

# CHARTIST

LABOUR'S REVOLUTIONARY VOICE No. 28 MARCH 1975 Price 5p

AS EMPLOYERS PLAN NEW WAVE OF REDUNDANCIES DEMAND—

## OPEN THE BOOKS!

THE WHIPLASH of unemployment now faces the working class. Latest figures show that 791,000 are unemployed with 250,000 on short time in the car, textile and engineering industries making a total of over a million. The Labour Government has joined the previous government in the 'dole queue millionaires' club. This is no surprise because they refuse to advance an alternative policy which can halt the rise in unemployment.

For all that, Chancellor Denis Healey persists with attacks on workers who defend living standards by demanding decent wages and gains applause from Tory head-hunters like Thatcher and Keith Joseph. Wilson and Foot sing the same refrain: accept cuts in living standards or face the dole. Foot, the darling of the 'Tribune' Left and the Communist Party, is currently presiding over the destruction of 4,000 steelworkers' jobs in his Ebbw Vale constituency. His sole proposal is tell the workers to "show some guts" and accept the murder of Ebbw Vale. We ask: was it for this that Foot, Healey and the rest of the Parliamentary Labour Party were put into office?

### FAILURE

Labour's dismal failure to implement its manifesto by bringing about "A fundamental and irreversible shift in the balance of power and wealth in favour of working people" lends encouragement to the Tories. Joseph has 'begun a campaign for capitalism'. Along with Thatcher and Maudling and the CBI, they are preparing for a real offensive against the working class, while Labour's leaders open the door for them.

The whole Labour and union leadership has done nothing but tell workers to ease up on pay claims... Their 'let's all pull together', class collaborationist mentality is a block in the way of the battle to defend jobs. Healey quotes Jack Jones as saying that 'it was no good his members pressing for enormous wage increases at the cost of bankrupting the firms which gave them the work'. This way the whole leadership abdicates any responsibility for defending those who elected them.

Unemployment will rise whether or not workers accept the Social

by Graeme Atkinson

Contract, because output is falling, investment is at an all-time low and British capitalism is bankrupt in the face of the world economic crisis. The answer to these problems lies in destroying capitalism not resuscitating it.

Every Labour Party member and trade unionist should call on the Labour leaders to stop acting as a fire brigade for the employers and to break from them immediately.

Workers should follow the lead of trade unionists at the Imperial Typewriters factory in Hull who have occupied their factory to defend over 1,000 jobs which have been axed. From this position of strength we can demand that the



Workers from Imperial Typewriters Company, Hull

employers 'open the books' to inspection by shop stewards committees. We want to see the books not only of individual bankrupts like British Leyland, but of the whole of industry. With knowledge of the big monopolies squalid profiteering and waste, the strug-

gle for workers' control will be given a powerful weapon.

Trade union leaders should ensure that all available work is shared amongst the workforce without sackings and without loss of pay, so as to expose the lies of the employers who want to pay workers off because they cannot screw enough profits out of them.

Workers are willing to fight against being scapegoats for the capitalist crisis. The apathy and class collaboration of the leaders stand in the way. Even now, the Labour leaders—in their 'Industry Bill'—promise to preserve the secrecy of the bosses' commercial operations, which are often aimed at sacking workers while grabbing massive cash handouts. This situation must be ended. The plans of the employers to make the working class pay for their crisis must be exposed. Business secrets must be abolished and the employers books forced open.

## THATCHER'S 'NEW TORYISM' — A WARNING TO LABOUR

"THE CHARM of Britain", says Margaret Thatcher, "has always been the ease with which one can move into the middle class." Like all middle-class politicians, she tries to delude us that her interests, and the interests of those she claims to represent, are the interests of the working class as well. "If middle class values", she declared recently, "include a belief in the wide distribution of individual private property, then they are certainly what I am trying to defend."

Margaret Thatcher's victory over Heath in the Tory Party shows how strong the so-called 'middle-class backlash' in Britain is beginning to become. Ted Heath was never able to give voice to this force. His mind was on the Common Market, on the interests of the really big industrial corporations, on the long-term interests and destiny of British capitalism as a whole. In 'confronting' the trade unions, he was acting for the giant monopolies

who could relatively easily bear the economic costs. He seemed hardly aware of 'smaller matters'—such as the desperate plight of many small businessmen during the 'three-day week'. Under his leadership, the Tory Party seemed in danger of losing its social base.

By Chris Knight

1974 was the Tories' disaster year. Two elections were lost. The party's share of the total vote slumped from 38% in 1970 to 29% last October. Only two major cities—Cardiff and Edinburgh—remained Tory controlled. The traditional Tory middle-class strongholds in the suburbs were lost to the Liberals. In Scotland, the Tories became identified almost wholly with the landowning lairds and bailies, the bulk of their former support going to the Nationalists. Something similar was happening in Wales, and political

commentators began forecasting that the Tories might never rule Britain again.

It certainly seems unlikely that the Tories under Edward Heath could have won another election. Margaret Thatcher's supporters in the Tory Party were sure of this. Not only had the working class been antagonised but the middle class had been alienated by Heath as well. Thatcher's Tory supporters realised that a big-business party, to get votes, must appear to represent much wider popular interests. It must have a 'social base', and for the Tories this must above all be the middle class.

It is Margaret Thatcher's personal fortune to have precisely the 'image' required. She has already begun making the most of her past as a 'grocer's daughter', the girl who lived above the little street corner shop and helped serve customers while still at school.

(Continued on page 2)

Inside: E.E.C. SPECIAL FEATURE

# THE CHARTIST

Monthly Journal of the Socialist Charter Movement.

Editor: M. Davis, 82 Loughborough Rd, London SW9. 01-733-8953

## Industry Bill protects business secrets with jail threat

AT A POLICY briefing meeting of the Labour Party in London at the end of January, Tony Benn, Industry Secretary, outlined Labour's industrial policy. Benn declared Labour had an "avowedly socialist industrial policy" requiring the full mobilisation of the labour movement if it was to work. The new Industry Bill, he announced was to be the main instrument of Labour's industrial policy.

Socialists and trade unionists have awaited with great interest the publication of this Bill which is now generating heated debate in the chambers of Parliament. CBI President Ralph Bateman has condemned the Bill as a 'Charter for Workers' control'. Tory industry spokesman, Michael Heseltine has dubbed it "a reckless socialist onslaught on private enterprise".

Despite the predictably hostile reaction of the Tories and big business the Bill itself reflects very little of the aspirations or requirements of working class people in a period of mass recession, short-time working, redundancies and factory closures.

### BANKRUPTS' PROP

The Bill's main purpose is the establishment of the much-vaunted National Enterprise Board which will have as a key aim the extension of 'public ownership into profitable areas of manufacturing industry.' But the main proposals contained in the Bill for the "regeneration of British industry" amount to little more than the creation of a state prop to bankrupt private companies.

