. by the Brussels chemical firm of **Solvay et Cie.**

Next biggest shareholder is the "**Pru**" with 360,363 Ordinary and 336,891 Preference shares, while 25 other nominee holdings range between 25,000 and 250,000 Ordinary shares." (City Column, "Evening Standard," 11/8/48).

Toronto Election

1 in 5 VOTE TROTSKYIST

IN the recent municipal elections in Toronto the Canadian Trotskyist party—The Revolutionary Workers Party—nominated Ross Dowson, National Secretary of the party, for the mayoralty seat.

The election was a straight fight between the Trotskyist candidate and McCallum, nominee of the Tory machine, which has dominated Toronto politics for years. The R.W.R. announced its intention to run Dowson when it was clear that the leadership of the organised labour movement, almost 90,000 strong, would not challenge the Tories for the highest seat in civic office.

To take advantage of the great opportunities that confronted it to advance its programme for the election of a Workers and Farmers Government in Ottawa, the Toronto Branch of the R.W.R. prepared a campaign much more extensive than it was able to conduct in previous elections.

Their efforts resulted in Comrade Dowson receiving the encouraging total of 23,777 votes, almost 20 per cent. of the total.

In the previous election the vote for Dowson totalled 15,423. Thus, this year's vote shows a significant increase in support, and has been received with disquiet by the capitalist press.

Comrade Dowson, a steelworker, has been active in the Toronto Labour movement for fourteen years. In 1946 he was elected National Secretary of the R.W.R. and is one of the party's most prominent speakers and a tireless fighter for the cause of the working class.

Together with their election success, our Canadian comrades have achieved success in their campaign to put their paper—"Labour Challenge"—on a stable footing. They aimed to raise $1,500, but their objective has already been surpassed, and reports from various centres across the country indicate that there is more to come in.

READ THE FEBRUARY

WORKERS INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Contents:

WHY WE OPPOSE CONSCRIPTION

AND WHERE WE DIFFER FROM THE STALINISTS

By G. NOSEDA

IN 1949 some 170,000 young men will be conscripted into the armed forces. As a result of the passage of the Government's National Service (Amendment) Bill last December, these young conscripts—and those already in—have their period of military service extended from 12 to 18 months.

While the Tories gave full support to this measure, a considerable section, some seventy Labour M.P.s abstained on the vote. Only a small minority—twenty-five —mainly Labour, and including the two Stalinist M.P.s Gallacher and Piratin, voted against.

However, none of this opposition flowed from a clear policy posing the need for an alternative working class military policy as against capitalist militarism.

The opposition — pacifists, Labour back-benchers, and Stalinists — disputed only the "necessity" for the extra six months' service. Without bringing into the open the basic clash of class interests involved, without even raising the important issue of **control** over the armed forces remaining in the hands of the present anti-democratic, anti-labour military caste, the opposition merely confined itself to a wordy skirmishing on the limited issue of the length of military service.

C. P. On Conscription

The Stalinist M.P.s, Gallacher and Piratin, who, as distinct from the avowed reformists, at least lay claim to being Marxist-Leninists, did not conduct themselves as Communists when the opportunity arose in the debate. These Stalinist spokesmen reflected the current opportunist and demagogic "line" of the "Communist" Party on conscription. It was as recently as June 1946, in a Stalinist pamphlet, "**Towards A Peoples' Army,**" that the "Communist" Party supported the idea of a capitalist standing army. It failed to expose the class character of universal military service under capitalism, and proposed no alternative **working class** military policy. They wrote that a basis of highly trained professional soldiers must be supplemented by large numbers of trained reserves; and continued:

"Such reserves cannot be obtained from newly recruited men. They can only be made available after months of instruction and training . . . it must be based on universal military service . . . at 18 a youth is fit to begin military training; and after 18 months (provided he has the right qualities) he is quite capable of responding to the training of a young officer." (Page 7.)

