

# AMERICAN C.P. Packs-Up Socialism

## SOCIALIST APPEAL

Organ of the Revolutionary Communist Party,  
Fourth International.

VOL. 5. No. 24.

JUNE, 1944.

Twopence

## BROWDER OPEN AGENT OF WALL STREET

BY DAVID JAMES

ON MAY THE 22ND, THE "DAILY WORKER" ANNOUNCED THAT THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST PARTY IS DISSOLVED. IN ITS PLACE THE STALINIST LEADERS HAVE FORMED A POLITICAL ASSOCIATION, PLEDGED TO DEFEND MONOPOLY CAPITALISM AND EXPLAIN ITS "BENEFITS" TO THE EXPLOITED WORKERS OF AMERICA.

This cynical desertion to the class enemy is the fitting conclusion to more than a decade of degeneration of the American Party under the Stalinist regime. Flowing logically from the dissolution of the Comintern, this event underlines the fact that on a world scale, Stalinism openly and unashamedly acts as a prop for the collapsing capitalist order.

When Browder forecast the dissolution of the Communist Party of America last January, he said that henceforth they would be on the side of the capitalist "democracy" and "free enterprise." Now he has laid bare the ugly reality beneath these fine words. With a cynicism worthy of the most brutal spokesman of Wall Street, he painted a picture of the enslavement of the world by Anglo-American imperialism. Apparently these two powers can live in peace if they arrive at "an agreed economic policy for the joint development of the world markets on a huge scale . . ."

He proposed

"joint industrial development of corporations for the various devastated and undeveloped areas of the world, on the one hand, a rise in the purchasing power of the American working people."

His "solution" of the Anglo-American imperialist antagonism is disarmingly frank:

"In return for the extension of freedom and independence among the colonial peoples, WHICH IS ESSENTIAL TO A LARGE MARKET, Britain must be compensated by being guaranteed a proportionate share in these markets."

Everything enters his calculations—except the interests of the masses

themselves. They don't count with Browder. Need he have gone on to add that "THIS PROGRAMME HAS NO ELEMENT OF SOCIALISM IN IT?"

This programme is remarkable not only for his blatant acceptance of capitalist imperialism in all its brutality, but also for the unscientific, middle class utopian ideas for the achievement of peace under capitalism. In his book "Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism", which has always served as a textbook in the Communist movement, Lenin showed how imperialism was bound to give rise to insoluble contradictions, crises and wars, and the pathetic futility of all schemes for eliminating them without destroying capitalism.

Browder has discovered nothing new in his "giant corporations". Lenin stated:

"Imperialism is capitalism in that stage of development in which the domination of monopolies and finance capital has established itself . . . in which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun."

### LENIN'S POSITION

Lenin, however, clearly established that far from leading to peace and democracy, imperialism represented a heightening of the crisis in capitalism: "At the same time monopoly, which has grown out of free competition, does not abolish the latter, but exists alongside it and hovers over it, as it were, and as a result gives rise to a number of very acute antagonisms, frictions and conflicts."

"The political features of imperialism are reactionary all along the line, and increased national oppression, resulting from the oppression of the

(Continued on page 4)

## CAPITALIST PRESS PLAYS DOWN STRIKE CASE

Reported by M. LEE

THE PRESS CAMPAIGN TO HOUND THE TROTSKYISTS, WHICH PRECEDED THE RAIDS ON OUR OFFICE AND THE ARREST OF OUR COMRADES, WAS RUDELY INTERRUPTED WHEN THE CROWN CASE WAS PRESENTED AT NEWCASTLE.

The first day of the trial so completely shattered the high hopes of "sensational disclosures" that the Press was forced to play down what is undoubtedly the most important Labour trial for almost a generation.

The hearing took place at Newcastle-Tyne police court on May 18th to May 22nd, where the evidence for the crown was produced as the basis for a committal to the assizes.

Seventeen witnesses were called by the prosecution, including 9 apprentices, 6 police officers, a handwriting expert, and a Ministry of Labour official.

The accused were defended by the well-known firm of solicitors, Messrs. Smithdale, Rutledge & Co., who had been briefed by the Anti-Labour Laws Victims Defence Committee on behalf of the defendants. Mr. Gerald Rutledge was the defending solicitor. He was aided by his colleague Mr. Ernest Silverman, brother of the Labour M.P.

(Continued on page 2)



Bill Davy, 19-year-old Secretary of the Tyne Apprentices Guild, "My association with the accused gave me a lot of satisfaction." See inside page.

## CHURCHILL'S SPEECH

Churchill's speech on foreign affairs in the House of Commons on May 24th was an attempt at a sober assessment of the position of British and world capitalism and its perspectives for the next period.

Throwing off the mask donned by British capitalism in the early stages of the war Churchill openly proclaims that "as the war progresses it has become less ideological in character", and in proof of this fact proceeds warmly to embrace the Fascist butcher Franco. Here he shows the real motives of British Imperialism. "I look forward to increasingly good relations with Spain, and to an extremely fertile trade between Spain and this country which will, I trust, grow even during the war and will expand after the peace." In peace and war, as with all other capitalist states it is the struggle for markets and raw materials; the struggle for capitalist interests, which dictates the policy of British Imperialism, its alliances, rivalries and relations with other States.

