

Contents include;

the Common Market
soldiers fight on!

which way for the
socialist charter?

sack the Queen

London co-op



BULLETIN
OF THE YOUNG CHARTISTS

THE CHARTIST

VOLUME 1

5p

NUMBER 7

Common Market

NO

FOR THE SOCIALIST UNITED
STATES OF EUROPE

YOUNG CHARTISTS BRANCHES

CROYDON:- J.WHELAN, 18/13 Beulah Hill, London S.E.19
GREENWICH:- P.ELLIOTT, 82, Woodhill, London S.E.18.
HARROW:- F.HANSEN, 67, Dabbs Hill Lane, Northolt, Middx.
HILLINGDON:- W.THOMPSON, 219, Botwell Lane, Hayes, Middx.
WALTHAM FOREST:- G.BASH, 716, Leabridge Road, London E.10
CANTERBURY:-- M.COOK, Darwin College, University, Canterbury
LEEDS:- C.PULLINGER, 3, Claremont View, Leeds 3.
TONBRIDGE:--c/o K.KNIGHT, 29, Birling Drive, Tunbridge Wells.
WREKIN:- J.PICKERING, 1, Charles Street, Trench, Telford, Salop.

EDITOR

K.R.VENESS, 34 Doncaster Gardens, Northolt, Middx.

CHARTIST PUBLICATIONS

Back issues of the "Chartist" 8p.
"Which way for Labour London" 9p.
"The Soldiers Charter" 13p.
"Briefing" - LPYS bulletins. 8p. the set.
A Selection of theoretical literature etc.

All money or enquiries to : Business Manager, 18/13 Beulah Hill,
Upper Norwood, London S.E. 19.

CHARTIST FIGHTING FUND

Previous total	--	£ 28-75p
Young Chartist N.C.	--	£ 5-25p
Ilford L.P. reader.	--	£ 5-00p
Coop donations.	---	£ 0-50p
London aggregate.	---	£ 2-60p
Miscellaneous money.	--	£ 3-90p
		<hr/>
		£ 46-00p

TOTAL TO OUR TARGET-- £154-00p.

EDITORIAL

Greetings comrades,

Since our last issue there has been a delay of some seven weeks--due mainly to the fact that the Editorial Board used its resources to produce the excellent pamphlet on the local elections called "Which way for Labour London". This has been really justified by our large sales of this pamphlet. As a result of this success, the CHARTIST for Labour Party Conference will be our first printed one in the new format. We are appealing for bigger sales and more donations to aid us in this--up to now all our ventures have been successful because you, our readers, have rallied round. We're confident you'll back us up in this new venture.

The major article in this issue is on the subject of the EEC and its effects on our movement. We in the Chartist movement feel this is right now the acid test for our movement. On this issue will founder many reputations, not least in the parliamentary Labour Party! To anyone who has been active in their CLP, union branch or Coop, the change is obvious. Many of the rank-and-file who previously supported or were indifferent to the Common Market are firmly resolved to fight Heath's government tooth--and-nail. Only a tiny handful of "pseudo-intellectuals" are left to defend the sell-out of the Tory government. Lets make the issue clear by a simple equation; Against the EEC=For getting rid of the Tories

For the EEC=For bolstering up this lousy government. Nor do we place ourselves in the ranks of the "third-campists". We at least will not sit on the sidelines and call for a plague on both sides. We are after winning the anti-EEC to a perspective of a united socialist Europe and this can only be done by being the hardest opponent of entry. Equally we have no time for those so-called "socialists" who share platforms with Tories, monarchists, liberals and even quasi-fascists in denouncing the Common-market. This only confuses the issue. If sections of the petty-bourgeoisie are frightened by the threats to their cosy little niches, it is our job to rally them to the banner of the Labour movement--not to sow illusions in lumpen demagogues who claim to represent them. If our leaders can be forced to oppose the government with all resources and we the movement are alert enough to stop any back-sliding, then we have fashioned right now the instrument for sweeping away the Tory government and their fifth-columnists inside our own party. Our battle-cry is clear "NO TO THE EEC--FOR A UNITED SOCIALIST EUROPE--THROW OUT THE TORIES-- PREPARE FOR THE GENERAL STRIKE!!!!!!

/cont.....

The disaster at UCS again throws into perspective the utter bankruptcy of the economic system we live under. At one time the ship-building industry was the very backbone of British capitalism but now even massive handouts of the taxpayers money can save a yard-system on the Clyde. This is the same Clyde which gave birth to the whole ship-building industry, but also it is the same river which won itself the nickname of the "Red Clyde" because of its militancy during the last century, the first World War and in the 1930's. Now again there is a situation where the workers of Lanarkshire will be in the very vanguard of the struggles in Britain. The call has already gone out for a Scottish general strike. Now the workers are actively considering an indefinite occupation of the yards. If this actually comes about, we in the Chartist will be first to support and work for this. However we would like to issue a few words of warning to the ship-men. Don't be caught like your brothers were at the GEC on Merseyside. Prepare your ground well. Gain support off of all the Scottish unions and indeed off of all the Labour movement nationally before you act. Make sure that all the members and their families know what is going on. Raise the demands for nationalization and the removal of the Tories as part of your campaign. Build up your stocks of money and support and hit Heath where it hurts hardest- in the pocket. If you do this then you can rally the whole movement to you and you will have the honour of being the first blokes to start the scuttling of Heath--yacht and all.