This same abject and confused line was "adapted" later only to the extent of opposing 18 months military service.

"Challenge," organ of the Young Communist League, in its special issue of December 4, 1948—addressing itself to the young workers registering for military service on that day—launched the slogan of **"Not a Day Over a Year!"**

The Leninist Position

This bankrupt policy of the Stalinists on capitalist militarism contrasts sharply to the clearly posed position of Lenin, of Liebknecht, and even of the early reformists for that matter. Liebknecht summed up brilliantly the character of the capitalist standing army when he wrote in his famous work, "Militarism and Anti-Militarism," that:

"An Army based on universal military service corresponds best to the capitalist stage of development. Although it is an army composed of the people, it is not a peoples' army, but an army against the people." (Page 11—S.L.P., 1817 Ed.)

Lenin made this problem even clearer. For him it was not a doctrinal matter but an issue of fundamental importance in the struggle against capitalism. In his writings on this matter he posed it from a positive angle, too, saying that:

"In every class society, whether it is based on slavery, serfdom, or, as at present, on wage labour, the oppressing class is armed. The modern standing army, and even the modern militia—even in the most democratic bourgeois republics, Switzerland, for example—represent the bourgeoisie armed against the proletariat. This is such an elementary truth that it is hardly necessary to dwell upon it. It is sufficient to recall the use of troops against strikers in all capitalist countries. The fact that the bourgeoisie is armed against the proletariat is one of the biggest, most fundamental, most important facts in modern capitalist society . . . In working out the concrete and practically necessary answer to the question of a militia we should have said: we are not in favour of a capitalist militia; only of a workers' militia . . . We can demand election of officers by the people, abolition of military law . . . further, the right of every hundred, say, of the inhabitants of a given country, to form free associations for military training, with the free election of instructors, who are to be paid by the State, etc. Only under such conditions could the working class acquire military training for ITSELF and not for its slave owners; and the need for such training is dictated by the interests of the workers." (Collected Works, Vol. 19.)

It is true, of course, that it is not sufficient to repeat in a lifeless and formal way what Lenin said and wrote. The task is to relate the teachings of Lenin to the current problems facing the working class. Clearly, on this basis, the line of the Stalinists on conscription has nothing in common with Lenin's revolutionary teachings.

What the Conscript Is Interested In

The young worker due to register for military service is rightly not interested in phrase-mongering such as characterised the Parliamentary debate on conscription. And while he is naturally in support of as limited a period of service as can be attained, more important to him is the need to safeguard his democratic rights, civil and political, and the assurance of the best conditions for as normal a way of life as possible.

To cover up the fact that this necessitates a struggle for working class military policy and to substitute this important, elementary lesson for the abstract and negative demand of "Not a Day Over a Year," is to betray the aspirations of young workers, who have no desire or wish to serve as the armed tool of capitalist interests, either at home or abroad.

The task and responsibility of the Marxist movement is to hammer home the nature of capitalist militarism. To offer the conscripted working class youth a positive way of struggle against it and to link this with the broad struggle of the working class in the fight for Socialism.

Revolutionary opposition to capitalist conscription is not, cannot be, negative. The militarist character of our epoch brings home with full force the fact that to allow the capitalist class to monopolise, build up and control armed bodies of men, such as the standing army, is to leave the working class disarmed and defenceless in the class conflicts that lie ahead. From the point of view of the labour movement and of the Labour Government, it is clearly dangerous for the armed forces to remain under the control of the Tory dominated officer caste. The big majority of officers are anti-socialist and in any crisis would side with the reaction. They play a big part in determining the outlook and psychology of the rank and file soldier.

That is why the Revolutionary Communist Party calls for:

The election of officers from the ranks in the armed forces; the extension of the franchise to youth from 18 years of age—(old enough to serve, old enough to vote); the establishment of military schools by the Trade Unions at the expense of the State for the training of worker officers; for full civil and political rights for conscripted youth.

