

FLIGHT

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE!

DURING THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND THE CIVIL WAR ONLY FOOLS AND TRAITORS CAN REPEAT PHRASES ABOUT 'FREEDOM', 'EQUALITY' AND 'THE UNITY OF LABOUR DEMOCRACY.'

—LENIN, 1919.

Incorporating THE RED FLAG

ORGAN of the REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALIST LEAGUE, AFFILIATED to the BUREAU for the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Vol. 1. No. 3.

LONDON, JUNE, 1938

ONE PENNY

ARMS AND THE UNIONS

The Government and the Employers' Offensive Opens

THE arms talks between the Engineering and Allied Trade Employers' Federation and the Metal Workers Unions have taken place. From the official statement issued, and the inspired press talk that followed, it is clear that both the government and the engineering employers are preparing a wholesale attack on trade union rights and conditions.

To speed up the arms programme the unions have been asked to abrogate those union restrictions which limit the employment of unskilled labour in the industry, i.e. youth, women and trainees: to relax the restrictions on overtime etc., and to facilitate the speed-up in the shops.

The trade unions are faced with the choice: to co-operate with the government, which means the abandonment of hard won conditions for a few easily made promises, or to seize the opportunity to attack the government by a bold programme of offensive demands for the engineering workers.

To date, no Union or groups of Unions has defined its policy, but it is clear what the main points will be. The Government and the Unions are both agreed that arms are necessary and the Unions will be ready to promise the labour power they control in exchange for two things. One, a Government promise that the arms will be used "in defence of democracy," and two, an increase in wages. In order to speed up the arms programme they will be willing to recognise the introduction of "trainees" to relax their not-so-tight restrictions on over-time, and to give way on points of shop customs where demarcation impedes the process of mass-production. All these are points which have been won by the long tireless struggle of the workers, and in many cases only 'fathered' by the T.U.'s after success has been gained. These things are to be thrown away by the T.U. leaders in return for an empty promise that the arms shall only defend "democracy."

One of three alternatives is possible: either the Trade Union leaders believe the Government and expect it to "play the game." Or, they know that Government promises are worthless but mean to rally the full force of the workers later in an endeavour to "defend democracy." Or else they are doing nothing but clinging to their miserable jobs, making the most of the opportunities of the moment, content to follow the Government wherever it cares to lead, as they did in 1914, in the hope that a few Cabinet jobs and knighthoods for services rendered will be their just reward. There may be a few who fall in the first class of "believers," but they are not all fools. And if they intend to lead the workers to revolt they are going about it in a queer way. The Labour Party recently tabled a resolution in Parliament, censuring the Government for its inadequate arms policy. Mr. Fred Smith General Secretary of the A. E. U., came out in his Monthly Journal with appeals to the Government to co-operate with the Unions in this time of national emergency in the face of Fascist aggression. He has been doing this for two years and bemoans the fact that two years have been wasted because the Government would not listen. Two years which have been gained for the workers from the approaching era of conscripted labour.

There is, however, another side to the picture. We know that the Government promises to the Trade Unions are bound to be broken, because the Government cannot, even if it so wished, force the class it represents to act against their own interests. In just the same way the T. U. leaders cannot force the class they are supposed to represent to act against their own interests. They may persuade them: undoubtedly they will try. But the workers are not sheep. They will think for themselves and they will act.

The Trade Union leaders used all their weight on the Government side in 1916 and 1917 to quell the workers' struggle on the Clyde and undoubtedly they will try it again. Ever since 1926 when they were not clever enough to slip out of a false position in time, the Trade Union leaders have been preparing for that struggle against their own class. The Bus Strike of last year resulted, not in a victory for the busmen, but a strengthening in the hold of the leadership of the T. & G.W.U. over its own members. The A.E.U., probably the Union most vitally concerned in the coming crisis, has an unenviable record in the last few years. With its membership increasing daily, with over £2,000,000 in the bank, it has seen strike after strike in the engineering industry, which is booming as no industry has boomed in this country since the war, and of all these strikes, hardly one

has been officially recognised. In the aircraft section, every effort has been made to squash the Aircraft Shop Stewards National Council, a body similar to the busmen's Rank and File Movement.

The A.S.S.N.C. has a programme of demands including a minimum rate of 1/4d. an hour for all adult workers and a 40 hour week. Today, the A.E.U. leaders, having officially

LEON TROTSKY

CONDITIONS FOR VICTORY IN SPAIN

see page 3

discredited the A.S.S.N.C. have taken over these demands in order to use them as a smoke screen behind which they will 'negotiate' with the Government.

Twelve months ago at Annual Conference the A.E.U. agreed to sponsor the "Industrial Aid for Spain" scheme. A scheme which was not of great consequence, but which would nevertheless, give some assistance to the Spanish workers. It is only within the last few weeks that the A.E.U. branches have been circled with particulars of this scheme. At the very same time the leaders are loudly demanding arms for Spain as a condition of their agreement with the Government. Why have they wasted twelve months? They cannot avoid the suspicion that they deliberately waited until any help that they might give Spain would come too late and so embarrass the donors the less.

This sordid tale of scheming for power over the Unions, which have

(cont. on page 4, col. 3)

THE COLONIAL QUESTION

BRITISH BARBARISM IN JAMAICA

Support The Negro Workers' Struggle!

I CANNOT believe that I was unsound in stating that the West Indian labourer does not even remotely resemble the English labourer—

LEONARD LYLE, President, Tate and Lyle Ltd
(From a letter to the "Times," May 10th, 1938)

Tate & Lyle, as everyone who buys sugar should know, make a fortune every year by selling to the British workers sugar grown by Jamaica workers. They must keep these two divided at all costs. Hence with that solemn shamelessness so characteristic of British capitalism, Mr. Lyle discovers that the West Indies labourer does not remotely resemble the English labourer. The real trouble is, of course, that he resembles the English labourer too much for Mr. Capitalist Lyle.

Jamaica is the largest of the British West Indian islands, and has a population of almost a million, the majority negroes. The negroes are descendants of slaves whom the British capitalists agreed to free a hundred years ago because slave-labour in the West Indies no longer paid. These negroes to-day have no language but English, they have lost touch with Africa, their outlook is Western, and in some islands over three-quarters of the population is literate. But white capital has always dominated the islands and continues to do so. The government is in the hands of the whites, local and British. These give the coloured middle class good jobs in the civil services to keep them quiet. The constitution of the government gives a grudging concession here and there but the Colonial Office sees to it that power remains in the hands of the Governor.