Thus the imperialist "democracies" on the eve of the decisive struggle

against their German opponent announce in advance the heritage they expect to gain. They will take into the peace the savage rivalries and appetites, the same ruthless policy of plunder and exploitation which has revealed itself in the war. But now on an entirely new basis.

In dealing with the relations of Britain with Russia and pledging support to the 20 years Treaty, Churchill could not but refer with satisfaction and joy to the speedy degeneration of the Stalinist regime in the Soviet Union. "Surprising changes have taken place in Soviet Russia. The Trotsky form of Communism (i.e. Marxist-Leninism) has been completely wiped out." In detailing the important points of this degeneration—Army, Church, Nationalism, etc.—Churchill stressed "The Comintern has been abolished. That is sometimes forgotten." And it is on this nationalist-bureaucratic degeneration that the Anglo-American Imperialists are banking for the post-war world. They hope, with Stalin's aid to destroy the Socialist revolution in Europe and

(Continued on page 4)

## DOCKERS' RAW DEAL

Many problems face the dockers. Problems that are creating mass discontent throughout the whole of Dockland.

Prime among these, is the problem of the Essential Work (Dock Labour) Order, out of which many points arise. Nearly all of the ports up and down the country are merged in the scheme under the Essential Work Order, with the exception of the Merseyside and Clydeside which are under a different scheme, namely, "The Ministry of War Transport Scheme". Those dockers who come under the Essential Work (Dock Labour) Order, subject to certain conditions, receive a minimum wage of £3 6s. On the other hand, the Merseyside and Clydeside dockers, receive a minimum wage of £4 2. 6d.

So the dockers are divided, nationally, so far as the minimum wage is concerned. They are not only divided nationally but, they are also divided locally. For example, the dockers under the E.W.O. are divided into three categories, namely A, B and C. A men must complete eleven turns per week for which they receive the minimum wage of £3 6s.; B men must complete nine turns per week for which they receive £2 14s.; C men must complete six turns per week for which they receive £1 16s.

According to the scheme, and emphasised, on numerous occasions, by the Trade Union leaders, the reason for the dockers being divided into three categories is because some of them are unable to perform a full week's work,

either because of age or physical incapacity. The farce of this "reason" is clearly shown by another clause in the scheme, which reads: "Workers in Groups B or C must either work or attend the Control Point to prove availability for work up to the minimum of nine or six half-days respectively. The Manager will determine at which of the morning and/or afternoon calls, the attendance of these men is obligatory." This means, that if a docker, who is placed in B or C category, works at a heavy job for a day or two, and feels that, because of the strain of the job, accelerated, by his age or physical disability, he is unable to turn out next day. He must report for work if that day is one of the days, the manager determines; he must report, otherwise the docker loses his minimum wage.

Many people, up and down the Country, are under the impression, that the dockers' troubles are practically over, because they receive a guaranteed weekly minimum wage. This impression has been, no doubt, acquired by the reports published, periodically, in the Capitalist press, who, also take great delight in publishing reports of the big wages that the dockers' earn. Insofar as the minimum wage is concerned, one must study, not only the bare fact that the dockers receive a minimum wage, but also the conditions, upon which the minimum wage is based, and which the dockers must

(Continued on page 4)

# Party Comrades Indicted of Conspiracy

## The Case of the Prosecution

Dr. Charlesworth appeared on behalf of the Public Prosecutor. He opened the proceedings with a statement outlining the case against the four accused "The Trade Dispute Act," he said, "makes one particular form of strike illegal, it does not make strikes in general illegal, but it does make a strike illegal if the object of the strike is not to further a dispute, a trade dispute within the industry concerned, but is designed or calculated to coerce the Government. He characterised the Tyne Apprentices' Strike as an illegal strike since he alleged "it had nothing to do with a grievance, real or imaginary, which the apprentices had against their employers or anything to do with their employment as apprentices in the engineering industry."

He continued that the apprentices, all under 21 had little if no experience in organising. That the accused were, none of them apprentices, or had been on strike. Two of them lived in Tyneside, the other two in Glasgow and London.

"You may wonder how it is that these two persons come from such different parts of the country to concern themselves with a strike which is going on and which did go on in Tyneside. Now the explanation is probably to be found in this, that all four of these people are members of an organisation known as the Revolutionary Communist Party, also known as 'Trotskyists'."

"... Now of course, the four accused are not being prosecuted here today because of any political opinions which they may hold. They are being prosecuted here today for the action which they took, and for the action which they organised and encouraged others to take. And of course their action may be explained when one understands the principles which actuate them and therefore it is not irrelevant for me to deal with the facts of their memberships of these parties which I have just mentioned (the Revolutionary Communist Party and the Militant Workers Federation.) Now it is significant that all four accused, two of them Haston and Tearse are both experienced full time organisers, a matter which is of considerable importance in this case. They are people whose business it is to organise bands of men and bands of opinion... Lee is not a full time organiser... there is no doubt that he is an experienced organiser, possibly as much as the other two."