Internationally, the situation has seen the exposure of the predatory policies of US imperialism inside its very Heartland with the publication of the "Ellsberg Letters". When even such papers as the 'NEW YORK TIMES' and the 'WASHINGTON POST' expose their own governments treachery, it is a symptom of just how bad the crisis that the Vietnamese revolution can inflict on the mightiest super-power in the world. If a small peasant nation can do that, think what will happen when a determined battle is waged to seize power by an advanced labour movement. When future historians write they will acknowledge the awful debt that we owe Vietnamese brothers-in-arms. The time is now arriving when we can repay that debt in full.

Time to close now but remember, any comments or suggestions or even, dare I say, articles we would be only too pleased to receive. Go to it comrades!!!

URGENT _____ ALL LCS, RACS & SOUTH SUBURBAN COOPERATORS. CONTACT THE EDITOR WHERE YOU WILL LEARN SOMETHING MUCH TO YOUR ADVANTAGE.

BRITAIN'S E.E.C. APPLICATION IN PERSPECTIVE.

We remind those who think "marxism is out of date" that the basic mechanisms now driving our rulers towards Europe were outlined by Marx and Engels as long ago as 1848. Heath's Market campaign and the EEC itself are living proof that Europe's industrial forces have out-grown the restrictive limits not only of private property but also of national boundaries themselves. Of course any lasting European unity on a capitalist basis is a pipe-dream. Inevitably--at the first sign of a world economic downswing--the "European Community" will break up into its national component parts. As soon times get hard, each national ruling class will start setting up tariff barriers once more against its rivals. But in seeking to overcome the obstacle of the nation-state, the giant monopolies are today more and more exposing their own impotence and revealing to the world the task which we--the organized labour movement in this country and abroad--will have to solve. If the industrial resources of Europe East and West are to be integrated and planned, then it is we, not the capitalists, who will have to do it. And to do this, as Marx and Engels write,

"The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie."

Both the intrinsic internationalism of Capital, and the need for the working class to "complete the job" and unify Europe and the world on the basis of capitalism's achievements, are brought out brilliantly in the "Communist Manifesto" as follows :

"The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere.

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of Reactionists, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed....

National differences and antagonisms between peoples are daily more and more vanishing, owing to the development of the bourgeoisie, to freedom of commerce, to the world market, to uniformity in the mode of production and in the conditions of life corresponding thereto.

The supremacy of the proletariat will cause them to vanish still faster. United action, of the leading civilized countries at least, is one of the first conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat....

The Communists are distinguished from the other working-class parties by this only : 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole."

THE "CHARTIST", THE LABOUR PARTY AND THE COMMON MARKET.

The question of the Common Market is one of the most difficult our movement has ever had to face. Although the Chartist stands firmly in the anti-Common Market camp, we recognize that in the opposite camp are a minority of workers who genuinely believe entry to provide the gateway to an eventual Socialist Europe. We think this argument has to be fought and fought hard, particularly since a brand-new pseudo-"internationalism" has suddenly become a principal weapon cynically used by the extreme right-wing in the Labour Party to whip up support for the Common Market, and since some who consider themselves "Left-wingers" have been taken in by it.

For a perfect illustration of pseudo-"internationalism", let us turn to our "old friend" George Brown. True, this somewhat revolting retired clown is of even less relevance to the labour movement these days than he was before. But there are still a few odds and bods in the Labour Party who take their cue from him, and in any case his words provide a useful specimen of the kind of propaganda we must learn to attack.

Lord George-Brown, staunch cold warrior, union-basher, Vietnam "hawk" (remember his advice to the Pentagon after My Lai—"stop weeping and get on with the fighting" ?) and now self-appointed press-agent for Heath's Common Market crusade—says he can't understand what's happened to the British "Left". Realizing that almost the entire rank-and-file of the Labour Party, Co-ops and trade unions are implacably opposed to entering the Market, he remarks :

"The odd thing is that all these people have suddenly discovered English nationalism. It simply cannot be acceptable to people like me, who have been brought up all my life to believe in the international brotherhood of man, the international faith of our party, and who see that trade unionists in France, Italy, in Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg and in the Netherlands have the same basic interests."

(Guardian, 7/7/71).

Coming from George Brown, of course, talk of "international brotherhood" is so unspeakably disgusting and so boundlessly and patently cynical that with the "Left" it can hardly be expected to cut much ice. But similar arguments have been used by "Left-wingers" in the Party such as Eric Heffer. And what do we do when support for the Common Market is mobilized on the basis of "internationalism" from workers who sincerely believe in it ?

continued/.....

To them we have a duty to make our position quite clear. All those who want a Socialist United Europe as an immediate foreign policy objective should be with us, with the most vigorous opponents of entry into the Common Market. It is criminal to allow any sincere internationalists to be swayed— for lack of a credible alternative—by the false "internationalism" of the right. It is criminal to concede the only alternative to the Common Market to be a revived "British Commonwealth" or the pathetic Powellite Utopia of an isolated "Greater Britain". Anyone with eyes in his head can see that Britain is part of the continent of Europe, that the ancient national boundaries of Europe are obsolete, that they are hampering the development of production, that they must be broken down and that the industrial resources of Europe can be and must be planned and organized on a continental basis if the needs of our movement and class as a whole are to be met.