Benn correctly identifies one part of the crisis of British capitalism as being produced by the refusal of private capitalists to invest in industry. But the solutions to this problem proposed in the Bill are pitiful. The £1,000 million—which the NEB can borrow to help ailing companies—is totally inadequate. The amount represents only one-sixth of the British Steel Corporation's investment programme.

The proposals of Benn's supporters in the Tribune Group on this score are also helplessly

adrift. They want to see £20,000m invested in British industry 'if there is to be any prospect of Britain achieving higher living standards'. But the problem which these reformist plans completely ignore is: where is the money to come from? So long as private ownership of industry survives the money can only come from workers' pockets or cuts in education, health and housing spending.

The Tribune Group in Parliament will try to introduce a 'progressive' tax code which would draw this much needed revenue from the profits of big business. But this reformist Labour policy would be caught in a vicious circle. In order to solve the problems of low investment in industry the Lefts would try to tax the profits of the biggest companies. When this new tax began to bite too deeply into their profits, then the capitalists would stop investing altogether!

But the crisis of British industry cannot be patched up by hand-outs to private enterprise in the Healey budget tradition or through government 'planning agreements' to boost investment.

### SECURITY

What millions of workers will want from Benn's Bill is control over these vast companies, full knowledge of their operations and security for jobs and living standards. Unfortunately we will get nothing of the sort from this Bill.

The section of the Bill concerned with the 'promotion of industrial democracy' is the other side of the problem. At the

Briefing meeting we have referred to, several delegates from trade unions and CLPs raised the question of 'disclosure' of business secrets and asked what provisions were being made for opening the books of the multi-national companies and their subsidiaries. In response Benn laid bare the fundamental weakness of reformist notions of socialist transformation. The Bill was only words on paper, he said. In appealing to trade unionists to be 'realistic' he stated that he could not force the multi-nationals to disclose their business secrets. But all those trade unionists at present in struggle against factory closures such as at Imperial Typewriters, Leyland, Chryslers, etc. want a lead in this fight. With knowledge of the capitalists' real profiteering the fight for workers control would be immensely strengthened inside the labour movement.

### DISCLOSURE

But the Bill itself is even worse than Benn's apology. The section on 'disclosure' reveals some very dangerous anti-working class proposals.

Firstly, the Industry Secretary is not required to demand information from companies, if it is deemed 'undesirable in the national interest'. We ask: whose interest?

Surely it is in the interests of workers the world over to have access to the company books of Fords, British Leyland, Chryslers and the other multi-nationals threatening millions with unemployment. The sharing of information on these capitalist combines can only strengthen workers solidarity

and the struggle for international socialism. Only big business has secrets to hide from the workers of the world, secrets which disguise their true profiteering and robbery of the wealth created by our labour.

The most sinister of all the proposals, states that trade unionists divulging information on company books could be subject to fines and imprisonment.

The legislation gives provision for Benn to obtain an order for opening of the books of selected firms to NEB accountants and selected trade unionists. But the conditions for this are eagerly quoted by the 'Times' (1.2.75):

"A trade unionist who passes on anything he may have learnt about his company which happens to be subject to an order, may also find himself subject to criminal proceedings". The mouthpiece of big business continues: "Under Clause 26 any person who contravenes the confidentiality of information given to the Minister under an order is guilty of an offence carrying the possibility of up to 2 years imprisonment and an unlimited fine. There are no exceptions listed."

### OPEN THE BOOKS!

Here we see that the demand which is gaining rapid support amongst widespread sections of the working class threatened with redundancy: Open the books! is turned inside out and given a savage twist. Not only are the capitalists' profiteering operations protected but workers are to be penalised if they discover the truth! Penalised not by the Tories but by the diktat of our Labour leaders. We say to Tony Benn does he really think this is a socialist programme for industry? The Bill as it stands at present, with its penal clauses, protection of bosses business secrets and cash-props for private capital must be opposed.

Left MPs who support Benn's Bill should be approached with these questions. We call on trade unionists and socialists to raise and union branches and to lobby the and union branches to lobby the Tribune MPs to throw out this non-socialist Bill.

### Thatcher's "New Toryism" cont'd.

Thatcher's election marks a decisive rightward lurch for the Tory Party. A 'Thatcherite' Tory government would use mass unemployment to curb the trade unions, as her 'policy advisor' Sir Keith Joseph has already promised. A witch-hunt against trade union militants could well be encouraged under the guise of appeals to 'loyalty' and 'patriotism'. Thatcher's first words in Parliament as leader of the Tories were to demand a 'pay rise' for the Queen as 'our most priceless asset'. Thatcher is certainly not a fascist. But her flag-waving 'Queen and country' politics—like those of Enoch Powell, whom she could readmit into the Tory Party and a Tory Cabinet at a later stage—could well pave the way for even more frenzied and sinister groups (such as the Nazi National Front) in years to come.

A political fight against 'Thatcherism' must be launched now.

Socialists in the Labour Party should not accept for one moment Thatcher's claims to represent the interests of middle class people. Like all big business-backed politicians, she is really only a political exploiter and deceiver of the owner-occupiers, small businessmen and professional people whose interests she professes to have at heart. A Thatcherite government would do no more than Heath ever did to combat the giant monopolies who are the real enemies of the middle class. The only way to 'save' the desperate so-called 'middle classes' from bankruptcy is for the Labour government to stick to the pledges already made to extend nationalisation into the profitable sectors of private industry. With the power of the giant monopolies broken, and the bulk of the economy in the hands of the state, it would be possible to plan the economy in the interests of all. With all major industrial profits going to the com-



WINNER MARGARET THATCHER

munity, and with all banking and credit in state hands, we could extend to owner-occupiers and to small businessmen loans at rates of interest far below those which the present capitalist institutions can offer. Instead of facing small-businessmen with the choice between endless insecurity on the one hand, and bankruptcy on the other, we could give them a real choice. We could give them the choice between working as small businessmen with guaranteed

long term state assistance or working in similar employment in the public sector.

Maggie Thatcher's victory and the rising 'middle class revolt' should be a warning to all socialists in the trade unions and the Labour Party; we have little time to lose. The fact that the new Tory leader, just after her election, was able to address an enthusiastic mass meeting of small shopkeepers in Central Hall, Westminster, is in itself an indictment of this Labour government. Harold Wilson's policies of compromising with big business alienate not only the working class, but the middle class as well. A bold onslaught against the giant monopolies, harnessing the mighty strength of the organised working class, offers the only means of uniting workers and small businessmen in a common fight, and the only means of defeating Margaret Thatcher's 'new Toryism' and all it stands for.

by Graeme Atkinson

THE PAY settlement negotiated by the National Union of Mineworkers leadership has been the subject of vicious attacks from the Tory press and from some Labour leaders who regard it as 'outside' the much vaunted TUC 'Social Contract' guidelines. Yet the deal falls far short of what even the Gormley/Clarke led right wing in the NUM were demanding. They demanded £64 for coalface workers and got £61; £44 for surface workers and got £41. On the NUM Executive, sixteen votes were cast in favour and ten votes against, although since then the Lefts like Scargill in Yorkshire and McGahey in Scotland have recommended acceptance of the offer in the coming ballot.