That is why we are against:

Capitalist conscription — for the abolition of military laws as they exist to-day.

We stand for the clearing out of the reactionary officer caste; for the dissolution of the capitalist standing army and the creation of a workers' militia whose function it will be to protect the rights of the working class.

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Organ of the Revolutionary Communist Party,

256, HARROW ROAD, LONDON, W.2.

Phone: CUN 2526.

EDITOR: E. GRANT.

BUSINESS MANAGER: D. GRAY.

THE CORPSE

THE "cold war" between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union has found a further reflection in the splitting of the World Federation of Trade Unions.

From the beginning, the development of the W.F.T.U. has been intimately bound up with the relations between the Great Powers. The delegates to the Executive Bureau of this organisation have faithfully reflected the policies, on the one hand, of the Russian bureaucracy and on the other, of British and American capitalism.

In the period following the war, when the Stalinists, in line with Russian foreign policy, were pursuing a class-collaborationist policy, utilising their positions in the trade union movement to hold back the workers, the leaders of the British and American trade unions found them quite comfortable bedfellows. But with the increasing tension between East and West, with the consequent turn to the left of the Communist Parties throughout the world, the W.F.T.U. because the scene of increasing clashes.

Faced with a solid Stalinist majority on the Executive Bureau, the American and British trade union delegates demanded the suspension of W.F.T.U. activities. At the last meeting, J. P. Carey, a delegate from the American C.I.O., declared: "It is no use pretending this W.F.T.U. is anything but a corpse. Let's bury it." Subsequently, the U.S., British and Dutch delegates withdrew.

The manœuvres of the Stalinists, the cynical methods they adopt in using the working class movement in the interests of Russian Stalinist diplomacy, undoubtedly render them incapable of building a real international body representative of trade unionists.

The American and British representatives are no less tied to the diplomacy of their own capitalists Had they pursued a consistent internationalist policy, supporting unconditionally the struggle of the colonial, the German and European masses, then they would have had a basis for the exposure of Stalinist manœuvres and for the creation of an international Trade Union movement worthy of its name.

GAINS FOR FRENCH TROTSKYISTS

IN France a minority grouping within the Socialist and Revolutionary Action has joined the P.C.I. —French Trotskyist Party. They have issued a statement clarifying their position.

The S.R.A. was formed from the youth movement of the French Socialist Party together with a section of the adult party which split away in disgust at the policies of the French Socialist leadership.

The statement of the S.R.A. minority declares that undoubtedly the S.R.A. had great possibilities, but at the present moment it is bankrupt. Its leadership has proved incapable of pursuing a consistent policy independent of Stalinism and Reformism, although the S.R.A. originally declared its programmatic solidarity with the P.C.I.

Those militants who are still loyal to the original aims of the S.R.A. are obliged to join the P.C.I., which, in spite of its numerical weakness has been in the vanguard of working class struggle.

The declaration is signed among others by **Dument**, ex-member of the E.C. of the XXth Section of Paris. **Claude Just**, ex-member of the E.C. of the Socialist Party. **Crunliger**, ex-member of the XXth Section of Saigon. **Mougard** and **Mary**, ex-members of the E.C. of Socialist Youth. **Stephen Just**, ex-secretary of Seine Federation Socialist Youth. **Roux**, ex-member of the XXth Section of the Socialist Party.

NAZI RACKETEERS STILL IN CONTROL

THE "Tribune," in its issue of November 12, 1948, gave a list of these magnates, ready backers of Hitler, who are still in control of economic life. We give it below together with some additional information from the "Manchester Guardian."

HEINRICH KOST, one of Hitler's "War Economy leaders" and former managing director of Rhein-Pruessen, is in charge of the provisional coal administration in the Ruhr.

WILHELM ZANGEN is back on the board of Mannesman, one of the combines which dominated the Ruhr, before, during and after Hitler.

ROHLAND, a member of the S.S., has returned from internment to the board of Vereinigte Stahlwerke, another giant combine.