Sir Leonard Lyle will say it is because the West Indian labourer does not resemble the British. But there is more in it than that, much more. In 1929 came the crisis and British capitalism was up to the nose. What was to be done? Not very much, but they could at least squeeze the colonies a little more. At Ottawa they decided to keep cheap Japanese goods out of the colonies and make these blacks, so different from the British worker, buy higher-priced goods with lower wages. The islanders had no say in the matter being, of course, under the benevolent protection of

Britain. The result was widespread misery. Then came "recovery", i.e. unemployment became 13 million instead of 21. But profits went up. The West Indian labourer can read and write. He could see the profits going up, but he still had to live on his one or two shillings a day. Further, on some of the sugar estates the workers still lived in the hovels of fifty years back. The workers know about the social services in Britain, unemployment pay, small as it is, etc. But they are not allowed to have Trade Unions. They demanded better pay and better conditions. The employers, like Leonard Lyle, however, thought that these men were impertinent. The result has been a series of riots in which the Government has not hesitated to shoot, arrest leaders, imprison and deport agitators. But the situation is so bad and the workers so determined that the Government and the capitalists see that they have to make some concessions, and gestures such as a few new houses, etc. They have allowed trades unions in Trinidad but they want them controlled by the Government.

What the West Indian workers need is a radical change in the whole system of Government. In 1897 a commission went to the West Indies and recommended that the big estates be broken up and peasant proprietors established. The secretary was a young man who in 1930 went back again on another commission, this time as chairman, Lord Olivier. He recommended again that the un-economic estates should be broken up. But nothing has been done. The Government is in the hands of the capitalists and planters and they are concerned with themselves and their profits. Trade Unions? Manhood suffrage? A government elected by the people? Impossible! For, says Sir Leonard Lyle, the West Indian labourer is fundamentally different from the British worker.

A powerful movement is now well under way in all the islands. The British workers must support it. Once the West Indian workers have their democratic rights they are able and willing to struggle. The magnificent general strike in Trinidad proves that, as does the militancy of the Trinidad workers. Citrine and Transport House take no initiative in helping to organise them. The British workers must, in their unions, press for full democratic rights for the West Indian workers. Tate and Lyle are planning to open factories in Jamaica. They want to take advantage of labour which has not the right to yet to protect itself. Thus black is used against white and Leonard Lyle seeks to poison the mind of the British worker against the colonials.

On May 23rd, American sailors in the harbour of Kingston, Jamaica, refused to blackleg on the black dock—
(cont. on page 4, col. 2)

ARMS FOR THE SPANISH WORKERS

WORKERS CAN STILL FORCE GOVERNMENT TO
RAISE ARMS BAN

But only by forming Councils of Action and bringing mass pressure to bear, in the
Factories and in the Streets.

UNITY

But not with Duchesses, Baronets and Deans: they will sabotage any real Militancy.

Unity of British Workers with French Workers
To Help The Spanish Workers.

INDUSTRIAL NOTES

ISSUES OF THE CINEMA STRIKE

Employers Attack In Nottingham

The E.T.U. have an agreement with C.E.A., made in February 1920, on the basis of a 48-hour-week and a minimum wage rate equaling that of the district-rate for journeymen-electricians. But this agreement has never been put into operation. The conditions in the cinemas still remain pre-war. The average hours worked are 60 and in some cases 80 while the average wage for a chief operator is £4 a week and for a second £2 15s. Many attempts have been made by the E.T.U. to negotiate for better conditions but the exhibitors have consistently refused to have anything to do with them. They asked them to go before the Conciliation Board but only on the condition of a 60-hour-week. The E.T.U. faced with this impasse asked their members to take a decision on the strike issue. The majority for the strike was 587 for and 21 against.

Can the employers afford to pay £6 10s. a week as put forward by the E.T.U.? We continually read in the yellow press about the fitting film-stars with their million dollar incomes. We hear of directors and producers being among the first 20 highest sur-tax payers in the United States. The Associated British Pictures Corporation made an annual profit of £445,892 between 1935 and 1937. The Associated British made a profit of £278,018 in 1933. Provincial Cinema Theatres made a profit of £447,782. Anyone who examines the balance sheets of the cinema companies can see that the employers could easily pay their projectionists better wages and arrange shorter hours.

The projectionists struck on April 14th and found that the N.A.T.K.E. a rival body much in favour with the employers was blacklegging against them. This reactionary "trade union" allowed their exhibitors to put up posters outside their picture-houses saying that they had no quarrel with the Union thus inviting workers to patronise the theatres with a clear conscience. During the strike the police as usual used and are using all their powers against the pickets and their wives outside the cinemas. In a Hammersmith case a speaker was sent to prison for six weeks and asked to pay ten pounds costs. The charge was assault; he was addressing a peaceful crowd in a recognised meeting place. So ruthless has been the conduct of the police towards the pickets and the speakers that it is getting more and more difficult for the strikers to put their case before the public.

The new militant executive of the E.T.U. offered strike pay to all projectionists irrespective of whether they belong to the Union. In spite of all the propaganda in the capitalist press that the strike has failed we have information that the employers are ready to recognise the E.T.U. and to negotiate on a 48-hour-week basis. The actions of the N.A.T.K.E. following close on the heels of the Tramway, Trolleybus and Underground

workers under the lead of Mr. Ernest Bevin show that Transport House is frowning upon all direct actions and keeping the workers split in rival unions. Trade Unionists of every industry must see that these manoeuvres of the T.U.C. bureaucracy do not succeed, wherever they appear.

REARMAMENT AND THE EMPLOYERS.

While discussions are being held about the need to increase production in the armament industry, the real meaning of such an increase in production is becoming quite clear to the workers.

In Nottingham, where a "realistic" air-raid was recently staged, the bosses are trying to intensify production and increase their profits. Both in the foundries and the gun factory (which includes the building department—sub-contractors) they (the employers) are trying to establish a new set of wages apart from the Trade Unions. They want to cut out specialised work and have a flat rate all round.

Load after load of shell cases are going to the gun factory, but these cases have had four operations cut out and done by one machine operated by youth labour. This state of affairs is causing considerable dissatisfaction and is leading to trouble in the foundries. At the same time overtime work is rampant here and shift work is being instituted everywhere.

The local Boots chemical works are having new blocks built at Beeston, near Nottingham. While it is supposed to be an ordinary chemical factory it is in reality nothing more nor less than a poison gas factory and a hospital for soldiers, complete with verandah and operating theatre.