He went on to state that the accused had gone about to harness the discontent of the lads against the Pit Ballot Scheme, assisted them organisationally and in the production of their literary appeals; that they generally took in hand what might otherwise have been a "mere flash in the pan" and organised something which eventually became the Tyne Apprentices Strike.

Dr. Charlesworth then detailed how there had been discussions between the four accused and Davy, a young apprentice lad. How advice and assistance had been given, both on questions of organisation and on the method of lobbying members of parliament. The main evidence of the prosecution was three leaflets under the headings: "Appeal from the Tyneside Apprentices to the Organised Working Class", "Apprentices Fight the Pit Compulsion Plot", and "Appeal from the Tyne Apprentices to the Miners", all of which were composed at Lee's house by the accused in conjunction with Davy and produced there. Readers of the "Socialist Appeal" will recall that extracts from these have been published in these columns. In order to demonstrate his point that the strike "was purely engineered for the purpose of putting pressure on the Government and not for the correcting of any industrial dispute within the

engineering industry", Dr. Charlesworth quoted from one of these leaflets as follows:

### Brother Miners

The Government has consistently refused to nationalise the mines in order to solve the coal crisis. They place the entire responsibility for the breakdown in coal production on the miners, whereas it is the result of private ownership of the mines and the inefficient and chaotic capitalist control and organisation which is to blame.

In order to solve the crisis, they have, at every turn, thrown the burden of increasing production on the backs of you, our brother miners...

The miners of Britain have shown the Government that they will not tolerate these reactionary methods. The recent miners strikes provide evidence of this. Now they are trying to solve the problem by forcing young workers down the mines, but we also will resist.

Brothers! Miners! You know better than any other section of the working class, that the coal crisis will not be solved in this fashion. Coal owners are responsible for the coal crisis. Only by nationalising the mines and operating them under workers' control can the crisis be solved.

We need your support in our struggle against the "BEVIN BALLOT SCHEME". We will support you in your demand for nationalisation of the mines and their operation under workers' control."

"That is the sort of political stuff which the defendants are concerned with," said Dr. Charlesworth.

Great stress was laid on the fact that organisational directives were drawn up, which included the appointment of five sub-committee—propaganda, pickets, flying squads, financial and social.

"Now the bench will easily understand the only object of having pickets and flying squads is because the actions are to be directed towards a strike."

Emphasis also was laid on the fact that advice had been given to the apprentices, on the method of lobbying M.P.s, on the literary and technical assistance given. Charlesworth concluded his statement with the following:

I submit the facts that I have outlined and as I think I shall be able to prove, show the accused persons were working to get the apprentices not only on Tyneside, but everywhere to resist the Mining Ballot Scheme by means of a strike. They provided the experience, they provided the details of organisation, not a step was taken, all writings were first drafted and edited at Lee's house, the apprentices apparently had not even a typewriter to help them in the way of circulating their literature. Every step taken was directed by one or other of these four accused. Without them to develop a scheme, it is very doubtful if the movement among the apprentices would have remained more than a budding movement, or that any strike at all would have occurred, or if it had occurred, would have assumed even such proportions as it did assume. And if these facts are proved, I will ask the bench to commit to the forthcoming assizes.

This was the essence of the case for the prosecution.

### Chief Crown Witness

The chief witness for the prosecution was James William (Bill) Davy, of 49 Coach Road, Wallsend, 19 year old apprentice fitter, employed by the Wallsend Slipway & Engineering Co. Ltd. He had been subpoenaed by the

Crown, he was under examination and cross-examination for 5½ hours. He gave his evidence in a quiet, but self-assured manner and conducted himself as a working class militant defending his views.

He stated that he had been a member of the Young Communist League, having joined in 1942. Late in 1943 he had come into contact with Heaton Lee and Ann Keen, whose house he visited for the purpose of attending study classes.

Asked by the prosecution what books he had been lent, Davy replied: "The Russian Revolution" by Leon Trotsky, and "Towards the Seizure of Power" by Lenin. He stated that it was ex-



JOCK HASTON  
National Secretary  
of the R.C.P.

plained to him that the aim of the organisation was to further the interests of the working classes, and ultimately to achieve Socialism.

Describing a meeting attended by Tearse, Davy said: "The object of the apprentices was to discuss the nationalisation of the mines—to find out what further steps we should take in our campaign to oppose the Bevin Ballot Scheme. At one time the nationalisation of the mines was the main plank of our programme." Asked what this had to do with the Bevin Ballot Scheme, Davy replied: "Nationalisation of the mines was our way of approaching the problem. Apprentices were being forced to enter the mining industry, and we pointed out that if the mines were nationalised the coal crisis would have been avoided and there would be no need for apprentices to



HEATON LEE  
Formerly  
Agent for George  
Wimpey & Co. Ltd.  
on open-cast coal  
production.  
North-East Organiser  
for R.C.P.

sacrifice everything by going down the mines."