HENLE, together with PFERMENGES, the Frankfurt banker, according to the "Tribune," are faithful representatives of the combines in the Frankfurt Economic Council.

And it was only last May that the threat of strike action on the part of 800,000 workers was necessary to secure the removal of HERR REUSCH as steel adviser to the Frankfurt Economic Council. Reusch was a member of the Nazi Party and was appointed Wehrwirtschaftsführer during the war. The "Tribune" states he has "emerged again."

Finally, LABISCH, now head of the Hoesch Trust steelworks at Silverhutte, was in charge of arms production in occupied Holland.

British and U.S. Delegates at the end of the W.F.T.U.: V. Tewson, Arthur Deakin with U.S. delegates A. Cope, J. Carey, and D. J. McDonald.

DURBAN RIOTING

(*continued from page* 1)

of white opinion in South Africa sense the inarticulate resentment.

Native Children's Food Subsidy Cut

The magazine "Forum," January 1949, comments on the growing nationalism of the Africans and gives some facts about the conditions of the natives. Dealing with the recent cut by the Malan administration in the miserable subsidy of 2d. per day for the children of natives (the subsidy for white children is 6d.), they describe conditions in the reserves:

"My Children Shall Eat To-night!"

"...another country school of 80 was closely scanned for the sight of even one child with sturdy legs or plump arms, but in vain. And all this was in one of the most prosperous areas of the Native Reserve..."

"A small man—one of the new half-pint Africans produced by a childhood of deprivation—rode on a donkey...in search of mealies (corn, which is the staple diet of the natives) now often a rare commodity. His bitter anxiety is no less memorable than the excited joy with which he returned many hours later having acquired half a bag somewhere. He shouted to us: 'My children shall eat tonight, my children shall eat!'"

The ostensible reason for the curtailment of this scheme is lack of funds. Yet while the estimate has been exceeded by £300,000—and that is the reason that demands were made for cutting it, at the same time £500,000 was given by South Africa for the suffering children of Europe.

Developing Moods

Dealing with the moods developing among the African natives, the author says:

"But he (the African) does not see this (opportunity for a good life) in South Africa where, for the first time, the African feels himself part of a race—not a tribe—a race claiming with no uncertain voice more freedom; more opportunity, more expression in his own land. Since this is denied an undercurrent of irritation has been set in motion and shows itself in sudden outbursts.

"Hungry people are irritable when they see their children suffering."

Economic Position Of Africans

The position of the natives is shown by the figures for mining and manufacturing industry. (Their position in agriculture is worse). 154,790 whites employed in manufacturing in 1943-44 earned £52,654,000; this was an average of £357 per head.

296,386 natives and coloured employed in factories earned £27,428,000. This is an average of only £94 per head.

In the gold mines on which South Africa's economy is based, 37,609 Europeans earned £19,564,364, which is £520 per head. In all mining, 53,434 Europeans earned £24,845,007, that is, about £465 per head. Whereas 405,792 non-Europeans, including coloured and Indians, earned £16,774,343, or about £40 per head.

The natives in the gold mines receive 2s. 8d. per shift and live in quarters wired in and isolated, akin to any prison.

With a capital of £79,803,000, dividends in 1943-44 were £15,493,565, that is, 18.9%.

Harvest Is Being Sown

Neither the out-and-out repressive policy of Malan, nor the veiled policy of Smuts can prevent the awakening of the African masses. The development of the African continent by which the imperialists are hoping to redeem their losses due to the movements of the Asiatic masses, will bring in its train a like upsurge of the African people.

Industrialisation and large scale schemes in the North will have repercussions in the South. That is why Malan objects to the arming of the natives; that is why he objects to granting any rights to the African peoples outside the Union.

The harvest is being sown. The African masses will come to learn that it is not the Indian people, nor the white workers who are responsible for their misery. Their enemies are the imperialists and white industrialists and landowners. They will fight for equal rights and in the long run they will get them, regardless of the atavism of Malan and Smuts, and of the white herrenvolk who support them.