Let us leave the Powellites and disciples of the Beaverbrook Press (among them on this issue, apparently, Tribune and the Morning Star) to their own delusions, and concentrate on the questions which concern us as organized workers and as a class:

- (a) how do we defend and raise our living standards ? Labour politicians who can't defend the interests of the working class in this country won't be able to defend them internationally either.
- (b) how, in this connection, do we get this Tory Government (and all Tory Government) off our backs ?
- (c) how, in other words, do we get our parasitic rulers and employers off our backs ?
- (d) how, if we are really serious about "taking the power" as workers and as a class, do we propose dealing with the mighty U.S. and European allies of our own ruling class in this country ?
- (e) how, in other words, make the most of our international connections and strength ?
- (f) how, in return, can we best assist our European and international working-class allies in ridding themselves of their capitalist rulers and governments ?
- (g) how, that is, do we act and organize as a new International (the Second and Third Internationals having folded up) and take up, once more, the fight of the founders of socialism for a Socialist United States of Europe in a Socialist World Federation ?

Now the question is, can any part of these objectives be served by identifying with the efforts of Heath and Co. to take us into the Common Market ? Let us start with the first objective, the question of our living standards. Nobody denies that the

continued/.....

enormous expected rise in food-prices caused by entry will hit hardest at the ordinary housewife and working-class family. Even the Government White Paper admits that Britain's housewives will face a £900 Million a year leap in food prices by 1978 if Britain joins. That would mean the cost of feeding the average family of 4 rising from £8.60 to £10 per week. A whole range of foods would be forced out of the diet of many poorer families, already suffering under a bout of inflationary price-increases steeper than anything known in this country since rationing ended in 1954.

"But", the pro-Market Labour "internationalists" keep protesting, "shouldn't we be prepared to make short-term sacrifices for long-term gains?" We couldn't agree more—every time we go on strike we are following that principle. But the point is this: as a movement, we trade-unionists are only going to make sacrifices when we are certain we will reap the rewards. The "marketeers" assure us that the rewards will be big. But even assuming that they actually materialize (which, with poor old British capitalism in its present state, is far from certain), the question remains: whose rewards will they be?

In a recent advertisement in Tribune (2/7/71), paid for by the "Labour Committee for Europe", Paul Rose M P puts his case like this:

"Do you want to live in a primitive backwater still making motor cars in an age of linear induction motors and strides in technology that cannot yet even be imagined?"

Do we want to be an underdeveloped nation in the 21st century?

A market of 300 million people will allow us to invest and expand. It will allow the development of advanced and sophisticated techniques that need a lot of money in research and planning and an even bigger market."

Now, when we read that the Market will allow "us" to "invest and expand", we are very interested to know who exactly is meant by "us"? Who are "we" in this context supposed to be? As far as the Chartist is concerned, we either speak for the working class and its interests in this country and internationally—or we don't speak at all. We and our supporters are workers, housewives, trade-unionists—most of us with no more "property" than some clothes, furnishings etc and perhaps a "luxury" such as a car. At any rate we have no cause to worry overmuch about our property "investments", our prospects of "expansion" and other problems of that kind—as the supporters of the "Labour Committee for Europe" apparently have. As far as we are concerned, the multi-millionaire monopolists who dream that "a market of 300 million people will allow us to invest and expand" are "them" and not "us". It is indeed the dream of

continued/.....

fresh markets which is luring the monopolies towards Europe. It is on a successful entry into the Common Market, and on the prospect of fat profits for the richest monopolies once inside, that Heath and his allies are pinning all their hopes. Common Market entry is, in fact, in a real sense, the centrepiece of Heath's whole present strategy. The "lane duck" policy—the spate of bankruptcies, of Rolls Royce, UCS & etc—does not make sense except in the context of the huge rewards expected for those monopolies which do survive in the Common Market. Neither, for that matter, does the Immigration Act, with its "patrial" clauses obviously directed at the Italian rather than the Pakistani worker. Similarly, central features of the Industrial Relations Bill were clearly framed with the Treaty of Rome in mind. All in all, it is the interests not of the working class, nor of the small businessmen but of the multi-millionaire monopolies which are assailing us with arguments for joining the Market, and providing the motive-force for every action of this Government.

We ask the "Labour Committee for Europe" how can the millions of workers and housewives who support our Party be asked to accept 10 %, 20 % and even higher rises in food prices when the only profits from entry are to go into the coffers of the huge private monopolies which are running this Government's home and foreign policies ? For our part, we refuse to do so. We dissociate entirely from the monopolies (however much Government-subsidized !) from their investments and their expansion prospects. We have only one objective in relation to them, and that is to break their dictatorial rule over our society, to use our own organization—our industrial and political strength as workers—to nationalize them without compensation and run them in our own collective interests as a class.

That means opposing their present investment and expansion plans, opposing the Tory Government's Common Market crusade (which is the same thing), demanding an immediate General Election on this issue and—in our view—backing up this demand with concrete preparations for a political General Strike designed not merely to get rid of the Tory Government but also to rid us of the monopolies themselves, enabling us to seize the full industrial, financial and political power of this country into our own hands as members of the Labour Party, as trade-unionists and as a class. A genuine workers' government in Britain, with a foreign policy striking at the roots of capitalist rule throughout Europe and the world, would be the best possible assistance to our European trade-unionist allies in uniting Europe (and ultimately the world) on a socialist basis.

continued/.....