### press campaign

The total increase in the NCBs wage bill will only amount to 23% as against the Tory press claim that the increases range from 28% to 35%. The intention of the Press campaign is to blame the next round of major price increases on the miners. Also, it is an attempt to cover up the fact that threshold payments of £4.40 are consolidated into the miners' basic rate and are part of the package. This last fact, of course, puts the deal in a new light. An increase of 23% cannot protect living standards when inflation is racing ahead at 25%. Only a clause in the agreement guaranteeing wages rise on a sliding scale based on a cost of living index drawn up by trade unionists and housewives committees can protect miners'

# MINERS DIG HOLE IN SOCIAL CONTRACT



Miners: walking off with a pay offer which, although in excess of the social contract, will mean a reduction in real wages.

wages in this period.

On the face of it, the deal is highly favourable to the employers. Why, then, all the fuss? After all, the deal doesn't even keep miners ahead of rising prices and a strike would have come too late to be successful, with coal stocks very high after a mild winter. The real source of the Labour government's paranoia is this: that, despite forcing the NUM to settle for less than what was demanded, the Social Con-Trick has been left in tatters. This is of immense significance to the power workers, teachers, seamen, railmen and engineers all of whom are in the pay queue. Correctly, these sections will take the miners' award

as their point of reference. Chapple, the appalling right winger who heads the EETPU, for example, is on record as saying the power workers will "want, no, insist on, exactly the same interpretation of the Social Contract". Weighall, the new General Secretary of the NUR has suggested that his members on the railways—many on £25 a week—will want parity with NUM surfacemen, that is £41 a week.

These claims jeopardise the Social Con-trick and, as far as Wilson, Foot and Co. are concerned, weaken Labour's credibility in the eyes of big business. The end result is that Labour leaders, Right and Left, from

Healey to Foot are all brandishing the whip of unemployment. Right wing Labour ministers have been heard muttering about the possibility of a statutory incomes policy. Instead of making the employing class pay for their crisis, Labour's leadership want to hold back wages and let prices rip. The end of subsidies for nationalised industries is proof of this.

The record of Social Contractors like Chapple, Weighall, Britton and even Hugh Scanlon casts doubt on their verbal insistence on pay rises equal to the miners. The danger is that they will rescue Wilson's rotten class collaborationist 'Social Contract', and avoid a real battle to defend living standards.

### rising scale

Workers with pay claims coming up should prepare now to fight against retreats by union leaders and organise to win their claims. This means linking up with other workers involved in the wages struggle and giving serious consideration to demands for a rising scale of wages based on trade union supervised cost of living index, tied to a zero norm. Only through this sort of policy, backed up by determined industrial action, can unity be built and living standards defended against the employers and their crisis.

## JOURNALISTS FIGHT REDUNDANCIES

# SACKINGS AT PENGUIN

AFTER A year in which Penguin Books surpassed all known sales records the management has seen fit to announce major redundancies. Forty workers were told just before Christmas that they would lose their jobs and that a further 14 jobs would remain unfilled. This came only eight months after the closure of Penguin Educational when 47 people were made redundant. And all this in a year when Penguin sold nearly 43 million books and looked likely to add even further to the profits of the massive Pearson-Longman combine to which they belong. Pearson-Longman's pre-tax profits in 1973 were £14,653,000.

At a mass meeting of the three unions involved NUJ, ASTMS and SOGAT a comprehensive motion was passed which:

- rejected the management's analysis of the company's financial problems and its proposed solution of redundancies;
- urged the management to answer fully the unions' questions about the company's financial position and work with the unions on solutions to its problems;
- requested the Dept of Trade and Industry to institute a full and thorough inquiry into the management of Penguin since it entered the Pearson Longman empire.

by an N.U.J. member.

Under pressure from all three unions and even with official advice from the Dept. of Trade ringing in their ears, Penguin refused to allow the books to be opened and still insisted that formal redundancy notices would be served on 31 January. In a move that was in fact resisted by union stalwarts, a mass meeting then voted to press for the matter to go to CAS. After nine hours of negotiation Penguin management finally agreed that a firm of accountants employed by the unions should investigate the company's financial position together with a firm that they themselves should employ. The full report will have important implications not just for Penguins, but everyone in book publishing.

For the Penguin situation, brings into focus the crisis that the whole print and publishing industry is facing. On the publishing side most redundancies get little publicity as few people are involved in each publishing house and few of those are both unionised and have negotiating power. Up until Christmas the NUJ was having a boom time in book publishing. In one year the membership of the Book Branch had risen from a few hundred to nearly 1½ thousand, largely be-

## E.A.V. Occupation to continue during talks.

N. London: On 6 February, Nicholas W. Poner, Executive vice-president of the American based Education Audio Visual, doled out redundancy notices to the six journalists employed in Britain. No warning was given or discussion allowed between the six employees, who produce educational film strips and records, and the company. This was in complete breach of the redundancy procedure agreed between the National Union of Journalists (to which the six belong) and EAV.

Later that same day the victimised journalists decided to occupy the premises in defence

cause of the pitifully low salaries paid in the field and the sudden realisation that unionisation would radically improve matters.

But if the fight is lost at Penguin, not only workers' livelihoods will go, but the employment conditions of all will suffer. Those made redundant will join a steadily growing pool of unemployed publishing staff which will weaken every union's bargaining power. We may find ourselves back in the situation not so long ago when one managing director countered the question of fair wages with the statement: "If I have a hundred applicants for one job why should I even think of paying more than £20 a week?"

of their jobs. After eight days the NUJ executive gave the occupation official backing. But, in accordance with NUJ conference policy, General Secretary, Ken Morgan, and the other national officers could have declared the sit-in official from the start.

The lateness of official backing has meant that blacking of EAV material by SOGAT members in the Leeds E.J. Arnold warehouse (EAV distributors) agreed by the workers, has been delayed. As we go to press the black should now be operating.

Despite management's threat to call in the police the journalists' determination to fight the closure has forced the company to turn somersault and agree to negotiate while the occupation continues.

In the negotiations the chapel (office branch) will be demanding the opening of EAV's books to workers inspection and guarantees of employment with no loss of pay. The six are agreed that EAV's hostility to union organisation stands behind the redundancies. Attempts have been made to contact the company's 66 American employees—at present unorganised—for support. NUJ dispute pay is only £10 so any donations or messages of support should continue to be sent c/o Hilary Horrocks, 30a Drayton Park, London, N.15.



Jenkins speaks on joint platform with racist Tory Powell

# 'BRITAIN ALONE'— A RECIPE FOR DISASTER

by Graham Bash

ON 1 FEBRUARY, Clive Jenkins General Secretary of the Association of Scientific Technical and Managerial Staffs, spoke out against the Common Market. And who was his co-speaker on the same platform? None other than Enoch Powell, Ulster Unionist, racist, and bitter enemy of the trade union movement.