Some workers previously employed in the Nottingham chemical factory now working in the Beeston factory have to go to some additional expense in the form of bus-fares, which is, in view of the fact that they have to meet them from their own pockets, an indirect wage cut.

NEW T.U. BRANCHES.

Since the armament and allied industries are being moved to sparsely populated areas outside the towns, new trade union branches are springing up everywhere. A number of our comrades have helped in the setting up of such new branches and they report that they find that these branches are the most militant they came across for a long time. Among them are Cranwell, Cottesmore, Hucknall, etc.

This has always been the case. New members are not so steeped in the old tradition of the Union leadership and when they join a union do so with the purpose of waging a struggle against the employers.

The Life of the League

MAY DAY

ON May Day the R.S.L. participated, together with the comrades of Workers' International News, in the demonstration from the Embankment. This was the first appearance of the R.S.L. in a working-class demonstration since its formation in February and the success achieved in company with our friends of W.I.N. bodes well for the future of a united trotskyst movement in this country.

The slogans on our banners, such as, "Class War, Not Imperialist War," "For the 4th International," "For Workers' Power," and the slogans that were shouted in unison, such as "Workers' Revolution is the only Security," "No Peace Without Socialism," "The 4th International Fights for Socialism," were well received, despite one or two weak attempts at ridicule by sympathisers of the Communist Party. The effect of the shouted slogans was particularly marked during the march into Hyde Park; and the arrival of the contingent at the platforms, from which our speakers were already speaking, was the occasion for a renewed burst of slogan shouting which, acting as a sort of climax to a successful march, was received by the audience at both our meetings with enthusiasm.

Of the whole demonstration which, under the influence of the Labour Party and the Communist Party, expressed the ideology of Collective Security, Peace through the League of Nations, and the Peace Alliance, our contingent was the only one which genuinely represented the ideas of revolutionary internationalism. It undoubtedly established the claim of the trotskyst movement to be the truly communist current in the British working class to-day.

Our movement has the task of filling the gap in British revolutionary politics caused by the defection of the Communist Party; the May Day experience, coupled with the encouraging reports we are receiving from our comrades in the provinces, augur well for our prospects in this respect.

SUMMER CAMPAIGN

The Summer Open Air Campaign is now under way and we plan to hold meetings in many parts of London and in many of the provincial centres. Comrade Bradley, who is well known as a leading trotskyst propagandist, has already visited Coventry and conducted successful meetings there; comrade James is shortly visiting Glasgow and other parts of Scotland; Sheffield will shortly be visited by our speakers.

All of our groups are conducting meetings on their own account and they are taking in hand the training of speakers to put our case effectively.

The R.S.L. is making a name for itself in the working class movement. Now is the time for all comrades sympathetic to the 4th International to rally to the R.S.L., the task of which is to build the Workers' Party as the British Section of the 4th International.

Labour vote, showing that the working class will respond to a working-class candidate. Although the R.S.L. disagrees profoundly with the war policy of the L.P., yet Groves' stand against the Popular Front was progressive and we welcome it.

The R.S.L. takes the opportunity of saying that Reg Groves, the Labour candidate, though in many quarters called "trotskyst," is not a member of this organisation. We supported his candidature and would support it again as we would support that of any other Labour candidate, even though it were Citrine or Bevin themselves. But such support is critical and the Fourth International would not for a moment admit or tolerate within the ranks anyone who, like Reg Groves, during his candidature, gave such replies to the Council of Action as made his policy indistinguishable from that of the Liberal candidate and did not unequivocally give the revolutionary socialist policy on war. On that the Fourth International can admit of no compromise.

THE LESSON OF AYLESBURY

THE recent Aylesbury election has given an example of an electoral situation which may again arise in coming bye-elections: the possibility of defeating a candidate of the National Government by a combination of the Liberal and Labour vote. The electoral policy of the R.S.L. and the Fourth International in this as in all other political situations is based on the class-struggle, and the independent activity of the working-class movement. In any election where there is a working-class candidate, we unhesitatingly counsel the workers to vote for him, whether he belongs to the I.L.P. or even the C.P. We take no responsibility for the policies of these parties, but the working-class candidate must be supported in an election or in any action which is in the interests of the workers and the struggle for Socialism.

The action of the Communist Party in this election proves once more the consciously counter-revolutionary policy which this party, under the direction of Moscow, is steadily pursuing. Anxious only to create a parliamentary bloc which will make a Franco-Soviet-British Alliance and challenge Germany and Japan, the Communist Party issued a statement

urging the workers to vote for the Liberal. The R.S.L. again warns the workers that the Stalinists today want only to bring pressure to bear on those sections of the bourgeoisie who may be useful to them against Germany. For they will sacrifice the workers without pity. Reg Groves, the Labour candidate, doubled the

Youth and the Revolution

THE Y.C.L. BANKRUPT

AN OLD JOURNAL AND A NEW

"ADVANCE" ENTERS THE FOLD

In this month's Internal Bulletin of the Labour League of Youth, circulated by organiser John Huddleston to League Secretaries, appear questions on the circulation of "Advance." So "Advance" at last has received the official blessing of Transport House. This "achievement" is yet another confirmation of our analysis of "Advance," its history and policy, given in the April "Fight." It is no longer possible for "Advance" to cloak its political bankruptcy with pseudo-militant phrases, as it has done in the past; henceforth it can only serve as a mouthpiece of the "official" Labour policy. One example of the complete conformity of "Advance" to Smith Square dogma is that all mention of the C.I.L. and unification has disappeared from the columns of the paper, whereas in earlier days the need for a "United Socialist Youth" was the subject of many "leaders."

Now more than ever is it essential that the revolutionaries within the ranks of the L.L.O.Y. should carry on unceasingly and intrinsically their exposure to the young workers of the treachery of "Advance," and should on every occasion place before them the revolutionary alternative.

the Y.C.L. today. We know what is meant by "Service for a Government of Peace." Yet even this small amount of "reading between the lines" is unnecessary; for in the resolution of the recent 10th Conference "On National Service and Conscription" appear these words:

"... A government composed of all working-class, democratic and progressive forces, based on a united policy of collective action to preserve peace against fascist aggression... could count upon the loyal voluntary support of all Youth in its measures of defence."

The Y.C.L.'s role, which is distinguished in every way from communism, is perhaps not so "distinctive" when we remember the treasurable role of the Social Democracy of 1914.