There are, of course, those who say that "we're not going to get socialism in Britain within the next four or five years, so in the meantime let's make the most of the Common Market under capitalism". And it does sound, superficially, a "realistic" argument. In fact, however, for socialists under present conditions, this is much too pessimistic a view. Paul Rose in his Tribune advert says "for heaven's sake" don't let us

"be moved by the popular opinion of the moment to try to get rid of this lamentable government. It won't work, anyway."

Won't work? Of course, it may not immediately "work"! But if it doesn't—if, despite the overwhelming opposition of the British working class and millions of the Tories' own small-businessmen and middle-class traditional supporters, this Tory Government does against all odds survive the coming autumn and winter to live out its full period of office—then it will have been the Labour Europeans of this world, along with our fence-sitting "leaders" in the Party, who will have kept it in power. Even the Tories themselves have to admit that they have absolutely no mandate for going into the Common Market. Their manifesto committed them "to negotiate—no more, no less", and in general the whole issue was deliberately kept out of the election campaign. The Tories won on the basis of keeping prices down—but prices have risen higher than and faster than ever known, and entry into the Market will involve accelerating this trend! The Tories are politically in such a position that, as Michael Foot rightly pointed out in Tribune (July 2),

"By this time next year, we could have Heath & Co. out, bag and baggage..."

Objectively there is nothing whatsoever to stop us from turning the Tories out right now. On the issues of unemployment, prices, and the Market we have got them on the run. Michael Foot's call in Tribune for a General Election must be transformed into a thunderous demand from the entire British labour movement. If Harold Wilson, Vic Feather and our other Labour "leaders" were firmly to take up this call, firmly to link it with an onslaught against all aspects of Tory Government policy, and firmly to back this up with preparations for a "seditious" General Strike threatening the very foundations of capitalist rule in this country and opening the way for a fundamental transformation of society—then without a shadow of doubt, the response from the working class would be stupendous, the Tories would agree to make all kinds of concessions, a General Election could be forced and we could win a landslide victory for Labour putting 1945 in the shade. On gaining office, we could use our enormous

continued/.....

organizational strength as a movement in this country to take over the economy, answering resistance by occupying our factories and places of work, taking over the main public buildings and so on. Then, once we had established ourselves as a Labour Government firmly in control, with the industrial and financial power of the country in our hands, without a shadow of doubt we would find the whole situation in Europe transformed and running in our favour. We would be able to defend the workers and youth of Poland, Czechoslovakia and all Eastern Europe (a region never mentioned by the "Labour Europeans !") against both NATO and the Krenlin. With our revolutionary example and authority we would be able to rely on the working-class rank-and-file against the leaderships of all the West-European Social-Democratic and Stalinist parties to unite East and West Europe on the basis of common ownership and workers' control.

At the present time, the political and economic instability of capitalism not only in Britain but throughout the continent is so profound (witness France in May 1968, the continual social crisis and mighty Communist Party of Italy, the ferment in Poland and East Europe, Spain tottering on the brink of revolution etc. etc.) that the possibility of achieving a Socialist United States of Europe, so far from being only a "long term" one, is in fact already more immediately realistic than the quite Utopian ideal of a Europe united on a capitalist basis. From the standpoint of British Labour the first step—our seizure of power in this country—is also, at least as far as objective conditions are concerned, an immediate possibility. All we need is the subjective factor—the will, the ideas, the determination, the discipline and the organization. Help us build this political force around the Chartist, and through a really socialist "Socialist Charter Campaign" based on Clause 4 and the struggle for working-class power. Let us fight this Tory Government with everything we've got. The harder we fight to prevent it dragging us into the Common Market, the nearer we will be to the Socialist United States of Europe.

NO TO THE COMMON MARKET --- PREPARE FOR THE GENERAL STRIKE !

FOR THE SOCIALIST UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

AND THE WORLD SOCIALIST FEDERATION !

Chris Knight—Young Chartists National Committee Member.

THE LABOUR PARTY YOUNG SOCIALISTS--A FIGHTING PROGRAMME ?

With growing attacks on all sections of the labour movement, with the Industrial Relations legislation on the one hand and proposed Common Market entry on the other, the Young Socialists will have important responsibilities to bear in the coming period.

Our Skegness Conference at Easter was variously described as "a conference whose high points were towering pinnacles" (Militant May '71) and as "three days of politically empty verbiage" (Keep Left April '71). We believe neither description to be correct. The Conference clearly laid an important basis on which future advances could be built. The right wing mounted a more concerted effort than hitherto, was comprehensively beaten, and at the same time a reasonably well worked-out 'socialist programme' was adopted.

But the process cannot stop there. It is necessary for us in the Y.S. to become a power in the broader movement, and this will not come merely from 'professors' of marxism priding themselves on the correctness of their 'socialist programme'. It is necessary actively to show how this programme can be implemented.

Now it is true that some sort of lead has been given. The organizing of a national campaign around the problems of unemployment is important and must be given full support. But much more can be done--even with our limited resources.

The National Committee should right now be organizing a campaign on the Common Market showing itself to be the most determined opponent of entry and concretely linking the alternative of the Socialist United States of Europe to the immediate question of throwing out the Tories.