The meeting at Folkestone Town Hall was organised by the "Get Britain Out" referendum campaign, the leading anti-Common Market organisation. Among its members are not only Enoch Powell, but also Tory MPs such as Richard Body, the owner of the Spectator, H.D.F. Creighton, and a former Liberal Christopher Frere-Smith, who is its chairman. Together in the same organisation as these notables, Clive Jenkins, Jack Jones of the TGWU and Richard (now Lord) Briginshaw of NATSOPA line up to peddle their dangerous nonsense about the 'maintenance of British independence'. And among unions which have contributed funds to this organisation—funds used to give a platform to Enoch Powell!—are the AUEW, TGWU, NATSOPA, ASLEF and ASTMS.

## Nothing new

But this is nothing new. Last year in Leeds, Jack Jones spoke on the same anti-EEC platform as Enoch Powell. Never mind that Powell stands for massive unemployment and cuts in social services. Never mind that Powell stands for stopping black immigration, and inciting racial hatred. Enoch Powell opposes the Common Market, so these trade union leaders rush to join him.

In the Labour Party, Tony Benn says that 'Britain's continuing entry would mean the end of Britain as a completely self-governing nation'. Peter Shore has spoken of "a new and dangerous weakening of our internal coherence and common purpose as a people".

This nationalist, chauvinist drivel, this crossing of class boundaries, this lining up with the worst reactionaries—is not only confusing and not only holds back the struggle against the Common Market. It is downright dangerous.

## Independence

The Labour Movement must oppose the EEC because it is a specific form of attack being waged on the working class in this country and throughout Europe. Because it attacks 'national

independence' and 'parliamentary sovereignty'. The only independence and sovereignty that the working class has is in the trade unions and Labour parties. That is the only independence we will defend.

The CHARTIST believes that when the Tribunes and Communist Party beat the patriotic drum, they are as dangerous to the working class as the open pro-marketeters within the Labour Party, such as Roy Jenkins and Shirley Williams. Indeed, they are more dangerous.

When the process of disintegration within the EEC, already begun, develops further, the capitalists in Britain will turn from the Common Market, towards militarist, nationalist, and possibly fascist solutions. They will use the ideology of 'national independence' and 'national purpose' as a weapon with which to attack the trade union movement. And they will draw their arguments from amongst those used by Clive Jenkins, Jones, Benn and Shore in today's situation.

## The only road

But there is another way forward for the working class. Our future is with Europe—not with their bankers, industrialists and landowners, but with the Labour Movements of Germany, France and Italy. Our allies in the anti-Market struggle can never be Enoch Powell, and the Tory Right. Our allies are the workers of Europe, in common struggle against the attacks of big business, and for the unity of Europe under working class power. The United Socialist States of Europe—that is the only way forward, the only practical alternative the working class has to demoralisation, despair and defeat.

- No to the Common Market!
- For European Workers' Unity!
- For the United Socialist States of Europe!



Portuguese workers—our real European allies.

# THE COMMON AND HOW TO

THESE ARTICLES ARE THE FIRST OF A SERIES ON THE COMMON MARKET LEADING UP TO THE MAIN ARTICLE HERE EXAMINES THE CLASS NATURE, ORIGINS AND HISTORY

## The myth

had seen the continent threatened with the expansion of anti-capitalist movements in the form of workers uprisings in Greece and Yugoslavia, mass support for left-wing governments in France, Italy and Britain, and finally the advance of the Red Army into the nations of Eastern Europe. Action was required by the US in order to stabilise the situation and ensure the survival of the capitalist system in Europe.

## STABILISATION

This stabilisation of the situation in Europe was achieved through the injection of massive amounts of dollars into the various war-blighted countries through what was known as the Marshall Aid Plan. Between 1948 and 1952, \$22,500 million of aid was pumped into Europe. It was on the basis of this life-raft that capitalism on the continent was again floated out to safety. Industries were reconstructed from scratch using the most modern production methods and advanced technologies. By the mid-fifties the momentum of industrial growth had led the western capitalist powers into inter-state collaboration in order to ensure that the upswing in economic growth was consolidated into a bedrock foundation for the continued expansion of investment and industry.

The earliest actions of collaboration were around the European Coal and Steel Community which came into being in 1952. This organisation was supported by the 'six' nations that later signed the Treaty of Rome. It is important to note that during this period, Britain shied away from any attempts towards unilateral action with other European nations. This was because British capitalists drew their main energies from collaboration with the USA and through trade with the remnants of the Empire and Commonwealth countries. The British financiers and industrialists continued to live in the past right up until the early sixties and hence missed the opportunity to play a leading role amongst the more viable and economically dynamic nations which were signatory to the Treaty of Rome in 1957.

When Britain eventually came to apply for membership of the Common Market it was with little enthusiasm. The early sixties had seen the transformation of the world economy from a plenty-for-all paradise for the western

SINCE THE first of January 1973, Britain has been a part of the 'European Economic Community'—the Common Market. At the time of entry, British membership of the EEC was opposed by the majority of the trade union movement, successive Labour Party Annual Conferences and a clearly majority of the parliamentary party. The grounds upon which this opposition was based were extremely dubious; concerning themselves with the defence of Britain's alleged 'democratic traditions' and 'national sovereignty'.

Two years of membership of the EEC have passed and an urgent re-assessment of the situation is taking place within the ranks of the labour movement. The referendum on the membership of the Common Market has become a focal point of political thinking for socialist activists in the ranks of the working class. No one is going to take the decision to vote to get out of the EEC lightly, particularly when our standard of living, the right to work and decent welfare facilities might well depend on the outcome of the referendum. Working class people will be demanding the very best reasons for voting to get out of the Common Market at this election—and quite frankly, they haven't been getting them from Tony Benn, Michael Foot, and Peter Shore.

## TREATY OF ROME

The European Economic Community was established in 1957 with the signing of the Treaty of Rome by the original six nations, Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg. It was founded in a mood of optimism on behalf of the participating countries. The governments of the Six had seen Europe emerge from the devastation of the Second Imperialist World War and into a new era of what seemed to be prosperity for the economies of the 'old' world. The agent of this recovery was the United States Government, which in 1945

# MARKET FIGHT IT

TO THE REFERENDUM ON BRITAIN'S ENTRY.  
RY OF THE COMMON MARKET.



Callaghan leading the fraudulent renegotiations on Common Market membership.

## of EEC 'unity'

by Don Flynn

capitalist nations to one in which competition began to tighten up and slackness and inefficiency in company organisation was revealed as a real handicap. On this score, British industry was revealing a disadvantage against its EEC rivals. The firms which operated on an international basis more and more felt the need for rationalisation and capital restructuring on a European wide scale.

Over the last twenty years there has been a process of European interpenetration of capital which has produced vast multi-national monopoly companies. Dunlop-Pirelli and Agfa-Gevaert are two examples of these.