The lesson of France shows us that the coming to power of a "People's Government of Peace and Democracy" does not in any way change the nature of imperialism. So Raymond Guyot, French Y.C.L. leader, in calling youth to the colours (as he has been doing since 1936) is providing raw material for France's next outbreak of imperialist buccaneering. With Gollan ably seconding these efforts in Britain, the Y.C.L., the organisation which the advanced youth

Subscriptions, orders and donations for FIGHT

should be sent to:

A. FITZROY,
45 Afghan Road, S.W.11.

Enquiries about the R.S.L., manuscripts, etc. for FIGHT and all general correspondence, should be sent to:

CHARLES SUMNER,
238 Edgware Road, W.2.

"YOUTH AT WORK"

A small review "Youth at Work" which has recently appeared, sets itself the aim of representing the interests of Trade Union Youth. It contains reports from towns all over the country, indicating the work that is being done to organise Trade Union Youth committees and to propagate the Youth Charter. This charter consists of a list of Immediate Demands (Forty Hour Week, Holidays with Pay, Prevention of Blind Alley Occupations, etc.)

This is an important sphere of activity for young revolutionaries, whose task is to draw for Trade Union Youth the lesson that these demands for reforms can only be viewed as part of the struggle of all the workers for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalist society. Without this overthrow the demands outlined in the Charter can never be achieved.

Our task as revolutionaries is twofold, we must fight at the side of these young comrades for the reforms of the charter, and at the same time we must point out that only along the road of revolution lies the eventual solution of their problems.

"OUR (STALINIST) YOUTH"

In the May issue of "Our Youth," discussion magazine of the Young Communist League, appears the following sentence in an article by Mick Bennett:

"No one of us has any doubts... that our Y.C.L. is necessary for the youth of Britain, and that it has a distinctive role to play" (Bennett's emphasis). The role of the Y.C.L. is indeed "distinctive." After a preliminary review of the situation in the Y.C.L., Bennett tells us that the role is:

"To build the greatest unity of the youth for actively helping to bring about and support a government of Peace and Democracy and to win social and economic justice for youth"; and further, "What we say in the British Youth Peace Assembly and in the Emergency Youth Campaign about Peace, Democracy and Social Justice, about Service for a Government of Peace, is what we say and think and do as a Y.C.L. This is the Y.C.L. We have no policy apart from the policy put forward in the B.Y.P.A. on these matters."

In these lines, we have already a crushing indictment of the "role" of

have always looked up to as the standard-bearer of revolution, has become an open tool of imperialism. No longer must we allow the Y.C.L. to masquerade under the cloak of October. The exposure of the Y.C.L. leaders, the pointing out of the fact that the Young Communist League has nothing whatever in common with communism is a political task of the first importance.

However, it is apparent that class-conscious youth is already realising the true nature of the Y.C.L. In Bennett's article (quoted above) on "Building the Y.C.L.," he says "During the month of March, Hitler takes Austria, there is a new offensive of Fascist aggression in Spain... the whole population is in a furore (!) about the situation, and yet at such a time 46 branches did not get a single recruit." He goes on "... important key areas in Glasgow... did not recruit a single new member in the whole of March."

It would seem that the Y.C.L.'s "broad" policy is not so successful in drawing the masses of the youth as was hoped. In truth, the month of March should have produced a large influx of young workers to an organisation giving a clear revolutionary lead. But such a lead was lacking and will continue to be lacking until we have built the new Revolutionary Youth.

Failing to draw the Youth is not the only problem facing the Y.C.L.: they have yet to learn how to hold those who have joined their ranks. We quote Bennett again "... it must be said that the rate of fluctuation is still abnormally high, particularly in the mass branches. A very large part of our recruitment is offset by losses, so that the rate of growth is very, very slow."

Is it, asks Bennett "... because our policy is not acceptable to the youth?" This question, we think, answers itself. But comrade Bennett has an explanation of his own "... We cannot yet say that the whole Y.C.L., all its branches and Branch Committees, all our members, are fully convinced that they fully understand all that is implied by our policy."

If the Y.C.L. branches cannot understand "all that is implied in" the Y.C.L.'s policy, then we can. And apparently the young workers are beginning to understand, too.

CONDITIONS FOR VICTORY IN SPAIN

THE Spanish revolution still fights heroically—attacked from the front by fascism and crippled by the lovers of democracy. Negrin, the Spanish premier, supported by the stalinists, continues to issue statements proclaiming his policy. His latest is published in *Imprecor* (May 7th, 1938) by his staunch supporters, the stalinists. In it he says all that Spanish democracy will do. He is careful to guarantee "legal property legitimately acquired within the limits imposed by the supreme interests of the nation and the protection of producing elements." He promises a "radical agrarian reform. The whole document of Negrin is in striking contrast to the document of Trotsky which we publish below. Although Trotsky's article was written some months ago, it preserves its timeliness to this day. It is at once a summary of past errors and a guide for the future.

THE PROBLEM OF ARMING

The Socialists and Anarchists who tried to justify their capitulation to Stalin by the necessity of paying for the Moscow arms with principles and conscience simply lie and lie unskillfully . . .

If the leaders of the Anarchists had resembled revolutionists at all, they would have answered the first blackmail from Moscow not only by continuing the socialist advance but by disclosing Stalin's counter-revolutionary conditions before the working class of the world. Thus they would have forced the Moscow bureaucracy to choose openly between socialist revolution and the dictatorship of Franco. The Thermidorian bureaucracy fears and hates revolution. But it also fears to be stifled in a fascist ring. Besides this it depends on the workers. Everything speaks for the fact that Moscow would have been forced to supply arms and, possibly, at a more reasonable price.

But the world is not limited to stalinist Moscow. During a year and a half of civil war the Spanish war industry could and should have been strengthened and developed, adapting a series of non-military factories to the purposes of war. This work was not carried out only because Stalin and equally with him his Spanish allies feared the initiative of the workers' organisations. A strong military industry would have become a powerful instrument in the hands of the workers. The leaders of the People's Front preferred dependence upon Moscow . . .

And what if Moscow, in the absence of a People's Front, should in general refuse to give arms? And what we answer to this, if the Soviet Union in general did not exist in the world? Revolutions have been victorious up to this time not at all thanks to great foreign patrons who supplied them with arms. Usually the counter-revolution enjoyed foreign patronage. Must we recall the experience of the intervention of French, English, American, Japanese and other armies against the Soviet? The proletariat of Russia won over inner reaction and foreign intervention without military support from the outside. Revolutions succeed, in the first place, with the help of a bold social programme which gives to the masses the possibility of seizing weapons that are on their territory and disorganising the army of the enemy. The Red Army seized French, English and American military provisions and drove the foreign expeditionary corps into the sea. Has this really been forgotten already?