Describing a meeting of the Wearside apprentices which Tearse as Secretary of the Militant Workers Federation had addressed, Davy said: "There were some noisy people in the audience, people who did not agree with certain points that were being expressed by the platform. It appeared they were politically opposed to Tearse. They said he was a member of the Militant Workers Federation. The question of the Barrow strike was raised by Donnachie, an apprentice who was in the audience, and who insinuated that the Militant Workers had caused the Barrow strike, or something like that. Donnachie expressed the opinion that he did not agree with Tearse being connected with the apprentices' cause, and that this organisation ap-

peared to have a reputation for being mixed up in strikes which had happened in the country.

Tearse challenged Donnachie on what he had said, and asked him to write the Barrow strike committee and get a correct account of the role the Militant Workers had played in the strike. He did not say whether he was a member of the Barrow strike committee or not. I do not think he was asked."

The prosecution quoted a letter from Bill Davy to Roy Tearse:

"Blyth apprentices represent a small minority, their leading light is a real humbug, an enigma in fact. He's a member of the Blyth Labour Party, very anti-nationalisation, very fluent when speaking, but a fool.

Jan 16th.

## Alleged That Police Used "Third Degree"

Cross-examined by Mr. Rutledge, Davy stated that on the Wednesday morning of the second week of the strike, he came home to find six police officers engaged in a search. "I don't remember all the documents that were taken from my house, but they took away about four letters from the accused Tearse to myself. They also took some typewritten notes from my house—these were suggestions for the organisation of the Tyne Apprentices Guild and for the conduct of our publicity campaign. Inspector Patterson said: 'We are taking these,' but I had no opportunity of inspecting them."

"I saw the police on the afternoon of the next day. They wanted me to explain my association with Tearse, Keen and Lee. I volunteered to give them some explanation and Patterson asked me questions and he wrote my answers down. They did not caution me before I made that statement. I went to the police station at 2 p.m. and I left at 4.30 p.m."

"The police came to see me on the following Wednesday at my place of employment. They wanted me to go to the Police Station and elaborate the statement I had already made. I went alone to the Police Station where the Police said there were other points they wanted me to clear up. I went to Wallsend police station where I saw Sergeant Dale and Inspector Patterson, who asked me if I was prepared to make any further statement to clear up these points."

"I was in the police station seven hours on this occasion. I was questioned the whole of this seven hours. During this time I had an opportunity of having food, but I did not have it; I did not feel inclined to have it when it was brought in. I was not threatened at this interview, but I was cajoled and coaxed. I was asked who would give me a job when I came out of prison; I agree I thought that was a threat. I was also asked what sort of future would be open to me if I went to gaol through supporting the Trotskyists. I was asked 'How will you figure in the eyes of the apprentices when these facts come to light' and 'Do you want to make all your family suffer because of your actions?' I was asked 'What about your mother; she will break her heart if you go to gaol.' The police also said 'Suppose we give your story to the papers; your name will be mud.' Sergeant Dale said he could get a warrant for my arrest in five minutes, if he wanted to. I agree that it was third degree and grilling for seven hours at this interview at Wallsend Police Station. I agree that after these threats I was quite glad to give them another statement, and but for these threats I

# ted in "Flimsiest Case cy"

**Nationalisation  
of Mines was our  
Solution** says  
**BILL DAVY**

would not have given them another statement."

"At 10 a.m. the following day, I again saw the police. I was there all day: I had a break for dinner, and I left about 5 p.m. On this third visit I saw Inspector Patterson and Sergeant Dale. I did not have my parents or my solicitor at any of these interviews, and I was not told I could have them there if I wished. I signed this third statement, but I am not sure whether I signed it then or on the following day. I saw the police four times in all."

"Asked whether it had taken 24 hours to wheedle or force these statements from him, Davy replied yes."

"The Tyne Apprentices Guild was formed as a result of the Pit Ballot Scheme—there was a feeling of hostility towards the scheme amongst the apprentices which existed before I met the accused. This feeling was very strong. We felt there was no call at all to send us into the mines. I believe that reorganisation of the mining industry is necessary in the national interests, and that is my own belief. My own honest view is that if there was nationalisation of the mines the Pit Ballot Scheme would not be necessary. I arrived at that view myself and the accused never assisted me towards that view."

The Tyne Apprentices Guild was formed because of the apprehension which existed amongst apprentices on Tyneside with regard to the Bevin Ballot Scheme and it was our first intention to organise ourselves to try to withstand what we termed the attack upon us by coming out on strike in an attempt to force the Government to exempt apprentices from being called up to work in the mines. These were our objects before we met the accused."

Replying to questions regarding the propaganda leaflets issued by the Tyne Apprentices Guild, Davy stated that these were "issued under my authority and signature and they express my views."

Replying to Mr. Rutledge, Davy denied that Tearse had advocated strike action. Nor had Haston, Lee or Keen at any time advocated strike action.

On the delegation to London, Davy said that 17 apprentices went to London. The fact that Bevin had not seen the delegation created further hostility to the Pit Ballot Scheme. "The ire which arose through Mr. Bevin's action in not seeing us, precipitated the strike in some degree."