STALIN AND THE CHINESE VICTORIES

A REMARKABLE feature of the victories of the Chinese Red Army has been the apparently cautious attitude which the Moscow bureaucracy has adopted towards it. While the world Stalinist press has jubilantly featured Mao-Tse-Tung's successes, the *"Observer"* of January 30 reports that these activities have "been almost ignored in the Russian press."

It will be recalled that in the quarrel with Tito, the Stalinists insisted that it was the Red Army that liberated the country.

At the same time, the Russian Embassy is one of the few that shifted from Nanking to Canton when the venue of the Chiang Government was changed.

According to reports of the *"Daily Telegraph"* correspondent in New York, "speculation over Russia's attitude to the Chinese Civil War increased today with a report from Nanking that the Nationalists intend to discuss with Russia a new trade treaty covering Sinkiang Province."

"According to this account, General Chang Chih-Chung, a member of the Nationalist delegation nominated to discuss peace negotiations with the Communists, flew this week-end to his North-West headquarters in Lanchow."

The attitude of the Russian Stalinist bureaucrats in this, as in all questions, will be dictated by their selfish interests. After their experience with Tito, who like Mao, succeeded in establishing an independent mass base, they cannot be sure how events will develop in China. They will seek to insure themselves by a fait accompli in Manchuria and in Sinkiang, which though a province of China, is virtually dominated by Russia at the present time.

WAS CHARLES Ist A DEMOCRAT?

THE February issue of "Workers' International News" contains a section of Trotsky's work "Whither Britain," in which he brilliantly summarises the social forces represented in the English Revolution of 1640-49.

The tercentenary of the beheading of Charles I was recalled by a spate of articles in the press at the end of January. In answer to those who tried to cover Charles with a democratic whitewash, including the Bishop of London and the "Sunday Times," it is well to recall the words which this true representative of absolute monarchy spoke from the scaffold.

Guizot, whom Trotsky describes as a French conservative historian, in "History of the English Revolution" summarises his speech as having the sole purport of showing that *"he had acted right, that contempt of the rights of the sovereign was the true cause of the people's misfortunes, that the people ought to have no share in the government, that upon this condition alone would the country regain peace and its liberties."*

Readers of Trotsky's material will find that he had a profound grasp of the forces at work in the English revolution.

LABOUR'S PROGRAMME

(*continued from page* 1)

tradictions in the economy which lead to slump. It will not only be shipbuilding that will be hit, but in particular the nationalised coalmining and steel industries, the basic props of the economy, will feel the full effects of the economic blizzard. And, in proposing that the "great export trades" should remain in private hands, Cripps is treading the very path that will lead to the slump.

While each step in the process of nationalisation is important and must be supported by the movement as a whole, and whilst the introduction of the "short list" would have far-reaching consequences, the nationalisation of this or that industry solves *no* basic problem. It assists the process of rationalisation and centralisation, and in that sense is a progressive step. But the contradictions in the economy stem from the *overall character* of that economy. The production of coal and steel, of electricity, etc., is part of the production process which has a logic of its own. It finds its outlet in consumption, on the markets of the world and at home. With the marketing of goods, their distribution and sale, taking place on a capitalist basis, the anarchic forces, over which the state has no control, will lead to the same catastrophic consequences as obtained in 1929-31. And the blind play of the market will remain, precisely because these forces have their roots in the capitalist mode of *production*, with which Cripps doesn't want to "*unnecessarily interfere*."

Workers Must Demand Overall Nationalisation

Thus, the first demand is that the short list must be extended to cover the *whole of the economy*, the Banks, the Land, and all enterprises that employ more than, say, 50 workers (the exact details to be worked out by the Labour Government in consultation with the Trade Unions). This is the only way to deal with the inevitable slump. On this basis, there would of necessity have to be established a monopoly of foreign trade, based on the new relationships in the economy, which would provide an insulation against the madhouse of world capitalist economy.