The N.C. should right now be strengthening the unity of the movement by urging Y S members to join the Co-ops and backing the growing movement for national affiliation to the Labour Party. The N.C. should right now be giving its full support to the movement around the Soldiers' Charter, instead of merely writing articles in support of Soldiers' Trade Union rights (Left, June '71) without so much as a mention of S.T.U.R.M. or the Charter. The N.C. should also have been expressing its full solidarity with the comrades in the SLL Young Socialists in their campaign supporting the sacked Pilkington Glassworkers.

Above all, the N C should be drawing real strength from all these movements and issues much more than merely proclaiming the need for a 'socialist programme'. Unfortunately the struggle for socialism requires much more than merely announcing the need for it.

continued/.....

The Y S should be the foremost section of the movement in warning that a General Strike in the coming period is on the cards, and in demanding that our leaders in the Labour Party and T U C prepare for it. Instead of pitifully trumpeting its own (largely self-imposed) impotence and asserting that it is useless posing such demands until the Labour leaders have adopted the 'socialist programme'—a sterile and completely sectarian approach—the Y S leadership should be demanding that the Labour leaders mobilize the vast industrial strength available to them and boot out the Tories now.

We in the Y S can only prove ourselves a force in action. Our 'fighting programme' must be more than a mere proclamation of the advantages of nationalization. It must be a concrete guide to action.

We, the Young Chartists, have never suffered from a 'youth fetishism' despite the comparative youth of most of our members. We do not share the illusions that, on its present politics and in its present form, hundreds of thousands will be marching into the LPYS. But having said that, it is clear that with the upsurge in the Labour Movement, the LPYS could have a really important role to play and could provide a fighting lead.

It is necessary now to translate words into deeds, to give a comradely welcome to all working-class tendencies at present outside the LPYS to come inside and continue the struggle, and above all to show that what we are interested in is to fight not merely for our ideas in themselves, but for the power to implement them. G. BASH (LEYTON YOUNG CHARTISTS).

READ :-

WHICH WAY FOR LABOUR LONDON ?

Copies obtained from the Editors address.

A vital guide for Labours new councillors
PRICE 6p.

SOLDIERS FIGHT ON : KEEP IT UP, BROTHERS !

In the Chartist No 5, we first reported the formation of the Soldiers' Trade Union Rights Movement, and in the last issue an article outlined how the movement came into being, together with the true facts behind the "Daily Telegraph" story which indicated that the Soldiers' Charter have been produced at Catterick camp. Since our last issue, S.T.U.R.M. has been the object of more comment in the Press and on television. The Daily Mail on May 10 carried an article headed "Battle Cry for Army Union", in which were outlined the basic demands of the Soldiers' Charter. The Report ended with the comment that the Ministry of Defence was "worried about the campaign". This is hardly suprising, since the Ministry is that of a Tory Government and ruling class whose very existence is threatened by the extension of working-class militancy into the Army. A soldiers' trade union would strike at the power-base of the officers—officers whose allegiance is to that obsolescent institution, the Crown, and not to the people of this country or even to Parliament; officers whose present unlimited powers S.T.U.R.M. would like to see curtailed by democratically-elected Soldiers' Committees.

A more recent Mail editorial referred to S.T.U.R.M., warning the "mutinous" Pirbright Drummers (see below) not to associate with us, and advising the "would-be shop-stewards in khaki" to "pack it in, brothers". As a great concession, this Tory gutter paper decided that there was no reason, "why long-hair shouldn't come back into military vogue". However, things more important than hair-length (however important that is) concern soldiers. One of these, recently in the news, is compensation for injuries or death among soldiers, not only on active service but in normal routine work at army camps. This is an area in which a Soldiers' Union would play an important part. There must be adequate compensation for injured soldiers and a decent pension for widows. At present a widow of a soldier killed on duty gets only a third of the pension for which he was entitled before his death, plus a gratuity. If a soldier is killed whilst on a short-service engagement there is no pension for his widow and all that she receives is a gratuity of between £190 and £470.

The most recent widely-publicized incident showing the need for a soldiers union was the very courageous action on the 2nd June of the ten drummers of the Brigade of Guards at Pirbright. The drummers had had to work

at least two hours after their normal finishing time on parades, rehearsals and training recruits for the "Trooping of the Colour". As a result meal times were cut and when the men arrived late, nine were put under open arrest and the tenth under close arrest--on the excuse that his hair was 'too long' ! This incident shows clearly the need for some machinery through which soldiers can air their greivances i.e. through soldiers committees. The officers claim that facilities for making complaints already exist. The officer at Pirbright did so, objecting in a statement to the Press: "We have received no official approach from the men complaining of overwork." But as this officer knows perfectly well, any soldier who had complained vigorously to his CO would have run the risk of being put on latrine cleaning for the next week or two ; had he persisted in complaining he would have risked being charged with "conduct prejudicial to good order and military discipline". In a number of statements through the labour press, S.T.U.R.M. has completely supported the action of these men and calls on all soldiers to take courage from the action of the drummers. The fact that they were relatively lightly punished (technically, they could have been charged with mutiny) already shows our strength.

S.T.U.R.M. asks the labour movement to support our demand for a Soldiers' Trade Union, and says to all soldiers-- **PREPARE** until we are strong enough to act, immediately start informal discussion groups, and take what powers you can within the existing system. We are not expecting, nor do we want soldiers to take steps fruitlessly exposing themselves to disciplinary reprisals. To place the responsibility for action on the soldiers themselves at this stage--when they cannot defy their officers without considerable risk to themselves--would be irresponsible, and a disservice to the soldiers' movement. We say its the job of the Labour and Trade Union leaders to act ! Use your industrial strength ! Throw out the Tories ! Enact legislation protecting the soldiers !