Dealing with the decision to give notice for strike action, when apprentice Martin was called up under the Pit Ballot Scheme, Davy stated that the Executive Committee decided to give three weeks strike notice to Mr. Bevin. At this meeting none of the accused were present.

At the request of Mr. Rutledge, Bill Davy read out an extract from Hansard reporting the debate in the House of Commons on the mine ballot scheme. The extract from Mr. Kirkwood's statement was read out in court as follows:

"I am satisfied that a proper man, with courage, would go and face the workers. I have asked the Minister (Bevin) time and again, and he has said, 'No, I am not going.' I asked him to go to the Tyne but he said 'No.' I said, 'You can take it from me that they will strike.' He said, 'Let them strike. If they want a showdown we are ready for them.' Who I ask, are 'we'? Ready for whom? What a disgrace!"

Mr. Rutledge stated "I will call Mr. Kirkwood later."

Replying to Mr. Rutledge on the reasons for his resignation from the Tyne Apprentice Guild, he said that

the Chairman at the Junior Workers Committee meeting said that the Tyne Apprentices Guild had been proscribed by the A.E.U., and that anyone present who belonged to the Guild must leave the room. He also said that persons who were connected with the Guild must leave the A.E.U. Youth Committee or sever connection with the Guild.

Davy here referred to a leaflet which had been drawn up in conjunction with Lee to all trade union branches in order to explain the position he had been forced into. Extracts read out from this leaflet were as follows:

"Members of the E.C. of the T.A.G. who were also delegates on



**ROY TEARSE**  
Secretary of the  
Militant Workers  
Federation and Industrial  
Organiser  
of the R.C.P.

the A.E.U. Youth Committee were given the alternative of severing relations with the Guild or of being expelled from the Union. Faced with this ultimatum, the delegates severed their organisational relations with the Guild under strong protest.

It is now obvious for all trade unionists to see that this move on the part of the E.C. of the A.E.U. was an attempt to behead the leadership of the Guild. They hoped by using pressure to smash the Guild and our struggle against the "Ballot Scheme."

We give you these facts confident in the knowledge that you will support us in our struggles by moving the following resolution through your union branch, district and factory committees:—

"This Branch of the.....vigorously protests against the action of the E.C. of the A.E.U. which has declared the T.A.G., and similar apprentice organisations throughout the country proscribed organisations,



**ANN KEEN**  
N.E. District Secretary  
of R. C. P.

thereby doing the dirty work of the Minister of Labour in attempting to smash the movement of the apprentice trade unionists; and demands that the T.U. leaders sever their connections with the state and conduct a struggle in the interests of their members and not against them."

In concluding, Davy stated: "I do not believe that I have been influenced by the accused. My association with these people gave me a lot of satisfaction. I do not believe I have been misled or misguided by them. None of the accused has promoted, fomented, or agitated this strike."

The majority of the members were inclined towards taking strike action. Others were indifferent.

There would have been a strike if I had never met any of the accused."

## Other Apprentices in the Box

Davy was followed by eight other apprentices, including two from Sunderland and one from Blyth, the rest being from Tyneside.

**John Cooper Brown**, Provisional Treasurer, a South Shields apprentice stated: "At previous meetings there had been discussions opposing the Bevin Scheme and we decided to arbitrate, and if that did not succeed, to strike. A resolution to that effect was passed at the third or fourth meeting."

Just before we tried to negotiate with Mr. Bevin, we decided to have a strike if necessary. I had the same view as the majority about that.

I don't think it right that apprentices should be sent to work in the mines and so lose their trade."

**James Lloyd**, journeyman joiner at South Shields, said: "When we did not get any satisfaction after trying to see the Minister of Labour in London and trying to see M.P.s, the question of a strike came into prominence. Just before the delegation went to London, the matter of a strike came up and to prevent a strike they went to London. They got no satisfaction and as a result we decided to come out on strike."

Cross-examined by Mr. Rutledge, Lloyd said: "There was a lot of bitterness against this Scheme, and there definitely still is. The object of our organisation was to use every method of persuasion before strike action was contemplated. This was done even to the extent of sending a deputation to London to Mr. Bevin. I agreed with the contents of the leaflets. Tearse never advocated strike action. I don't know the other accused and have never seen them before."

**Hames O'Hagan** of Hebburn-on-Tyne stated "I did not like the scheme and was hostile to it. I have always had a strong feeling against going down the mines. I am an apprentice. The apprentices regarded it as detrimental to their employment."

**William Landles**, apprentice electrician from Northumberland, cross-examined by Mr. Rutledge, said "I was definitely against the Pit Ballot Scheme and this feeling was definitely shared by my colleagues. All of us wanted to take every step by means of propaganda before taking precipitous action. I have never heard Tearse speak at all. Lee and Keen have never advocated strike action. I don't know Haston."

**William Patterson**, apprentice shipwright, South Shields, asked about his visit to the House of Commons, said that Mr. Sorenson had explained that M.P.s could not be helpful these days. He said he had received advice from Haston and Tearse on the lobbying of M.P.s and also from a policeman. Asked by Mr. Rutledge who had been most helpful he replied "the policeman"! He said that none of the accused had ever advocated strike action. Asked if he agreed with the strike, he replied: "Strike action is the working man's last weapon."