### EURO-MARKETS

The EEC has been central to this process whereby unlimited circulation of commodities and capital is permitted within the border of the countries of the Nine. British industry has come to link into its euro-markets like a jigsaw puzzle piece and the threat of British withdrawal from the Common Market would pose the gravest dangers for British as well as European capitalists. In April of last year, the council of the Confederation of British Industry issued a statement to the Labour Government to the effect that withdrawal "...would be especially damaging to British companies which have already established operations within the European Community." Later on, the CBI Director-General, Mr. Campbell Adamson elaborated on this point by saying that many important investment and marketing decisions taken by British Industry over the previous year had been jeopardised by withdrawal.

In summary, the EEC was created in response to the need of European capitalist industry to consolidate its operations, primarily through a process of centralising the different aspects of management and decision-making. Also, the Common Market reflects the drive towards the integration of the various processes of production—an example of which might be an attempt to build car factories next to steel plants and siting both in the region of their sales markets. Through the 'fifties and the 'sixties, centralisation and integration

took place with varying degrees of success until the present day. We can now say that the future prosperity of capitalist industry in Europe depends on its being able to continue to rationalise its operations in this way, by creating fewer but far larger multi-national monopolies which would be able to compete with their North American and Japanese counterparts.

Why then do socialists oppose the Common Market and why is the CHARTIST calling for a massive vote to withdraw from the EEC in the referendum? After all, some might ask, we are deeply opposed to notions of nationalism and say that only the working class acting on a world basis can ensure the victory of socialism over oppression and exploitation. Might not a united Europe, even on a capitalist basis provide the opportunity for solidarity and militant action by workers across Europe?

The CHARTIST intends to be very clear on this question. We say if it were possible for the capitalists of Europe to transcend the limitations of the nation State and raise the productive forces by integrating and planning the economies of the whole continent of Europe then we would have to support their efforts. The reason why we oppose the Common Market is because European unity on a capitalist basis is impossible.

Internationalism on the part of the capitalist class is never more than a thin veneer designed to disguise the desire of the imperialist 'motherland' to exploit the rest of the world.

The Common Market, in its

early stages, was created by peaceful means. Concord and understanding between the European nations was possible because the post-war boom provided sufficient for all. But now that recession—growing unemployment, industrial stagnation, together with unbelievably high rates of inflation are ripping through the nine countries, European unity is being exposed for what it always has been; a unity of thieves, squabbling over the share of the spoils.

### UNITY OF THIEVES

In the past years, this 'unity' has been threatened with collapse by the shattering of credit arrangements, the so-called 'snake', France's independent line towards the oil-producing countries, and Italy's reintroduction of import restrictions against the rest of Europe. The debates over the Regional Development Fund, the Common Agricultural Policy and the potential oil-producing capacities of the member countries, rock the EEC at every stage. To spread the illusion that the ruling classes of Europe are capable of reconstructing the continent and reorganising the means of production in a way that might ultimately benefit the working class of Europe would in reality disarm the international labour movement by deceiving it about the real nature of its own capitalist class.

We are campaigning for a 'no' vote in the referendum because the EEC—as an organisation dedicated to the preservation of capitalism at the expense of the working class—is helping only to tear Europe apart. It stands four-

square opposed to those developments on the continent which really hold out the prospect for a United States of Europe.

The beginnings of the European revolution is demonstrated by the resurgence of workers' struggles throughout Europe. The action of the Portuguese and Greek working class in overthrowing two brutal dictatorships is evidence of this.

Struggles reach new peaks in Spain and Italy, where mass strikes and occupations against acts of repression and attacks on workers' living standards, hold out the prospect of socialist revolution. In France and in Britain, a new wave of militancy has swept through the towns and cities these last 8 years. Germany also has not been immune from the wave of mass strike movements. And finally, workers in the Stalinist countries of Eastern Europe will prove quick to respond to decisive action by workers in the west, by throwing off their own bureaucratic overlords and sharing the experience of socialised property relations with their brothers and sisters in Western Europe.

### INTERNATIONALISM

In the coming months, the CHARTIST will campaign upon a programme calling for a 'no' vote in the referendum and at the same time, linking this to specific demands which will develop the will of British workers towards internationalism and the fight of all workers in Europe in defence of their jobs and living standards. We will be demanding that the Labour government:

1. Withdraw from the Common Market immediately regardless of any 'new terms'.
2. Break from the European monopolies and British-based multi-nationals and convene an all European conference of labour and trade union organisations to a) co-ordinate joint defence against the attacks on jobs and living standards by the European monopolies and b) prepare and implement a strategy for uniting Europe under the class rule of the working class.
3. Establish a Socialist Britain as a base from which to struggle for a Socialist United States of Europe, embracing both East and West of the Continent.

## An abuse of Labour Movement democracy

"When the outcome of renegotiation is known, the Government will decide upon their own recommendation to the country, whether for continued membership of the Community on the basis of the renegotiated terms, or for withdrawal.....

The Cabinet has therefore decided that if, when the time comes, there are members of the Government (including members of the Cabinet) who do not feel able to accept and support the Government's recommendation, whatever it may be, they will, once a referendum has been announced, be free to support and speak in favour of a different conclusion in the referendum campaign." (Harold Wilson: 2 Jan.)

With these words, Harold Wilson made a mockery of Labour

Movement democracy, and a farce of the special Labour Party Conference that will be held before the referendum. What it means is that the Labour Government will decide its line irrespective of what Conference says, and almost certainly against its wishes. For it is obvious that the Government under Wilson and Callaghan will recommend a 'Yes' vote, whilst there is every possibility that a special Conference will say 'No'.

And all this was with the approval of the Labour Party's NEC who agreed a proposal that any decision reached by the Conference should not be binding on party members, who should be free to campaign as they wish.

General Secretary of the Labour Party, Ron Hayward, even

went so far as to hint that the Conference might be left to air its views rather than pass any formal resolutions.

No wonder Tribune MP for Tottenham, Norman Atkinson, was moved to challenge this. 'The supreme policy making body within the Labour Movement is its annual conference of its rank and file members,' he lamented. 'There will be great disappointment throughout the country that the Prime Minister has resorted to the idea of having a free vote ...in order to pre-empt the necessity of an annual conference decision which would be binding on all members.'

Harold Wilson said "The Party Conference will be listened to, of course, as it always is."

That's what we're all worried about!

# MASS UNEMPLOYMENT HITS U.S. WORKERS

by Martin Cook



JOBLESS MEN & WOMEN SEEKING WORK & RELIEF CHECKS IN CROWDED CHICAGO UNEMPLOYMENT OFFICE

CHICAGO SUN-TIMES

FOR A QUARTER of a century the wealth and power of American imperialism was one of the main pillars of world capitalist stability in the near-unparalleled growth of the 'Boom' period. The U.S. economy was so strong that the mighty dollar could be accepted without question as the medium for trade and the international monetary system. Now, at last, the developing crisis has finally hit home in that citadel itself—with a vengeance.