If at the head of the armed workers and peasants, i.e. at the head of the so-called "republican" Spain there were revolutionists and not cowardly agents of the bourgeoisie, the problem of arming would in general not have played a paramount role. The army of Franco including the colonial Riffs and the soldiers of Mussolini are not at all immune to revolutionary contagion. Surrounded from all sides by the fire of the socialist uprising, the soldiers of fascism would have proved to be an insignificant quantity. Not arms and not military "genuses" were lacking in Madrid and Barcelona; what was lacking was a revolutionary party!

THE CONDITIONS FOR VICTORY

The conditions for victory of the

masses in a civil war against the army of exploiters in its essence are very simple.

1. The fighters of a revolutionary army should clearly be aware of the fact that they are fighting for their full social liberation and not for the re-establishment of the old ("democratic") forms of exploitation.

2. The workers and peasants in the rear of the revolutionary army as well as in the rear of the enemy should know and understand the same thing.

3. The propaganda on their own front as well as on the front of the adversary and in both rears should be completely permeated with the spirit of social revolution. The slogan: "first victory, then reforms," is the slogan of all oppressors and exploiters beginning with the Biblical kings and ending with Stalin.

4. Those classes and strata who participate in the struggle determine the policy. The revolutionary masses should have a government apparatus directly and immediately expressing their will. Only the Soviets of workers, soldiers and peasant deputies can act as such an apparatus.

SELL "FIGHT" and help build THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

5. The revolutionary army should not only announce but immediately carry out the more pressing measures of social revolution in the provinces won by them: the expropriation of provisions, manufactured articles and other stores on hand and transferring them to the needy, the re-division of lodgings in the interests of the toilers and especially of the families of the fighters; the expropriation of the land and landowners' inventory in the interests of the peasants; the establishment of workers' control and of the soviet power in place of the former bureaucracy.

6. Enemies of the socialist revolution, i.e. exploiting elements and their agents, even when covering themselves with the mask of "democrats," "republicans," "socialists" and "anarchists" should be mercilessly driven out from the army.

7. At the head of each military unit there should stand a commissar possessing the irreproachable authority of a revolutionist and a warrior.

8. In every military unit there should be a tempered nucleus of the more self-sacrificing fighters, recommended by the workers' organisations. The members of this nucleus have but one privilege: to be the first under fire.

9. The commanding corps of necessity includes at first many alien and unreliable elements in its staff. A verification and selection of them should be carried through on the basis of military experience, the recommendations of the commissar and testimonials from the rank and file fighters. Simultaneously there should proceed an intense preparation of commanders drawn from the ranks of the revolutionary workers.

10. The strategy of civil war should unite the rules of military art with the tasks of the social revolution.

(continued on next col.)

ROSE COHEN IN THE HANDS OF THE G.P.U.

ROSE COHEN, now in the hands of the stalinist counter-revolutionary terrorist organisation, charged with "spying," was a young socialist girl who worked about eighteen years ago in the Labour Research Department. From the early days of the C.P.G.B. she was a member of that party and a close friend of C.P. leaders; MacManus, Pollitt, Page Arnot, Dutt.

It was these people who introduced this pretty, sincere, revolutionary young woman into the very heart of the Comintern. It was they who arranged for her to attend Comintern Congresses and live very near to them in the Lux Hotel. In those days, so much did they value her that even the diplomatic bag was used as a means for sending her chocolates, tennis balls, and other comforts unobtainable in Moscow at that time.

As revolutionary workers we protest against the British capitalist class interfering in the affairs of the revolutionary movement. We expropriate on their Notes to the Soviet Government. But, we demand that the British working class be made fully acquainted with the facts surrounding this working class woman and the charges against her.

We defend the right—the duty—of our class to protest against Rose Cohen's torture in the hell chambers of Stalin's G.P.U. We demand that the T.U.C. be allowed to send a lawyer to Moscow to defend her.

Her husband, Petrovsky, who was arrested earlier, is described as "head of the Educational Department of the heavy industries." That is merely sand in the eyes of the British workers, and in particular is meant to blind the young members of the British Communist Party to the facts. Who is Petrovsky really? An old revolutionary who, during the last war, was on the editorial staff of a Russian socialist paper in New York. After the Russian revolution he went back to Russia and, working in the apparatus of the Communist International, was the C.I. representative in Britain. Known as Bennett, his pamphlets were published by the C.P. (No doubt some of the C.P. leaders have never forgiven him for the cuts he and Piatnitsky made in their "allowances"!)

Rose Cohen worked with Bennett (Petrovsky) in the Anglo-American Secretariat of the Comintern. Later she was on the editorial staff of the *Moscow Daily News*.

If Rose Cohen is to be put on trial, Pollitt, Dutt, Arnot and her other "friends," who introduced a pretty "spy" into the International, must be put on trial by the British workers. But these C.P. leaders know Rose Cohen is no spy. They know that her arrest is but one in many thousands of old revolutionaries who have to be removed by Stalin before he can feel safe in his turn towards the capitalist class.

To keep their own skins safe, to keep their jobs as agents of the reactionary stalinist bureaucracy which

(cont. on page 4, col. 3)

tion. Not only in the propaganda but in the military operations is it necessary to take into account the social composition of the different military units of the opponent (the bourgeois volunteers, the mobilised peasants, or as with Franco, the colonial slaves) and in choosing an operative line to take into consideration the social structure of the corresponding regions: the peasant regions, revolutionary or reactionary; the regions of the oppressed nationalities, etc.). Briefly: revolutionary policy dominates strategy.

11. The revolutionary government, as the executive committee of the workers and peasants, should be capable of winning full confidence of the army and of the toiling population.

12. The foreign policy should have as its chief aim the awakening of the revolutionary consciousness of the workers, the exploited peasants and oppressed nationalities of the whole world.

The conditions for victory, as we see, are quite simple. In their aggregate they are called the Socialist Revolution. There did not exist in Spain even one of these conditions. The basic reason is that there was not a revolutionary party.