(Continued on next page)

**Daniel Donnachie**, fitter and turner of Blyth, describing a meeting said: "I asked about the part of the Militant Workers Federation in the Barrow Strike. I said that the Militant Workers Federation lived on strikes, and created strikes, and they were in all the strikes in the country, and it was necessary for us to break away from them, and throw this man out of our meeting. The accused Tearse then challenged me to a public debate to prove the accusations I had made against him. I accused him of being connected with the Barrow strike, and another man asked him if he was a member of the Barrow Strike Committee, and he replied "Yes." The meeting ended in disorder."

Cross-examined by Mr. Rutledge, Donnachie was asked if he was aware if a strike committee was an elected body. He replied that he was not aware of this.

**Leslie Britton**, a Sunderland apprentice said that he was one of the delegation that visited London. "When we got to Kings Cross we were met by Tearse and Haston. After breakfast Haston arranged lodgings for us for the night. Then we went to Haston's office; Tyne and Wear apprentices attended this meeting. A discussion took place about the procedure for lobbying M.P.s and what our policy was."

**James Winter**, apprentice fitter of Sunderland said he did not care what they did with the pits as long as he did not have to go down them.

On the lobbying of M.P.s he said he had proposed members from Sunderland, but these were ruled out because they were conservatives. He thought that it was a waste of time going to the House of Commons, and this was confirmed after what had happened there.

This apprentice opposed nationalisation of the mines.

"After having a discussion with fellow apprentices at Sunderland, I decided we could not support the Tyne Apprentices Guild in the letter to Mr. Bevin. In the first place the apprentices thought Mr. Bevin would not tolerate the apprentices demanding anything from him; and another thing was that an apprentice fitter was not coming out on strike or take action for any errand boy or butcher's boy."

It is worthy of note in passing that Donnachie was quoted at great length in the columns of the "Daily Worker" while not one word of the evidence of the other apprentices on the question of nationalisation was referred to. The "Daily Worker" quoted from the two Wear lads who, as one stated, refused to strike on behalf of any "errand boy or butcher's boy."

This concluded the evidence of the apprentices called by the Crown against the accused. After examining the evidence of the police officers as to the finding of the 98 exhibits, some of which were in the handwriting of the four accused, the case for the prosecution was closed.

### Defence Committee Meetings:

- June 4. BIRMINGHAM, Bristol Street Schools, 7.30 p.m.  
Speakers: Reg Groves, Will Morris, Ajit Roy  
Fred Longden, Chair.
- June 11th. GLASGOW, St. Andrew's Hall, 7.30 p.m.  
Speakers: J. Maxton, M.P.,  
J. McGovern, M.P., Ajit Roy.
- June 11th. MERTHYR, Miners Hall, 7.30 p.m.  
Speakers: S. O. Davies, M.P., C. Stanfield,  
J. Lawrence, V. Sastry.
- June 11th. NEWCASTLE, 7.30 p.m.
- June 18th. NOTTINGHAM, 7.30 p.m.

## Bevin's Action Provoked Strike Says RUTLEDGE

(Continued from page 3)

Addressing the bench on behalf of the defendants, Mr. Rutledge said that this was the first case under the Trade Disputes Act of 1927, and he submitted that the section under which it was brought meant that before a person could be charged with acting in furtherance of a strike, there must be in existence a strike at the time the act complained of took place.

Not one of the defendants did any act after the commencement of the strike. Dr. Charlesworth had declared that the accused were not on trial for their political convictions, but he submitted that a great deal of the prosecution's case had been made up of political colour. For example, Davy was asked what kind of literature was found in Lee's house, and much had been made of the lobbying of M.P.s. These things, which had been brought in with the object of covering up the weakness of the case for the prosecution, had nothing whatsoever to do with the charges.

HE DECLARED THAT IT WAS ONE OF THE FLIMSIEST CASES OF CONSPIRACY THAT COULD BE BROUGHT AND CERTAINLY THE FLIMSIEST HE HAD HAD TO DEAL WITH.

The apprentices, who had given evidence were intelligent lads and gave their evidence frankly. All opposed the Bevin Pit Ballot Scheme and all agreed that the main object of the Tyneside Apprentices' Guild was to oppose that scheme by all the means in their power. Their policy was formed before the accused appeared on the scene. They said that if they had never met the defendants the strike would still have occurred.

"Had the Minister of Labour met the lads in London the strike might never have occurred. It was provoked by the Minister's autocratic action in refusing to see the lads."

"If the prosecution ever had a case of conspiracy it exploded like a damp squib when Davy was cross-examined, for it was found in what manner statements had been obtained from them by the police in Wallsend."

"The prosecution had to satisfy the court, first that there was a strike; second, that it was an illegal strike, and thirdly, that these defendants conspired together to further that strike. Not one of them was charged with inciting a strike or inciting others to strike."