P.S. Recently we Young Chartists have been leafleting on a regular basis at the main entrances to London's rail, road and air terminii. Except for sporadic opposition from certain policemen, great success was gained. As yet, not one soldier has been hostile and we found a large number who were very enthusiastic.

Clive Pullinger - Leeds Young Chartists.

WHICH WAY FOR THE SOCIALIST CHARTER ?

The enormous betrayals of the Wilson leadership during its period of office failed to evoke much opposition from the traditional Labour "Left", which in part is an explanation for why some of our less experienced and more impressionable co-revolutionaries wrote off the Labour Party and marched off into the wilderness. The most positive lead given by the TRIBUNE group of M P s was the call in 1968 for a Socialist Charter which would rally the dispirited ranks of our party and prepare the ground for a co-ordinated struggle to gain control of the party, both locally and on a Parliamentary level. It was because we saw the need for such a movement that many of us who are Marxists joined it.

Unfortunately for those of us who saw the necessity for a clear programme of action, the original Charter, far from being a realistic alternative to Wilsonism, was little more than a re-hash of "Signposts for the Sixties", (a fuller critique of this can be read in Comrade Bash's article in Chartist No. 3). Faced with a programme devoid of any sense, and with the apparent inertia of much of our supposed leadership, many of us younger Chartists came together to form the YOUNG CHARTISTS, and to fight in a disciplined fashion for a programme for the taking of real power by the labour movement.

At first we were small in numbers and were disregarded by most of the Charter movement. However, our success in building a viable organization, and the lead we have given on issues such as the Soldiers' Campaign and in the London Co-operative Society has won us many new members and a large periphery of sympathisers and activists. In contrast, the Socialist Charter, despite the herculean efforts of its registrar Brenda Brett, has declined and is in reality reduced to only a hard core of activists. How has this come about ?

Basically the Charter has failed for the same reasons that its predecessors, V F S and the Socialist League, failed. It lacks any perspective of where it is going and what its objectives are, and equally importantly, it lacks a disciplinary method capable of uniting its supporters into a viable fighting force. It certainly hasn't failed because its activists and officers at rank-and-file level have been lazy or uninterested. Far the opposite—the amount of work put in has been quite prodigious.

What we need now is a guide to action which spells out where we are going. When people are disloyal to the Charter, they should

continued/.....

be reprimanded. If they persist, they should be expelled. Far from losing members, this will show we are serious and win us the best elements now becoming active in the CLPs and trade-unions. Concretely, we Young Chartists suggest :

- (a) A re-called National Convention to scrap the hopeless and, incidentally, out of date points of the original Charter, and to replace it by a programme of action committed to ousting the Tory Government.
- (b) The election of a functioning body to aid the Registrar in really organizing a national campaign to throw out the right-wing leaderships of the unions and C L P s and to re-place them with people prepared to mobilize the might of the labour movement and bring the full power of industry and finance into the hands of the working class.
- (c) The institution of a fee-paying membership system--which would force a lot of so-called "Chartists" to put their money where their mouths are.
- (d) A real line being adopted whereby people who do not carry out Charter policy are stopped from speaking in the Charter's name.

If these proposals are adopted, then the Charter can become the instrument we all desire it to be.

LABOUR, TAKE THE POWER !

Keith Veness: Harrow Young Chartists.

* * *

FROM THE ARCHIVES

Consider the passage below::

"....many of the most influential labour leaders had not grasped the revolutionary implications of mass industrial action, and those who had were not prepared to accept them.

I remember vividly Robert Smillie describing to me an interview the leaders of the Triple Alliance had with David Lloyd George in 1919. The strategy of the leaders was clear. The miners under Robert Smillie, the Transport Workers under Robert Williams, and the National Union of Railwaymen under Thomas, formed the most formidable combination of industrial

continued/....

workers in the history of Great Britain. They had agreed on the demands which were to be made on the employers, knowing well that the Government would be bound to be involved at an early stage. And so it happened. A great deal of industry was still under Government war-time control and so the State power was immediately implicated.

Lloyd George sent for the labour leaders, and they went, so Robert told me, "truculently determined they would not be talked over by the seductive and eloquent Welshman." At this, Bob's eyes twinkled in his grave, strong face. "He was quite frank with us from the outset," Bob went on. "He said to us: 'Gentlemen, you have fashioned in the Triple Alliance of the unions represented by you, a most powerful instrument. I feel bound to tell you that in our opinion we are at your mercy. The Army is disaffected and cannot be relied upon. Trouble has occurred already in a number of camps. We have just emerged from a great war and the people are eager for the reward of their sacrifices, and we are in no position to satisfy them. In these circumstances, if you carry out your threat and strike, then you will defeat us.

"'But if you do so', went on Lloyd George, 'have you weighed the consequences? The strike will be in defiance of the Government of the country and by its very success will precipitate a constitutional crisis of the first importance. For, if a force arises in the State which is stronger than the State itself, then it must be ready to take on the functions of the State, or withdraw and accept the authority of the State. Gentlemen,' asked the Prime Minister quietly, 'have you considered, and if you have, are you ready?' From that moment on," said Robert Smillie, "we were beaten and we knew we were."