L. TROTSKY.

Stalinist Counter-Revolution in India

THE class-conscious British worker has always looked upon the revolutionary movement in India and the colonies as part of his own struggle against capitalism. A successful revolution in India will so weaken the basis of British Imperialism as to ensure an easy victory for the British working class in the coming socialist revolution. The leaders of the British Labour Party, who never had any serious quarrel with British imperialism, know this and that is why they have never lifted a finger in support of the freedom movement in the colonies. To-day we have to add the name of the Communist Party to list of those who are trying to make the Empire safe for capitalists.

In the *Daily Worker* of April 18th, 1938, J. R. Campbell has put forward the new imperialist ideas of the Stalinists. In answer to a question whether the Communist Party of Great Britain would give any support to a subject nation which strives to gain independence, Campbell replies, "If a Labour and Democratic Government was formed in the country, the Communist Party would advocate that the Government undertake an immediate and substantial improvement in the economic and political position of the people in the colonies. Such a Government could establish an uncensored Press, the right to form industrial organizations and extended educational system in all the colonies. It would abolish some of the reactionary features of the Indian Constitution and seriously begin to Indianise the Army."

An "immediate and substantial improvement in the economic and political position of the people in the colonies" is something for which the colonialists have been fighting for a long time. On the very day Campbell was writing his hypocritical answers the Indian workers in the British-owned copper mines of the Indian Copper Corporation were on strike to secure an increase in wages. On April 23rd the Managing Director of the Corporation, Sir Godfrey Fell, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., told his cheering shareholders, "It is time we had a showdown," and "We will not yield to force nor grant unreasonable demands which would make it impossible for us to operate at a profit." Every effort on the part of the working masses in the colonies to improve their economic position brings them into conflict with the interest of the capitalists and the landlords, native and foreign, and the troops and guns of the Imperialist Government. Campbell pretends to ignore this fundamental fact and tells the colonialists that the Stalinists will advocate reforms. No capitalist government grants reforms willingly, least of all to the colonial working masses. Economic reforms can be won and preserved only by the organized militancy of the colonial masses. It makes hardly any difference whether the imperialist Government is the Government of Neville Chamberlain or Atlee and the Duchess. The experience of the people in the French colonies bears this out completely.

After nearly two years of Front Populaire Government the masses in the French North African colonies are now in revolt. In Morocco and Tunis, General Nogues and his officers have instituted a regime of fascist terror. The French Stalinists who equally with Campbell stood for reforms in the colonies have now joined the French Capitalists and are telling the world that the revolutionary masses are agents of Hitler and Mussolini. The "Social Future," the paper of the Tunisian Communist Party warns the masses that they must not disobey French laws, the same laws which, according to the same paper, have created in Tunis a regime of "hunger, poverty and unemployment." To talk of advocating reforms in the colonies while supporting an imperialist Government at home is sheer hypocrisy.

The Communist Party, Campbell

tells us, would advocate the removal of "some" of the reactionary features of the Indian Constitution. This means that the Communist Party will not advocate the removal of the rest of the reactionary features of the Constitution. What abject cowardice and what servility towards the British bourgeoisie! Even the Indian bourgeoisie whose programme is one of co-operation with imperialism has damned the Constitution as a whole and is clamouring for a constituent assembly.

The Communist Party, says Campbell, will advocate the Indianisation of the Army. Let us see what this Indianisation of the Army means. Of the 222,000 troops in India, about 166,000 are Indians. Does Campbell mean that he will support the Indianisation of the remaining 56,000 white troops in India? Does he not know that one of the crying grievances of the Indian people is the existence of a colossal military apparatus which eats away 65 per cent of the Indian revenue. Moreover under the present constitution the administration of the Army falls within the special powers of the Viceroy, the nominee of the British bourgeoisie. As long as the Viceroy possesses these special powers, the army will continue to be an imperialist Army even if the British officers are replaced by the sons of the Indian bourgeoisie. Yet these special powers of the Viceroy are the foundation of the Constitution. They cannot be destroyed without destroying the Constitution as a whole. But Campbell evidently does not want that.

Campbell's answer makes it quite clear that the Stalinists are quite prepared to betray the colonial masses for an alliance with the British bourgeoisie against Hitler. In the old days the Communist Party stood unreservedly for the independence of India. Britain's difficulty was to be India's opportunity. They loaded Congress and the right-wing Indian leaders with abuse for their very policy of compromising with the British. And now look at them today to the Right of Congress. But the Indian bourgeoisie compromised with Britain through fear of mass activity. That is why they hated the Communists. Today in India as in Britain, France and Spain, Stalinism is actively collaborating with reaction, shouting as loudly as ever but pushing the masses back whenever it comes to action. This, as far as the leaders are concerned, is no mistake or misunderstanding. It is a deliberate sabotage under orders from Moscow in order to encourage the bourgeoisie to favour a British-Soviet alliance.

The masses in the colonies and in India have never known any democracy. Yet they will fight fascism and defend the Soviet Union. But they know that the best way to defeat the fascist menace is to use the opportunities afforded by the mutual rivalries of the imperialist powers to achieve their freedom. In doing this they will bring near the day of the Proletarian World Revolution which is the only defence of the Soviet Union and the only answer to fascism. To do this however, demands an implacable struggle against the Stalinist counter-revolution, in India as well as in Britain.

BUY FIGHT!



READ FIGHT!



SELL FIGHT!

"Peace Alliance" Leads to War

LESSON OF CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

WILL the workers see through this "Peace Alliance" in time? Or will the Labour and Liberal leaders again trick them as they did in 1914? That is the problem.

Germany massed troops on the Czecho-Slovakian border in the third week in May. The Czechs called up reserves and France stood by Czecho-Slovakia. Brailsford reports that the British ambassador went to the German Foreign office, went again, and went a third time, i.e. he told the Germans that Britain would not stand aside if Germany marched. Germany held her hand. But so tense was the situation that orders were given to evacuate the British women and children from the German embassy—(Evening Standard, May 24th). Note that this stand against Germany was no "Peace Alliance" Government but a National Government which admires fascism. A few weeks before, this Government completed a military alliance with France. Thus there was a line-up of the British democracy, French democracy and the Czecho-Slovakian democracy "against fascism." But does anybody in his senses believe that Neville Chamberlain, Lord Nuffield, Sir John Simon and the rest cemented the French alliance and warned Germany, for the sake of democracy?

Rubbish! They were doing what seemed to them best for the interests of British capitalism. If Germany had marched, the war would have begun. Russia would have moved to support Czecho-Slovakia and then Harry Pollitt, J. R. Campbell, John Strachey, Sidney Elliot of Reynolds, Brailsford, Atlee, Harold Laski and the rest of them would have called on the British workers to support the war and defend democracy against Fascism. Could there be a clearer exposure of the capitalist role that the "Peace Alliance" despite all its attacks on the National Government is to play?