When formally charged by the clerk, Mr. Rutledge on behalf of the four defendants, pleaded not guilty. All the accused reserved their defence. Comrade Jock Haston, in a statement, alleged that the charge was a frame-up and that there had been conspiracy on the part of the authorities and not on the part of the accused. He urged that it was a case of political victimisation; in spite of what the prosecution had said, political issues had been introduced. "We four are to be the scapegoats for Mr. Bevin's new reactionary legislation." The three others formally associated themselves with this statement.

The case was committed for trial at the forthcoming assizes. Bail was allowed on condition that none of the

defendants speak at public meetings; that they report daily to the police in Newcastle or London; and that none of the defendants see anyone connected with the case except through their legal advisers.

Since the trial coincided with the introduction of Bevin's anti-working class Regulation 1A(a), and since it was accompanied by a nation-wide campaign against militant miners and apprentices and the Revolutionary Communist Party for supporting them, it has become associated in the minds of the workers with the introduction of this anti-labour law. The accused are regarded by the majority of the organised workers as class war fighters representing the rights of the working class in the dock.

That the Labour leaders in the Government resort to the use of the much hated and much campaigned against Trade Disputes Act, is but a measure of their desperation. And that Bevin has been instrumental in instituting this, the first case under this hated Act is a measure of his degeneracy. The fact that this case has been ineffectual in distracting public attention from the very real hatred of the Bevin Pit Ballot Scheme was amply seen in the evidence of the apprentices. All the poor propaganda at first embarked upon by the capitalist press about how happy the Bevin pit boys were in their work, has been replaced by the real and unassailable hostility of the youth to the pit compulsion scheme. As the court was proceeding, daily cases were being reported of the imprisonment of lads refusing to go down the mines.

The reaction of the mass of the population to the prosecutions of our comrades daily grew more favourable; manifestations of support in one way and another became more evident. Resolutions of support continue to come in from union branches and miner's lodges. As the trial proceeded from day to day the sympathies of the Newcastle people expanded visibly. As the four comrades walked through the streets to the court, they were greeted by well-wishers all along the route. As they sat in the bus, the driver changing his shift, rapped on the side of the coach and clenched his hand in a gesture of solidarity. Taxi drivers, news vendors, shipyard workers, all gave our comrades a "thumbs up" and a good luck greeting. A young rank and file member of the C.P. approached them in the station and said: "I disagree with you, but I'm with you." Sitting in the train compartment, a Yorkshire A.E.U. official stated that there was a great deal of support throughout the A.E.U. Branches in his area. Everywhere workers and soldiers recognised our comrades from their press photographs and were friendly. The workers understand the nature of this anti-working class case and they resent the use of the capitalist courts against worker militants.

Comrades! Fellow Workers! This case is your case! The issue the comrades are fighting is your issue! It is an all important struggle. For the rights of trade unionists hangs in the balance.

Rally to the defence of the four. For a blow against one is a blow against all!

## CHURCHILL'S SPEECH

(Continued from page 1)

the rebellions of the colonial masses as well. Furthermore, they are calculating on an even speedier degeneration of the Soviet Union towards capitalism in the post-war world. However they are compelled to concede Russia—temporarily at least—a greater role in the affairs of world power politics, than they had originally foreseen. For the price of Stalin's betrayal of International Socialism, they consider this well worth while.

In dealing with post-war world organization Churchill could not find anything else to offer the tortured peoples of the five continents but a new version of the League of Nations. The only difference being that the dominating powers have shifted and the small Powers and middling Powers are told in advance they are to be satellites of the giants. Such a solution would be far less effectual than

even the Peace of Versailles. The "United Nations" will fall out with each other even more rapidly than did the Entente after the last war.

The outlook is gloomy if we leave out one vital factor: the factor that will reduce all these plans to naught, the inevitable revolutions and insurrectionary movements of the proletariat in Europe, in Britain, and throughout the world. Stalinism has betrayed: so much the worse for Stalinism. Churchill and the ruling class will see that it is not so easy to tame a revolution either in Russia or in Europe. The next period will see the decisive intervention of the proletariat. Given a fighting leadership they will transform the world. That leadership can only be the International of Lenin and Trotsky, of "Trotskyist Communism", the Fourth International.

## AMERICAN C.P. PACKS UP

(Continued from page 1)

financial oligarchy and the elimination of free competition . . ."

Browder's idea that Britain and America can reconcile their imperialist antagonisms by "peaceful division" of the world's markets is nothing but a revival of Kautsky's theory of ultra-imperialism, which Lenin scorned as a reactionary utopia:

"Let us consider India, Indo-China and China . . . we will presume that all the imperialist countries conclude an alliance for the peaceful sharing out of these parts of Asia . . . we ask, is it 'conceivable', assuming that the capitalist system remains intact—and this is precisely the assumption that Kautsky does make—that such alliances would be more than temporary, that they would eliminate friction, conflicts and struggle in all and every possible form?"

This question only requires stating clearly enough to make it impossible for any but a negative reply to be given; for there can be no other conceivable basis under capitalism for the sharing out of spheres of influence, of interests, of colonies, etc., than a calculation of the STRENGTH of the participants in the share-out, their general economic, financial, military strength, etc. . . .