In the worst recession since the Great Slump, unemployment has shot up to 8.2% or 7½ millions. The highest for 41 years! Over a million extra joined the dole queues in January alone. The jobless rate is nearly double for blacks, and pushing 40% for black youth. Many of the newly laid-off are from the car factories—the lynchpin of American industry. Chrysler, worst hit of all, has shut 5 out of its 6 plants and sent 60,000 through the gates. The other big companies are hardly doing much better. Car sales fell by 38% in 1974, from an already depressed level. Construction and retailing (900,000 with no work) are also badly hit.

## Wage controls

Not only this. Inflation is at 13% per annum, and rising, making the recession worse. Thanks to Nixon's wage controls, real incomes of manual workers have been savagely cut over the last few years. President Gerald Ford may be more 'honest' than his predecessor (if only through sheer stupidity), but he is still a disaster for the capitalist class. Shilly-shallying between fear of unemployment and of recession,

he finally came out with a feeble package of 12% income tax cuts, business tax credits, and a hefty levy on oil imports. Economic experts are agreed that these measures will be useless. Disenchanted backwoods Republicans now think Ford and his billionaire running mate Nelson Rockefeller (neither elected by anyone to their offices) are getting too soft and left wing(!) These political cave-men want a return to all-out free enterprise and anti-communism under that tenth-rate ex 'B' feature movie actor, Ronald Reagan.

With the 'Colossus' of the 'Free World' starting to fall apart at the seams, you might think that America's mighty trade unions would be launching at least some kind of action. Not a bit of it! Under George Meany's right wing leadership the AFL-CIO's (U.S. TUC) main demand is for bigger tariffs on imports to protect jobs (many of these imports are produced by US firms to gain advantage of lower wages). Leonard Woodcock's more 'radical' United Auto Workers rallied 10,000 car men in Washington: only to hold hands with Democrats like Teddy Kennedy and make feeble demands for an 'excess profits tax'. Woodcock

opposes cuts in car prices.

But American workers are not taking the attacks lying down. Militant local protests in Chicago and Detroit are being waged by laid off workers. A limited 8% escalator clause has been won by the miners after their 3-day week strike—pointing towards full and unlimited cost-of-living compensation. And the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers union's demand for 'Opening the Books', if only of the unpopular oil companies—marks a step forward. The trouble is, the union leaders have no stomach for a real fight to defend

workers' interests. This would need a wholesale mobilisation of the unions industrial might, with a break from the so-called "Friends of Labour" in the Democratic Party and the creation of a mass Labour Party.

## Lawsuits

Instead, the union's failure to oppose ALL layoffs and fight for work-sharing with no loss of pay leads to lawsuits against the union's 'Seniority system' (last in, first out). These are filed by black and womens' groups as a dead end protest, they being always the first to be laid off due to racist and sexist hiring policies. Worse still, the unions are putting their weight behind the vicious campaign against 'illegal aliens' (largely Mexicans). Last year 800,000 workers were deported, the target for 1975 is a MILLION deportees! Many of these are picked up in brutal mass raids on Chicano (Spanish speaking) ghettos such as East Los Angeles, often including legal residents. Such workers are of course brought in for cheap and scab labour, especially on the farms. Nonetheless it is essential for the unions to fight for full rights for migratory workers and jobs for all—the responsibility for the crisis is not theirs!



AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY

## N. IRELAND... & BRITAIN

THE PREVENTION of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act 1974 was rushed through Parliament—in a mere 24 hours—by the Labour government after the 'Birmingham Bombs' in an atmosphere of hysteria and anti-Irish feeling, whipped up by the Tory press. There was not one MP who voted against this pernicious piece of anti-working class legislation which threatens a whole number of basic civil liberties and gives extensive new powers to the police.

Within the working class the implications of this new legislation are completely underestimated. This is largely due to the virtual silence of our trade union and Labour leaders. That the Act was only introduced to outlaw the Provisional IRA is a dangerous myth. The warning bell was sounded when Roy Jenkins said "I have no immediate intention of adding further organisations to the list but I shall certainly add other organisations of whatever complexion if necessary."

The new pamphlet published by the NCCL on the Act—"The State, the Law and Ireland"—gives a clear and informative description of its class nature. The pamphlet shows that some of the main

parts of the Act are open to countless different interpretations and are based on very vague concepts.

The Act makes it a crime to:

- belong to a proscribed organisation
- raise or receive money or goods on behalf of a proscribed organisation
- encourage any other form of support for a proscribed organisation
- organise a public or private meeting of 3 or more people in support of a proscribed organisation or to be addressed by a member of a proscribed organisation.

A literal interpretation of the vagaries of these provisions could now mean that it is illegal to support movements demanding 'Troops Out Now'. Illegal also to raise money or books for internees, to buy or sell republican literature, or for any left wing journal or organisation to support the anti-imperialist struggle of the Irish people for self-determination.

All the powers of the Act are

# THROW OUT THIS ACT!

by John Quirke

exclusively in the hands of the Home Secretary. This includes the power to exclude or deport from Britain any person who he considers to be "concerned in the commission, preparation or instigation of acts of terrorism". Power of exclusion or deportation is particularly repressive because it is carried out without any charge brought or proven.

Already legislation which was passed on the pretext of being anti-IRA is being used on a far wider scale by the police to harrass other Republicans, socialists and trade union militants. The case of Joe Gallagher, a builder's shop steward from Milton Keynes—now released—is one of many examples. Numerous members of Clann na hEireann have been deported, including Gerry Doherty, ex-national organizer, and Jim Flynn (even though they have consistently opposed the methods of struggle of the Provisionals.) The wives and children of these men—many

of whom have been living in Britain for almost twenty years—have been left virtually destitute. The men have been deported without charge or trial.

Repressive legislation of this type is nothing new in the Six Counties. There it has been in operation since 1922; first with Special Powers legislation and now with the Northern Ireland Emergency Provision Act 1973. The Special Powers Acts, introduced as "temporary measures", have become lasting "police state" laws and strengthened over the years.

Even under the Act people who have been deported to Northern Ireland for suspected "terrorist activities" must go through the stated "detention procedure." But this is not happening as the cases of Noel McComb, James Glynn and others illustrates.

The irony of the Act is that it implicitly recognises the "Six Counties" as NOT being part of Great Britain.

This legislation is being brutally enforced in the Six counties by

REVIEW: 'LONDON LABOUR IN CRISIS'

A CHARTIST PAMPHLET



by  
Paul Moore

# Stop G.L.C. Rates & Services Onslaught!



GLC leader Reg Goodwin...A smile for the election manifesto.

"THE level of fares in London is excessive...The fares policy followed by the Tory GLC has only served to further drive passengers from public to private transport, a fact borne out by the figures. Between 1963 and 1971 the numbers of passenger journeys on LT buses dropped by 688 million (31%) and on the underground by 19 million (3%). (figs. from Greater London Statistics-Annual Abstract 1970)".

"Labour, unlike the Tories, wants to encourage the use of public transport. As a first step Labour will postpone any further increase in fares..." ('A Socialist Strategy for Labour-GLC manifesto 1973).