The political position is simply this. German capitalism must expand or expire. The easiest way is to attack Russia and dominate the Ukraine, the first step to the great redivision that must come. Britain sees this quite clearly. It is allied to France, not for the sake of democracy, but for the sake of preventing Germany dominating the Channel and the North Sea. Britain is arming against Germany. There is no one else for Britain to arm against except Germany. It is the same with France. Germany is the enemy. There is no question here of democracy at all. But France, more frightened than Britain, formed the Franco-Soviet pact. Note too that it was formed by Laval, one of the greatest reactionaries in France, not for love of democracy, but as a check to Germany. Where the division between the capitalists comes in is the tactic. Churchill, the Duchess of Atholl and some of the French politicians want to strengthen the alliance with Russia. They see Germany gaining strength in Europe, and Germany and Italy finding a foothold in Spain. They fear a sudden attack on France or worse still an alliance between Russia and Germany. By a Franco-British-Soviet pact, disguised as the League of Nations, they will then be in a stronger position to bargain with Germany, Italy and Japan. He is a blubbery fool who believes that Churchill and the Duchess, if in power, will immediately precipitate a war against Germany.

Chamberlain, J. L. Garvin, and the "Cliveden Set" think differently. They want to bargain at once because they think this is a better way. But both of these, being what they are, are only seeking ways and means of coming to an understanding with Germany. Once they get that, both will abandon Stalin without a tremor. When Churchill went to France the other day, the first person he went to see when he came back was Halifax. These people are all one. The Liberal Party, a capitalist party, goes with Churchill and the Duchess. The Labour leaders as usual, crawling behind the capitalists, follow the liberals. They are not too anxious to get into any Popular Front. They know that when war does come, Britain will be on the side of France. Then they can shout about a war for democracy to their hearts' content and draw the workers in. Their latest statement on the Popular Front is

more conciliatory than before and if the pressure is strong enough, their resistance will be broken, but they would rather not have the responsibility if they can help it.

All this is nothing new. The "Peace Alliance" is 1914 in new circumstances. The revolutionary movement has always foretold and was prepared for that. It is the Stalinists who are doing the dirty work for the capitalists in the workers' movement. The Stalinist bureaucracy aims at maintaining hostility between Britain and France on the one hand and Germany on the other; and the Stalinist parties have orders to lead the workers to the shambles at any cost. Their Popular Front manoeuvre failed but Sydney Elliot of Reynolds discovered the phrase "Peace Alliance." It is the same thing and the Stalinists grab on to it. So rigidly are they carrying out their orders that they supported the Liberal instead of the working-class candidate. They are boosting Churchill and the Duchess as if they did not know the game these people were playing. They would support the Pope of Rome if he was against Germany and they have actually advocated an agreement with Fascist Mussolini (Inprecor, April 30th, p. 484.) if he will break with Germany. The workers' movement is nothing to them. For Stalinists, like the capitalists, lie and bluff to the workers about democracy while they carry out the orders of their murderous masters in Russia. That is the "Peace Alliance." It is merely dragging at the tail of one section of the capitalists.

The Fourth International says no! The fight against war is the fight of the workers against all capitalists. Every strike weakens the war-machine. Every strike strengthens the U.S.S.R. against capitalism. Every colonial revolt weakens the capitalists. That is the road, long and hard, but the only road. We must not be deceived again even though the Stalinists are using the name of Lenin to push us into another "war for democracy."

BRITISH BARBARISM IN JAMAICA

(continued from page 1)

workers and collected subscriptions for the strikers. That is true international solidarity. British workers will not be behind hand. Those who wish to send a resolution of protest to the Colonial Office, or of solidarity to the West Indians and a subscription, however small, can do so through the office of FIGHT or through the International African Service Bureau of 129, Westbourne Grove, an organisation devoted to the interests of the negro struggle.

C. L. R. JAMES.

Published by
The Revolutionary Socialist League,
238, Edgware Road, W.2
Printed by THE NARON PRESS,
129-131, Bedford Street, London, E.1

SOVIET PURGE CONTINUES

ECONOMY DISORGANISED

WRITING in the Daily Herald, January 24th, Mr. Harold Laski in his notes on People and Politics said:

"The halt in the Soviet purge will hearten Socialists all over the world: and that it should coincide with the meeting of the new Legislative Assembly is important. But it shows, I think the urgent importance of two things: first, the need for far fuller light than we have upon the internal position in the Soviet Union; and, second, the necessity for all Socialists who recognise, as I do, the vital importance of Russia to our movement not to assume that whatever is done there by its Government is, necessarily, what should have been done.

"For here is a frank admission that wholesale errors have been committed, and, to whatever cause these may be attributed, this means that the duty of criticism is one that no Socialist can abdicate."

Since Mr. Laski wrote that, much has occurred in the Soviet Union which shows how premature his conclusions were as to there being a halt in Soviet purges. There was the case of the "Robinsons," two Americans whose trial is still awaited. 60 Czechs, 500 Germans, and 3,000 Greeks were under arrest. Andrei N. Tupolev, "perhaps the most decorated man in the Soviet," whose initials ANT appeared on Soviet planes, one of the world's foremost aeronautical engineers and inventors, the man who created the Red Air Force, was disgraced and arrested. Zavenyagin, candidate to the Central Committee, (previously decorated for his construction work on the Magnitogorsk combine), with two of his colleagues in the Commissariat of Heavy Industry, "disappeared" in the month of January. There was no halt in the Soviet purge.

If anyone had doubts about that they were dispelled very quickly when the Bukharin-Rykov trial took place—the largest of all the public trials so far, with the longest role of death sentences.

Even whilst this trial was going on in Moscow further "plots" were being uncovered in other parts of Russia. In Prokopievsk, Western Siberia, seven alleged terrorists were put on trial accused of murdering a woman who informed on them in their criminal activity in setting fire to a mine shaft—she alleged that they were "Trotskyist-Bukharinists."

On March 23rd six people were sentenced to death for having organised wrecks on the Tomsk railway.

Because ineffective lanterns were supplied to the Arctic explorers, I. Krasin, former director of the Leningrad Lantern Factory, and three engineers were put on trial for criminal negligence.

Nicholas Vassilevitch Krylenko, first Commander-in-Chief of the Red Army, then Commissar of Justice, disgraced in March and accused in April by State Prosecutor Vishinsky

for "wrecking" and denounced as a traitor.