Production Drive Would Have Different Meaning

On such a basis the call for increased production would have a real relationship to the steady raising of the living standards of the masses. It would be basically different from the present drive, which in the long run, can only end in over-production in a similar way to the drive in the early twenties, if the opponents of further nationalisation win the day at Whitsun.

Such a policy would receive the backing of the overwhelming bulk of the organised working class. Already, the A.E.U. and other unions have gone on record for the nationalisation of their respective industries. A bold call from the Labour and Trade Union leaders would rally the wholehearted support of the rank and file.

Immediate Problems

While preparing the way for a better future for the working class, it would provide the means of grappling realistically with various immediate problems which vitally concern the workers, such as housing, the steadily rising cost of living, etc. . . .

When Cripps says "*it is absolutely crucial at the present time that every section of the population should exercise restraint in their demands upon the nation for increased purchasing power*," he forgets that despite the taxation of the rich, the workers see around them the upper classes carrying on in the same old way, with no housing problem when they can afford to pay for flats at £30 per week, where weekly rations can be put aside for sumptuous meals in the Dorchester, the Savoy and the Ritz.

Attack Standards of Parasitic Rich

That there is a cost of living problem has even penetrated to the Chairman of the Parliamentary Labour Party. It cannot be dismissed by promises of better days to come. It has to be tackled *now*, by instituting a programme of price control, carried through in the closest co-operation with committees of housewives, trade union representatives, the Co-ops and small shopkeepers. It requires the abolition of luxury feeding side by side with the plain fare for the bulk of the population, the undermining of the racketeering of "furnished room landladies and landlords," who still escape the present meagre control measures.

The wage of the worker is public knowledge. Every detail, down to the last penny he takes home, is known by all. How about a similar searchlight being directed onto the living of the "privileged few"? Before there is talk of wage limitation, let there be a Means Test applied to compensation for nationalised industries, drawn up by the Trade Unions.

Workers Must Participate in Management

In the execution of an economic policy it is vitally necessary that the representatives of the industrial organisations of the working class play their full part. The discussion on the management of nationalised industry is gathering momentum in the Labour movement. It must find clear expression at the Whitsun Conference. The position must be established where the representatives of the unions sit on the boards of nationalised industries from top to bottom, taking their part, democratically and openly before the rank and file, in the fashioning of policy in the nationalised industries.

Rank and File Must Utilise Opportunities

These are the issues that confront the Labour movement at Whitsun. Despite the bloc vote, and the manner in which such conferences are rigged and monopolised by the platform, given the vigilance of the rank and file, they can play an important part in these discussions.

The opportunity now given to discuss programme should be utilised to the full. Every effort must be made to prevent the rank and file, through its representatives, being muzzled and thereby unable to express itself fully.

THE RUHR STATUTE

By TED GRANT

THE new "Occupation Statute" which is to be applied to Germany gives control of the Ruhr, the power house of Europe, to the British, French and American imperialists. In its provisions, it is far more drastic than the Treaty of Versailles.

It reserves to the Allies the right to control the Ruhr industries, the manner in which the products are to be distributed, the level of production and exports. The Military Security Board on which British, French and American representatives will sit, will exercise control and inspection of Western German industry in order to prevent rearmament of any sort. The international control of the Ruhr extends to cover management and production as well as distribution of coal, coke and steel. Steel production is to be limited to 10,800,000 *tons as compared to pre-war production of* 22,500,000 *tons. It is intended that the Military Security Board and control of the Ruhr will remain after the occupation is terminated.*

The Ruhr Statute is a compromise between Anglo-American imperialism and France. The French wish for a rigid national oppression of Germany as a guarantee against her revival. The Anglo-American bloc is divided between the need to limit Germany as a competitor and the desire to use the Ruhr as a base for the future struggle against Russia.