This election pledge is just one of many completely betrayed by London's public Labour leadership—local borough and GLC councillors.

### Iron vice

Under the Labour government's new policy—clamping an iron vice onto local council expenditure—promises matter no longer.

The tremendous economic crisis of capitalism will not mean for London's Labour leadership the end of that system. For the right wing of the Labour Party are moving nationally and locally to ensure that working class living standards will be cut to pay the

bills to the finance houses and the international bankers.

How this is happening, and how these cuts can be fought is the subject of the new pamphlet from the Socialist Charter. The extent of the betrayals, stretching through every part of every London borough, is ruthlessly exposed, and a fighting alternative policy outlined.

The pamphlet documents the cuts, from housing and schools to increases in rates and fares.

On housing:

"London councils, although building houses, are not doing nearly enough. Houses bought from private owners are left empty. Re-development takes far too long and only under great pressure have councils used their short-life property, or handed it over to squatting groups to manage. To cover up their lack of a housing policy Council leaders, like Reg Goodwin of the GLC, attempt to split tenants against squatters by blaming squatters for the crisis!"

### Pledges broken

On fares:

"Labour is pledged by the GLC manifesto and Regional Conference decisions to move towards a free fare system, with consultation on the way. These pledges have been cynically broken, and 'consultation' made into a farce. In December '74, the GLC un-

veiled its consultation document. "Fair deal—your choice". Few people have seen it but those Labour voters who have, are unlikely to feel inspired. For the choice offered is not a choice at all: either pay on the rates bill, or pay when you travel—but both ways you've got to pay. Yet again working class families have to foot the bill for the crisis."

### Refused grant

On Education:

"The Inner London Education Authority will only be spending about 1/4 of what it needs on minor school works this year because Education Secretary, Reg Prentice, has refused the necessary grant. The grant of £1,200,000 in 1971 was cut by the Tory government to £500,000. Prentice kindly raised it to £695,000, which means for example that a school playground will not be laid out even when land is waiting there for it!"

The pamphlet goes on to explain the only way the cuts could be fought.

We say that there is another course for Labour councils and the GLC. It involves a fight on two levels. The first is to take a stand against any form of rate or rent increases. Not to cut back services but on the contrary expand them. Predictably, the reply from the right wing will be

"but where will we get our finance from?" The answer to this must be hard and clear. Cancel all interest payments to the banks and money lenders.

But the fight is not merely a local one. The real key lies in the fight to destroy the power over our lives of the banks and insurance companies. The second aspect for Labour and GLC councillors is to take up the fight within the broader labour movement to commit the Labour government to a policy of nationalisation without compensation of the land, banks finance houses and the building industry—with control passing to the working class.

Now is the time to organise around these policies. Every surrender must be fought. Labour councils were elected to fight for the working class not to administer cuts in the interests of big business. On this programme, CHARTISTS are determined that a new leadership must be built in the Labour movement.

"London Labour in Crisis" 10p, or 15p by post from Brixton Books 82 Loughborough Road, S.W.9.



## Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act 1974

CHAPTER 56

### ARRANGEMENT OF SECTIONS

PART I

#### PROSCRIBED ORGANISATIONS

the whole repressive apparatus of the state—the army, Ulster Defence Regiment (UDR) Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC), torture and internment, to crush the struggle for Irish self-determination.

As the Chartist has always stressed: in the introduction of such laws in Britain is laying the basis here for what is going on in Ireland now. Any worker in Britain waging struggle in defence of jobs and living standards can now be subject to summary arrest, without charges, in the name of preventing 'civil unrest'.

These attacks on the Irish people and on our basic democratic rights are taking place under a Labour government. This is not only with the use of the Prevention of Terrorism Act, but with the Tories' racist Immigration

Act. When Roy Jenkins tried unsuccessfully to deport trade union activist Franco Caprino, Jenkins deemed his deportation to be 'conducive to the public good' and in the 'national interest'. All because he was active in organising immigrant workers into trade unions. This threat now hangs over the head of any other immigrant worker who is an active trade unionist.

Roy Jenkins (and the entire Labour government) is also responsible for the incarceration of the two class war prisoners of the 1972 building workers strike—Warren and Tomlinson. In their case it was the catch-all powers of the Conspiracy Laws.

In particular, responsibility for the heightening of these attacks on the democratic rights of Irish people and British workers lies with the bulk of our left Labour and Tribune MPs—Benn, Foot, Heffer, Orme and company. Whilst paying lip-service to the struggles of workers in defence of democratic rights these MPs are complicit in the repression of the Irish people, the undermining of democratic rights and the weakening of the fight for the unity of British and Irish workers. We must bombard these MPs through our Constituency Labour Parties and trade unions with demands that they throw out the repressive 'anti-terrorist' Act now.

## Teachers victimised over TUC 'Shrewsbury' lobby

by Mike Davis (N.U.T.)

FIVE HACKNEY teachers are facing disciplinary action by their school governors. Their crime? Taking part in the TUC lobby of Parliament on 14 January to call for the release of the Shrewsbury Two.

The charges brought by the Labour controlled Inner London Education Authority are clearly designed to victimise the five trade unionists who were active during the London Allowance and Houghton pay fights and stamp out further militant action against growing education cuts.

In collaboration with ILEA and despite the action being official the National Union of Teachers Executive voted 5 votes to 35 against supporting the victimised teachers.

Max Morris, past president of the NUT and the two other Communist Party members on the Executive all failed to vote in support of the five. Moreover, the Executive even went so far as writing a letter to ILEA stating that the action was unofficial. Many teachers are asking how this can be reconciled with the letter the Executive circularised to NUT branches publicising the lobby and giving details of how to get there!

The NUT is affiliated to the TUC, Fred Jarvis, General Secretary elect sits on the Gen-

eral Council. As Mike Knowles, one of the five and secretary of Hackney Trades Council pointed out: "Only last year at the NUT annual conference the Executive moved a rule change to the effect that closer cooperation with the TUC was to be among the objectives of the union".

The five teachers all from South Hackney Comprehensive have the support of 95% of their school. Hackney Teachers Association has set up a Defence Committee to raise finance and support.

This attack is only one in a whole series of victimisations. A teacher from Stockport, delegated by the Trades Council to attend the TUC lobby has been sent a warning letter. Two teachers from Westminster have been victimised for taking action against the disgusting Houghton Report on teachers pay. And a Gay teacher has also been prevented from teaching by the ILEA.

The NUT Executive must immediately reverse its policy of not supporting victimised teachers. Local teachers associations should send motions to ILEA demanding all charges are dropped against the five Hackney teachers and prepare to take strike action if they are not reinstated.

# young socialist NEWS

MASS LAY-OFFS, SHREWSBURY 2,  
PRICES, SOCIAL CONTRACT, IRELAND...

## WHAT IS THE Y.S. ANSWER?

THIS YEAR'S Labour Party Young Socialists Conference at Easter (Blackpool) will meet at a time when the economic crisis of capitalism is rapidly effecting every working class family and especially youth. No miners' strike is necessary this year to "create" a 3 and 4 day week for many workers. The prospect of the dole queue faces many school leavers and working class youth.