After this the General Strike of 1926 was really an anti-climax. The essential argument had been deployed in 1919. But the leaders in 1926 were in no better theoretical position to face it. They had never worked out the revolutionary implications of direct action on such a scale."

Aneurin Bevan, In Place of Fear,
Heinemann, London 1952, pp 20-21.

In Britain today, as the working-class movement against the Common Market, against the Industrial Relations Bill and against the Tory Government builds up into an ever more irresistible force, a catastrophe for British capitalism is being prepared. Slowly but surely the conditions are ripening for a General Strike on a scale which will put both 1926 and even France 1968 in the shade. The question for all Labour Party members and trade-unionists is: How do we prepare for it? The Chartist warns, as Aneurin Bevan's words show, that a General Strike poses the question of power. In preparing for the coming General Strike, we must prepare for the actual seizure of state power itself. We Chartists are doing that now.

COOK'S COLUMN

Dateline GREENWICH

Newly elected M.P. for Greenwich, comrade Guy Barnett pledged his support to the newly formed Soldiers Trades Union rights Movement when questioned about it by local Young Chartists. He likened this to a growing campaign for "democratic" rights for many sections of society at present deprived of them. Lets hope Cde. Barnett pushes this point at Westminster for us with the same fervour our soldier friends push it in the Army.

Dateline SCHOOLS

Seen in the last issue of the SAU magazine; "as part of the "serve the people campaign" a jumble sale was held in a working-class area of North London recently. Good quality clothing was sold at very low prices."

Perhaps this campaign is a worthy successor to last year's urban guerilla warfare training camp. Or even "Never mind the quality feel the contact".

Dateline L.C.S.

Quick somersault - Gordon Schaffer, old fellow-traveller and opponent of ours, has announced his "conversion" to the idea of Labour Party affiliation. Welcome to the ranks of the Bolsheviks !!

Dateline Leeds

Thanks to comrade Ann Jeffrey for her excellent review of the soldiers Charter in the "Citizen", Leeds Labour weekly.

Dateline NORWOOD

The LPYS In Lambeth-Norwood now run a very successful "Disco" at the "Thurlow Arms" every alternate Saturday. All CHARTIST readers welcome. Bar in the hall for older cdes.

Dateline BETHNAL GREEN

We have seen five articles by supporters of our old friend and rival "The Militant" on the question of union rights for soldiers and sailors. Not one of them even mentioned S.T.U.R.M. Is this a record°?

Dateline COTTON GARDENS

I.S. gave out a leaflet recently which asked "Throw out the Tories but how?"...Read the "CHARTIST" AND FIND OUT COMRADES!!!!

Martin welcomes any juicy titbits for the column. Send them to us c/o the Editor's address. Anything pointed or useful will be appreciated.

SACK THE QUEEN !!!

Most parliamentary discussions about the role of the Monarchy tend to resemble a shareholders' debate on the balance sheets and aims of some sort of "neuter" benevolent foundation. Whilst respecting the sincerity and good intentions of the Crown, the "left wing" pragmatists point to the parasitic economic and social position of H.R.H. and impotently fulminate about the Royal Family's luxury spending financed by taxpayers money, not to speak of the Queen's enormous private resources and her tax exemptions. On the other side of the House, pragmatists of a right wing mold claim that the public's investment is more than returned in the form of tourist attraction as well as increased exports emanating from the Royals' "emissary work" overseas. Far from a resplendent layabout married to a blue-blooded gigolo, the Queen they maintain, is a hard working woman who conscientiously "serves" the British people by bolstering our country's goodwill and prestige throughout the world, particularly within that "brotherhood of man, founded on love and equality": the Commonwealth.

Needless to say, the latter argument even holds sway within the P.L.P. where "progressive Monarchism" and working class politics blend like sugar and sand in the ideals of "democratic socialism". Even those who dare postulate that the sacred cow is little more than a lame duck, soon capitulate to the hysterical consensus of defending the first estate. Richard Crossman in a recent "New Statesman" editorial, branded the Royal Family as "tax avoiders" who were surrounded by all sorts of hangers-on. Yet, despite this attack Crossman declares himself a staunch supporter of the Crown, (for other, non-pecuniary, pragmatic reasons, e.g. as the head of State the Monarch is solely a non-political figurehead, a "dignified" rather than "efficient" steering wheel within the constitution. Because of her political neutrality, the Queen is a far better centre of national loyalty than a politically-allied President with real power would be. This dichotomy between ceremonial and political aspects of public life enables the P.M. to devote more time to political responsibilities and is supposed to militate against demagoguery and the type of "emotional politics" to be found everywhere else except Britain. Thus the loyal patriot can "damn" the government and at the same time retain his nationalism by "cheering" the Queen etc).

The key factor underlying all this grovelling around the royal posterior by the representatives of the working class, is the mistaken assumption that the queen is in some way "non-political". /cont.

Even if she does have grandiose political aspirations, the POWER to realize them is not hers, so the argument runs and even if she does have nominal powers somewhere in the murky depths of the "unwritten constitution", this is only so much jargon with no real force at all. This mistake of the Crown's function assumes crucial importance not because of the volumes of constitutional garbage written to prove the Queen is 'above politics', but because whole sections of the Labour movement accept this dictum as gospel. In general it is the middle-classes, the extreme monarchists and constitutional theorists who go into orgasms about the Crown's prerogative; as far as the working-class is concerned power is to be found in Downing Street, not in Buckingham Palace.