Bitterness In Germany

The masses in the Western Zone have reacted vigorously. The German political parties have pointed out that only this one area is to be singled out for international control. Carlo Smidt, Social Democrat, protested that "*there could be no German democracy if the country's economic life was not one of self determination. The German worker, he said, had three times been robbed of Socialism since* 1918." ("Times," Jan. 9).

The disillusionment in the policy of the Allies has resulted in a wave of nationalist sentiment. In the Ruhr, bitterness has reached its height over the dismantling of the Bochumer Verein steel works. The Military Government succeeded in prevailing on a few to undertake the work of dismantling this great factory. But the mass opposition of 11,000 engineering workers at the plant resulted in even some of the few labourers who could be prevailed upon to undertake this work, refusing to do so. These workers have now been sentenced to short terms of imprisonment.

Stalinists Try To Recover Lost Ground

The Stalinists are endeavouring to make capital out of the situation. As a result of their policy in Berlin, the treatment of German prisoners of war, the brutal expulsion of the Germans from Poland, the annexation of East Prussia and part of German Silesia by Poland and Russia, the behaviour of the Red Army in Germany, and the policy of reparations in Eastern Germany—all these led to a loss for the Stalinists in the West of Germany. In the municipal elections last year they lost nearly half their comparatively small vote. In the recent election they lost every seat they held on the Executive of the Miners' Union.

To recover some of the ground lost, the Stalinists have denounced the Ruhr Statute as an imperialistic attempt to annexe the Ruhr, and have commenced an agitation demanding the immediate conclusion of a Peace Treaty and the withdrawal of all troops from Germany. They have denounced all who accept the Statute as quislings.

Max Reimann was arrested for a speech inciting action against the occupation powers. He has been sentenced to three months imprisonment.

"*He branded the occupation Statute as a new colonial law imposed on Germany. We shall fight until our beloved German people have been liberated from foreign imperialists and those in Germany who work with them.*

"*When he declared that the Americans have annexed the Ruhr through the Ruhr Statutes, there were excited shouts from the audience in the hall, punctuated by such remarks as 'They have no business to be here,' 'String them up!'*" ("Times," January 3).

This does not, of course, deter the French Communist Party from whipping up French nationalist feelings and demanding the most stringent measures for control of the Ruhr.

In an endeavour to escape some of the odium surrounding the Russians in Germany, the German C.P. in the Western Zone has been formally separated from the Socialist Unity Party.

Such is the mood in Eastern Germany, that 10,000 illegal immigrants are moving from the Russian into the British Zone each month.

"*According to their own statements, the refugees have left the Russian Zone for political reasons or for personal safety. In the younger age-groups hundreds are taking this course rather than find themselves conscripted for labour and directed to work in the uranium mines in Saxony. This influx of regugees to the British Zone is going on continuously and according to official sources no end to it can be foreseen for the present.*" ("Times," Jan. 5).

Concentration camps have been established in the Eastern Zone for malcontents and a purge has been instituted in the Socialist Unity Party against so-called "*agents of the Social Democratic Party, spies and saboteurs in foreign pay.*"

"Severe measures" to "overcome the passive attitude of a section of the members" were announced towards the end of last year by the Socialist Unity Party.

Having established a totalitarian regime which violates the elementary precepts of workers' democracy, the Socialist Unity Party has issued a statement over the names of Pieck and Grotewohl, accusing the British Military Government of having "*trampled every democratic principle underfoot.*"

The "Times" ironically reports:

"*The emphasis on German national sovereignty and territorial integrity has caused some questioning, even in Communist ranks, about the Oder-Neisse line. One Party spokesman argues in reply that Germany is actually better off for the loss of its Eastern Provinces and that the most productive countries are the most densely populated, Holland and Belgium being named in particular. Today's 'Berliner Zeitung' asked Germans to accept the Oder-Neisse line as 'a frontier of peace.' 'The imperialist powers,' on the other hand, 'are tearing Germany limb from limb' and are interested not in frontiers, but in fronts—in fact, in raising a front in Western Germany against 'the democratic peace.'*"

In the struggle between west and east, it is not excluded that a temporary compromise may be reached between America and Russia, in which the Russians may even get the concession of a seat on the Board to control the Ruhr. In this case, the present opposition of the C.P. would change instantly as the policies of the Stalinists have zigzagged in the past.