Last year's YS Conference greeted a newly elected Labour Government. The then National Committee recommended their particular version of a socialist programme to be put to the Labour Government, despite criticism that this was totally inadequate.

This Easter we will look back on the actions of the Labour Government so far. In no way have they implemented the socialist programme of the YS. In fact in very few ways have they carried out any policies that are in the interest of the working class.

The YS must decide what is to be done to people like Jenkins who have flouted Labour Party TUC and UCATT national conference decisions for the release of the Shrewsbury 2 building

workers. Healey's budgets have been financial attacks on the working class. Benn's industry Bill totally fails to meet car workers demands for nationalisation and protects the capitalists' business secrets. In fact trade unionists are threatened with jail for seeing the 'books', in certain circumstances. Rees has continued the Tory's policies in Ireland, refusing to withdraw the troops. Wilson has, of course, co-ordinated and blessed the actions of the whole of his team.

In this economic situation, with these leaders in the Labour Party (and likewise in the trade unions), how is the YS to go forward? These are the vital questions that will be discussed this Easter -- questions that effect all youth.

### BOOK NOW!

BOOK YOUR SEAT ON THE COACH (£4. return). ALSO DISCOS, SOCIAL EVENTS, FOOTBALL, FILMS ETC. Conference: Friday 28 March to Monday 31 March. Rally 1 to 4 April. FOR MORE DETAILS WRITE TO: Kevin Moore, c/o 82 Loughborough Road, London, SW.9.



PAUL ROSE MP

## MANCHESTER ANTI-FASCISTS IN CONFERENCE

ON 16 February, 150 delegates of various organizations met in Manchester to set up a broad anti-fascist organization to be called "Democratic Defence". Sponsored by Paul Rose, Labour MP for Manchester Blackley, the Conference arose out of attacks launched by National Front fascists during the last General Election. Although the overwhelming majority of conference delegates were from the Trade Union and Labour movement, there were also representatives from Liberal and Church organizations. The consensus of the floor was against any free speech or platform for fascists. Only the Liberals opposed this and urged reasoned argument with the fascists.

A steering committee of 30 was elected from the floor to prepare campaigns against the National Front and to organize a national conference later this year.

Despite the 'Popular Front' nature of the campaign, largely the result of Paul Rose who wants 'unity' at any cost, Chartists will participate and fight along with other comrades of the Manchester Anti-fascist Committee to orientate it towards the trades unions and Labour Party on a clear "no platform" position, because it is these forces, the mass organizations of the workers' movement which alone can stem the rise of fascism, defeat racialism and crush the National Front, with whom no debate is desirable or possible.

## Calderdale Council ban National Front

By BERNARD HARRISON

AT A MEETING on February 17 the Recreation and Amenities Committee of the Labour controlled Calderdale Council refused permission for the National Front to use Todmorden Town Hall for a public meeting. The application was made by the Oldham branch, but there is known to be a cell of NF supporters in Todmorden already. They have amongst their number a foreman at a local weaving mill which employs Asians and where there have recently been redundancies. The implications would appear to be obvious!

Sowerby Constituency Labour Party (includes Todmorden), at their A.G.M. on February 22, passed an emergency resolution which congratulated Labour members of the R A Committee and also called upon the E.C. to do all in its power to oppose fascist type organisations whenever and wherever they attempt to spread their poisonous doctrines. The Left is now strong on the Executive of the Sowerby CLP and determined to see action taken.

The victory has not been total, unfortunately, as one councillor at the A.G.M. disclosed that the decision had been taken mainly to safeguard council property.

However, it does seem that the overwhelming support for the resolution and the strong speeches made in favour of it have shown the councillors that there are more principled and practical reasons for banning the fascists!

In Halifax, another part of Calderdale, the Front have recently set up a branch. In a letter to the local paper their chairman brashly proclaimed the growing strength of their movement nationally and boasted a membership of 19 at his own newly formed branch. On February 21, he was reported in the "Evening Courier" (a paper which seems eager to give them space) as saying that the NF were putting up a candidate for the May elections at Miscenden, which is a massive council estate. He predicted that they would take enough traditionally Labour support to win.

This is an indication of the growth of the Front's confidence in their ability to take their racial and class poison into the working class districts of our area. It provides a stern warning to all Socialists and Trades Unionists in Calderdale (and in other areas which have been relatively free from fascist filth in the past.)

They must see the need to organize and mobilise in order to smash this menace before it gathers strength.

Subscribe to the Chartist  
£1 per year ( 5 dollars USA )  
Payable to Chartist Publications  
82, Loughborough Rd., London SW9

## YORKSHIRE REGIONAL Y.S. BUCKTON WARNS OF N.F. THREAT

THE ANNUAL conference of Yorkshire LPYS was attended by over 80 people on 1 February. The conference was told that Bert Twigg, regional youth officer, had prevented several delegates from attending, including the NC member, Allan Brack.

Two lively debates were held in the two sessions. A motion calling for an anti-racist campaign was carried unanimously. However, an amendment, moved by Chartist delegates, calling for participation of the LPYS in all anti-fascist campaigns and for denials of free speech to fascists was defeated. This despite a warning by Ray Buckton, general secretary of ASLEF, who told the conference that he knew of 'several' union branches who had National Front members as officials.

In the afternoon session, a Chartist motion calling for a YS campaign for soldiers trade union rights was defeated. A disgraceful amendment calling for 'volunteer reserves' to replace the standing armed forces, was heavily carried.

## LEEDS CONFERENCE DEMANDS ACTION AGAINST RACIALISM

A Conference against racialism held on 16 February has decided to set up an action committee to participate in struggles involving racialism and fascist activity in the Leeds area. The conference, called by the local ward Labour party in Burley, was attended by 50 people including trade unionists local community associations, Communist party members and other left groups.

The conference addressed by a representative of Leeds Islamic Centre, agreed that if the new committee was not to fail as other such committees in Leeds have, then questions such as struggles

This now means that Yorkshire Regional YS has a policy defending special constables and the Territorial Auxiliary Volunteer Reserves (TAVR) - forces which are being prepared by the capitalist state in readiness for strike breaking actions against the Labour Movement. Voluntary or conscripted, the capitalist army is an instrument of the capitalist class. It must be broken from within and from without. It can only be replaced by a worker militia under the control of the trade unions.



National Front members with nationalist trappings

over social service cuts must be taken up—in particular, the fight against the Labour government's decision to cease construction work on Leeds General Infirmary. It was also stressed that the fight against the nationalist propaganda of the National Front on the question of the EEC, on a class basis, was increasingly urgent in view of Labour leaders appearing on platforms with racist Tories such as Enoch Powell.

The conference was interrupted by four National Front members, who, when forced to leave produced an axe and bottles. Although the NF members were easily dispersed the need to protect future meetings was stressed. For further details of the new committee contact, Graham Durham, 155 Cardigan Road, Leeds 6.