In formal terms the monarchy embodies tremendous power. In fact it is almost frightening that an undemocratic, hereditary position should have the following powers :-

- (1) Personification of the state.
- (2) Supreme legal authority.
- (3) Ministers are responsible to the Crown.
- (4) The right to declare war.
- (5) Head of the judiciary.
- (6) "Foundation of Honour"- confers titles etc.
- (7) The Queen's assent is required for all legislation.
- (8) Head of the armed forces.

In reality of course, all of these are exercised by the P.M., the Defence Minister, the Home Minister, the Chancellor etc, who act in the name of the Crown. At best the Monarch is merely informed and consulted, very rarely taking part actively in the decision-making process. Royal assent has not been refused since 1703 and the only two powers open to controversy are those of dissolution and the appointment of the P.M. Quite clearly the Crown was active during the 1931 crisis, aiding the Labour Party split, as well as on several other occasions. All this proves that the Monarchy is NOT powerless. On the contrary all it does is verify that the Monarch does not and can not play an independent role. To most socialists this is obvious. Despite the Restoration, the Civil War heralded end of the Monarch's and the Lord's autonomy when the bourgeoisie siezed state power. What followed was a long and arduous process of eroding the powers of these reactionary institutions. But unlike France, whose bourgeois revolution took place much faster in a more matured situation, no real attempt was made to abolish the first two estates. In fact the aristocracy was accomodated into the Tory party, which explains its paternalism and its really rotten "Noblesse Oblige" and the Crown and Lords became part of the capitalist state machinery.

In this sense the Monarchy is extremely political. All the assiduous searchings for an independent role is at best wrong and at its worst thoroughly misleading. The real question is its political role in the main struggle in society between the forces of Labour and of capital

Ideologically, the glitter of the Crown acts as a focal point for nation--alism. To keep prattling that she is "non-political" only strengthens this rubbish. As we move into social crisis large sections of workers are still imbued with this, though this is now losing its grip, especially amongst the youth who resent a buffoon like Prince Charles speaking in the name of "youth and moderation". Not even the bizarre spectacle of him donning a "Ben Sherman", braces and a pair of "cherry-reds" could redeem this upper-class twit-republicanism has never been so strong !

Up to now the Monarchy has remained in the shadows largely because the Tories have never felt threatened enough to use her. One of the reasons Baldwin felt threatened enough to force the abdication of King Edward VIII was his marked sympathy for Mosley's fascists !

Nevertheless, we should always be aware of Royalty lurking in the background like the Tirpitz ready for use if and when we the Labour movement attempt to take power. Just imagine how the tories would use H.R.H. if a future socialist government tried to implement a union for our soldier comrades!

No, we will not allow this. Our leaders must prepare now plans for scrapping the facade of the Lords, Monarchs other layabouts., etc. We must stop all this talk about economies and "efficiency" and put a good working-class boot up their parasitic backsides!

FRANK HANSEN - Harrow Young Chartists.

* * * * *

READ THE SOLDIERS CHARTER
WRITTEN BY SERVING SOLDIERS AND NOW
ONE OF THE MOST TALKED OF PAMPHLETS IN OUR PARTY.
Copies from ; - Box BM 453 , London W.C.1. Price 10 p.

* * * * *

LONDON CO-OP — END OF THE "GENTLEMENS' AGREEMENT" !

If Wilson's somersaulting and fence-sitting on the Common Market issue is compared with the antics of some members of the 1960 Committee and the right-wing C M A, then he appears as a novice by any measure !

The Annual meeting of the 1960 Committee marked the latest stage in the Stalinist hedging-game over the question of London Co-op affiliation to the Labour Party. A relatively big meeting of the 1960 Committee rejected by the slenderest of majorities our call for affiliation. Few opponents of our resolution had the guts to speak at all—let alone say what their real reasons for opposition are. We heard wretched pleas for the continuation of the Co-op Party on the grounds that it allows the London Co-op to influence national Co-op politics. That seems a strange excuse in view of the fact that the London Co-op has found itself isolated within the Co-op Party every time it raised 'politics' at all ! Strange also that Communist Party members argue for the Co-op Party even with its bans and proscriptions—but argue against Labour Party affiliation...on the grounds of its bans and proscriptions !

Let's have no more covering up. The Stalinists dislike the idea of Labour Party affiliation because it would force them to admit their own sectarianism. The stalwarts of the right-wing C M A are against affiliation to the "Party they love and will die for, and might even become an M P for", because they are afraid that affiliations will strengthen the fighting unity of our movement. If the Labour Party affiliation issue has proved anything, it has proved that one somersault can lead easily to another. The C M A are just as split as "1960" on this issue. In fact, the Board of Directors are gainst affiliation, but the Political Committee is for it.

The sectional meetings being held during the second week of July have on their agendas a clear and unequivocal resolution on affiliation. The Young Chartists and their allies came close to getting a strong foot-hold on the Executive of 1960. Our candidates were beaten by a margin of only one or two votes.

We are very encouraged by the meeting, as we have only just started to tap our support whilst our opponents were at full stretch. Next year will hold another story.

By the time you read this, we will all know whether the resolution has been passed or not. Even if we are defeated this time—we will win next year !

Janet Whelan - Croydon Young Chartists.