British Fear Competition

The British are seriously concerned about the danger of cheap German goods once again flooding the world market.

Mr. Harold Wilson, President of the Board of Trade, arranged a meeting with shipbuilding and engineering employers and union leaders for February 2 to consider the question of competition from Germany and Japan. "*If German firms dumped goods in this country action could at once be taken with the controlling authorities,*" said Wilson. The Germans are beginning to prepare for a drive for the markets of the world which is bound to clash with the intensified British export drive.

The "Daily Mail" editorial on January 24 says: "Some German goods are selling at 40% less than comparable British goods in foreign markets. The average wage in Germany is £3 3s. a week, as against the average of £6 14s. in Britain. This gives the advantage of cheap labour to the German industrialists. In preparation for this drive, lavish catalogues have been sent to the West free of charge by German industrialists. The articles mentioned in the catalogues include jewellery, cosmetics, electric clocks, wrist watches and precision instruments, cameras, lamp shades, leather goods, furniture and objects of art.

Dr. Ollrath von Maltzahn, Chief of the Anglo-U.S. Zone Foreign Trade Department at Frankfurt, has pointed out that West Germany's exports in 1948 were nearly treble the 1947 figures. "*Britain will have to recognise us as a competitor for world trade,*" he said.

Failure of Labour Government's Policy

In a sane Socialist society, far from limiting production, it would be increased to the utmost capacity. But the great powers fear above all, commercial competition based upon Germany's superb industry, and the revival of her military might, Germany's industrial potential offers the perspective of the greatest danger to rival capitalist countries; it offers also the greatest possibilities for the working class of Europe if harnessed to a democratic Socialist plan, integrated in a Socialist United States of Europe. Here is where the Labour Government is failing in its foreign policy. A reduction of the standards of the German masses constitutes the gravest menace to the British working class. In their own interests the British Labour movement must reject the scheme to chain Germany, of dismantling the German factories and the paying of reparations. The demand for the rights of self determination for all peoples applies to Germany as to all other countries in any Socialist policy.

KRAVCHENKO

(*continued from page* 1)

"On arriving in winter at Tula aerodrome the members of his squadron had found it kept clear of snow by gangs of women sweepers in filthy rags, kept on the move (to such an extent that they had to satisfy all physical necessities as they went across the aerodrome) by women overseers with submachine guns. They asked who were these waifs and were told that they were factory workers who had been late too often."

No Wireless Sets

He continued:

"A special permit had to be obtained to allow the French squadron to keep its wireless set since all individually owned wireless sets had been confiscated and it was forbidden to listen to any broadcasting station whatsoever save those of the Soviet Union."

The "Daily Worker" displayed great indignation at the suggestion that the Czechs had been denied wireless sets except for internal broadcasts. However, they failed to comment on or publish this evidence of Moynet; they apparently think it is good enough for the Russian masses to be denied this right.

Another witness for the Stalinists was K. Zilliacus, Labour M.P. for Gateshead, and well-known apologist for the Stalin regime. Of course, throughout, his evidence was a justification of Stalinism. But his admission that **". . . it would take Russia and her satellites 50 years to attain the degree of freedom enjoyed in Britain" exposed the myth built by Stalinist propaganda.**

He went on to declare that "we could not apply to Russia the same standards as we did to ourselves." ("Daily Herald," 3.2.49.)

Printed by Superior Printers Ltd. (T.U.), 11-13, New Rd., E.1, for the Publisher, E. Grant, 256, Harrow Road, London, W.2.