Is it 'conceivable' that in ten or twenty years time the relative strengths of the imperialist powers will have remained UNCHANGED? Absolutely inconceivable.

Therefore 'inter-imperialist' or 'ultra-imperialist' alliances, in the realities of the capitalist system and not in the banal philistine phantasies of English parsons or of the German 'Marxist' Kautsky . . . are inevitably nothing more than a 'truce' in periods between wars. . . .

Instead of showing the vital connection between periods of imperialist peace and periods of imperialist war, Kautsky puts before the workers a lifeless abstraction solely in order to reconcile them to their lifeless leaders."

These extensive quotations are given in order to show that Browder's desertion from Communism follows a well trodden road, which has been travelled by innumerable traitors to the working class, such as Kautsky. Browder's purpose in 1944 is the same as Kautsky's in 1916—to reconcile the workers to their "lifeless leaders." The difference between the two is that Browder outdoes Kautsky in the nakedness of his sell-out and the fervour of his reactionary statements. This desertion is at root, only a reflection of the degeneration of the Stalinist regime in the Soviet Union. The American Stalinists are, after all, only loud-speakers relaying Moscow. The fact that Browder could use the Teheran

### URGENT!

PLEASE SEND DONATIONS TO  
the Defence Committee, V. Sastry,  
318, Regents Park Road, Finchley,  
London, N.3.

Agreement to "justify" his policy. shows that the Stalinist Government of the Soviet Union has reached a definite understanding with its imperialist "allies" to use its influence in betraying and crushing the world communist revolution in the attempt to stabilise world capitalism.

Browder bases his policy on the perspective of a stable, peaceful development of capitalism "after the war." Illusion! Even in America, which, of all capitalist countries has the brightest economic prospects (as a result of exploiting the rest of the world), the figure for post-war unemployment estimated recently by a Senate Commission, is 19,000,000.

The class struggle is sharpening. Lenin's analysis is correct: worsened conditions, political oppression are born of imperialism, and are provoking militant reactions from the workers, such as the great strikes in the American mining, railway and engineering industries. Politically, too, the workers are losing faith in the capitalist politicians. Browder's reference to "a sweeping demand for Roosevelt's reelection" is quite unreal. The "Economist" of 13.5.44 exposes the apathy

of the American workers about this question:

"By and large, the average American industrial worker is a political supporter of President Roosevelt, in an apathetic sort of way . . . if the weather is not too inclement on the November election day they will probably go to the polls, and if they go, they will probably vote for F.D.R."

This lack of interest in the fortunes of the capitalist parties is the prelude to the emergence of labour as an independent political force. This can only be in spite of, and against Browder and his association.

"America and the world must choose between Teheran and Hitler." This statement of Browder's, revealing the mind of a capitalist lackey who does not believe in the capacity of the workers to act independently of their exploiters, is belied every day by events. There is a third choice—the world Communist Revolution, which is even now growing and beginning to disintegrate the imperialist camps. The spectre of Communism is once again haunting the world.

The significance of the collapse of the American Communist Party reaches far beyond the frontiers of America. International Stalinism is now openly an appendage of capitalism, confirming the analysis made in the "Transitional Programme of the Fourth International" 1938, which spoke of the "definite passing over of the Comintern to the side of the bourgeois order, its cynical counter-revolutionary role throughout the world." The Fourth International alone has correctly traced the process of decay of Stalinism in the Soviet Union and in the world as a whole. It alone can provide an alternative revolutionary leadership for the toilers.

To the honest revolutionary workers who still cling to the Communist Party we say: The capitulation of the American Communist Party foreshadows the fate of your own Party. Stalinism the world over has abandoned the "elements of Socialism." There is no future for this tendency which has embraced capitalism at the very moment of its death agony. Your place is in the ranks of those who are undergoing persecution for their OPPOSITION to the capitalist order, both in America and in this country—the Fourth Internationalists—the true communists.

## DOCKERS' RAW DEAL

(Continued from page 1)

fulfil before they can earn it. Here are some of the conditions:—

The dockers must report at such Control Points and at such times as required; he must carry out his duties in accordance with the rules of the port or place; complete the employment for which he was engaged, and work as and when required including overtime periods. In addition, if he is an A man, he must travel to other ports or places as and when required by the local Manager. In short, he must be a perfect wage-slave. In regards to the so-called big wages that the dockers earn, which the Capitalist press, from time to time has endeavoured to impress on the people, is prevalent throughout Dockland. In reality, what does happen is, that cognisance is taken of where two or three gangs of men may be working on a special job, such as salvage jobs etc., where the men may be getting extra money for working on jobs of this abnormal character. The men's wages are noted and published in the press for the express purpose of causing dissension in the men's homes. In their deliberations, the Capitalist Press fluently and with great magnitude, report on the big wages the dockers earn, but what they do not report in their press, is the enormous profits that are being raked in by all the ship-owners and master Stevedores, which is prevalent throughout Dockland.

Published by E. Grant,

256 Harrow Road, W.2.

Printed by C. A. Brock & Co., Ltd., (T.U.),  
79 Southern Row, Kensal Road, W.10.