In Central Russia in the Tartar Republic acting under instructions from the "counter-revolutionary Trotskyist-Bukharinist" organisation, seven officials of the Ministry of Agriculture of the Tartar Republic engaged in sabotage, were shot.

In Kirghizia for similar offences and "bourgeois spying and wrecking" nine persons were executed.

At Tashkent, in the north of Uzbekistan, six persons were shot, one was sentenced to ten years imprisonment, and two to eight years on charges of wrecking activities in the construction of a dam and power plant.

On the same day (May 10th) in Erivan, the capital of Armenia, two men were given terms of imprisonment, and three men were shot, for wrecking in connection with agriculture. For this one day—there were similar reports from Novosibirsk, on the Trans-Siberian Railway—the total number of shootings for wrecking crimes amounted to eighteen.

In the "Monthly Review" issued by the U.S.S.R. Trade Delegation in the United Kingdom, for February, a list of the New Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R. is given on page 49. It is illuminating to look over this list—it is already out of date and useless.

The People's Commissar for Railway Transport, A. V. Bakulin has been removed. Soviet railways have been in a critical condition for quite a long period, Bakulin has been made the scapegoat.

Owing to some confusion in the reports it is not possible to say who has now taken over his post. The confusion arises from the similarity in names of L. M. Kaganovitch, Commissar for Heavy Industry, and M. M. Kaganovitch, Commissar for the Defence Industry. One or the other has now presumably taken over the

Land Transport, although things are not too good in an industry with which they are both connected, the Chemical Industry: "wrecking in the Soviet chemical industry had caused the failure of the entire 1937 plan." In fact it has been alleged that more wreckers were found in this industry than in any other!

But let us return to the list of commissars.

The People's Commissar for Water Transport was N. I. Pakhomov: elected in January he was disgraced in April. His job has now been taken over by M. Yeshov head of the G.P.U. so Yeshov now holds two posts.

The People's Commissar for Agriculture was R. I. Eikhe, also elected to the new Council in January, but deposed from office in May. Perhaps Eikhe found things in the agricultural industry too much for him. In a report delivered on January 18th on the "Plan for 1938 in Agriculture" before the plenary session, he gave a depressing picture of the work of the wreckers: seed had not been prepared; repairing tractors plan had been fulfilled only 30 per cent; petrol supplies lacking, and so on.

Robert I. Eikhe was made a commissar of agriculture last October occupying the post formerly held by Mikhail Chernoff, who was tried along with Bukharin last March and executed. It was Eikhe who denounced Chernoff as a wrecker and who gave details of his alleged sabotage in the agricultural industry. Despite the fact that Eikhe undertook to improve the industry he failed to do as well as Chernoff had done.

Who will be the next to fall? How long is this sorry condition of things to continue? The answer to these questions is obvious.

When the socialists of the world face up to their duty of criticism, no Socialist can abdicate. Not that Mr. Laski practices what he preaches. What every serious minded person wants to know is: What are the causes which give rise to the trials and the deplorable shootings? What are the real conditions in the Soviet Union? What is the actual situation in the country? Anyone who tries to make such an investigation from honest motives will be met with hostility, the kind of hostility with which Mr. Laski treated André Gide for instance. When André Gide went to Russia and upon his return wrote his little book, which was worthy of deep consideration, all that Mr. Laski could do in a crushing review of the book in the Manchester Guardian, was to say: "The true comparison M. Gide ought to have made is between the old Russia and the new!"

HENRY SARA.

ARMS and the UNIONS

(continued from page 1)

a "democratic" constitution, but in which the members have no voice, could be continued indefinitely. But the position is already clear enough. The Union leaders are ready and prepared to betray the workers once again. What can the workers do? Particularly what can the engineers do against the coming dangers? First, they can resist the treacherous moves of the leaders by all the constitutional machinery of the Unions. More important, they can elect militant shop-stewards in every shop, and call into being powerful Works Committees throughout the industry.

This will help to perfect the real basic machinery of Trade Unionism which is powerful enough to overcome the faithless leadership, and eventually to substitute workers control for the inefficiency of capitalist methods. Meanwhile the workers can demonstrate both to the leaders and the Government that the hold the former has over them can easily be broken, and that if a betraying pact of co-operation is made between the Government and the Union leaders it will be worthless, because in the end it is the engineers, the workers themselves who decide whether or not the pact will be put into effect.

ROSE COHEN IN THE HANDS OF THE G.P.U.

(continued from page 3)

is trampling the proletarian revolution in the mud, the Pollitts, Arnots and Dutts are prepared to slander and lie against not only Trotsky and the old Bolshevik leaders but against their nearest proletarian revolutionary friends.

Workers! Rose Cohen, one of our own class, is in the hands of the bloody G.P.U. Only we can save her. Send protests to the Russian Embassy, London, demanding her release.

Get resolutions passed in your Trade Union branches demanding that the T.U.C. defend Rose Cohen. Send copies to FIGHT for publication.

The arrest of Rose Cohen is but a prelude to further frame-ups. To save her child, she will be ready to "confess" (in other words to sign any statement put before her by the G.P.U. inquisitors Rosenberg and Scheinin) after being subjected to and broken by the torture of the "heat rooms" and the "conveyor" in the dungeons of the G.P.U.

Workers! Demand the release and safe conduct of Rose Cohen and her child to Britain.

Young Communist Party members! Force the truth from Pollitt, Dutt, Arnot and Company.

Down with Stalin's bloody terror against proletarian revolutionaries! Free Rose Cohen! Free the thousands of working-class fighters now in the prisons of Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini!

ALPHA.

MEETING HELD

IN THE LONDON AREA

BATTERSEA — Comyn Road, Clapham Jc., Tuesdays, 8 p.m.
ISLINGTON — Highbury Corner, Mondays, 8 p.m.
ST. PANCRAS — Mornington Crescent, Fridays, 8 p.m.
KILBURN — Kilburn High Road, Fridays, 8 p.m.
PECKHAM — Rye Lane, 8 p.m. To be commenced shortly.
TOOTING — Undine Street, 8 p.m. To be commenced shortly.

SUMMER CAMPAIGN Sundays.

Finsbury Park - - - 11 a.m.
Hyde Park - - - 3 p.m.
Clapham Common - - 3 p.m.
Brookwell Park - - - 7 p.m.
Victoria Park (to be commenced shortly).
Peckham Rye (to be commenced shortly).