

**THE REFERENDUM
ON THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET,
THE ABSTENTIONS
AND THE SOCIALIST SOLUTION
TO THE CRISIS OF CAPITALISM IN BRITAIN**

J. POSADAS

8.6.1975

The referendum in Britain¹ is part of a European and world campaign to shore up the capitalist system. Particularly in Europe, the large capitalist monopolies wish to crush the Workers States and the world revolutionary process. It is to coordinate their attacks that they subdue their inter-capitalist competition and draw closer together.

The European Communist and Socialist parties are a large part of the most exploited in the European masses, but they do not seek to overthrow capitalism. The Communists talk of social change by 'going to government', but the masses struggle and

¹ Britain had joined the European Common Market (EEC) in 1973 under the Ted Heath's Conservative government. After having won the Oct 1974 general elections, Harold Wilson organised a referendum in 1975 asking the British people: "Do you want Britain to remain in the EEC, yes or no?" 33% voted 'No', and 67% voted 'Yes'. It is often overlooked that 52% of the electorate abstained. It is only out of the 48% who voted that 67% said 'yes'. An important part of the Labour Party around Tony Benn called for a 'no' vote, along with the TUC leadership under Len Murray. It is often thought that 67% of the population voted to stay in the EEC, but in reality, it was under 36% of the electorate. Editorial.

see beyond parliaments. The Communist and the Socialist parties cannot think outside parliaments, but the masses do.

Europe is in the grip of inflation and unemployment, but there are many successful strikes and factory occupations. Pensioners, women's groups and even children organise street protests. The European masses are not intimidated by the huge level of unemployment. They know that Workers States exist and that Workers States can be made. This knowledge did not exist on the eve of the First World War. Now it does. The European masses keep the knowledge of the Workers State in mind. The only ones who seem to know nothing about this are the Communists, the Socialists and the Trade Union leaderships!

Capitalism realises that its system is finished. Faced with constant strikes and opposition movements, it cannot but watch the decay of its political authority. In France - where even the prostitutes are rebels - there are rumblings of discontent even in the police, even in the army. The French police want the right to be unionised, and to not being used against ordinary people. These are indications that capitalism decomposes, and not just in France. The apparatus and the superstructure of the bourgeois State are rotten to the core. In the European society of today (1975), the revolutionists have more authority than capitalism. You see this in the conduct of the prostitutes: they want dignity and human rights - just what capitalism cannot give them. Capitalism has marginalised these people and wants to keep them forgotten. It cannot believe that here they are, marching together, self-confident and as part of society.

Capitalism reorganises its military power:

The large world consortiums compete mercilessly against each other. Why then do they talk now of 'the greater economic integration of Europe'? They *talk* about this, but what they

want is the political leadership of Europe. Rest assured that they are not looking for an 'economic integration' devoid of political and military advantage to them. World capitalism wants out with all the Workers States.

Capitalism wants a final reckoning with the Workers States.

It has armed itself atomically with a view to smashing the economic, political and social competition of the Workers States. This is why French imperialism has facilitated German access to nuclear power. In the US (the United States), Schlesinger and Kissinger² have actually said that the US will use nuclear weapons "should war break out in Europe". Should "revolution break out in Europe" - they meant! This is why the US makes access to nuclear technology easy for the European capitalists.

US imperialism stimulates the armies of the European capitalist countries to think 'atomic'. It spares no expense in doing so. Meantime, it works for its allies in every European country to gain ground and win posts in every electoral contest. US imperialism leads each ruling class towards repression and 'atomic response'. Eager to avoid the possibility of rebellions in European armies, the US advises the capitalist leaders to make military reshuffles under the cover of 'anti-corruption drives'.

A reorganisation is taking place right now in all the capitalist armies. New military bodies are being created. Military technology is improving by the day. General Stehlin³ was sacked, and then he was linked with scandals involving ITT, Northrop and the US army. Other cases have involved big world corporations. The same happened in the CIA. Meanwhile, we are invited to admire the new honest men who uncovered

² **James R Schlesinger**, US Defence Secretary, 1973-1975 under Nixon and Ford. **Henry A Kissinger**, US Secretary of State 1973-1977.

³ Before 1974, **General Paul Stehlin** had been top leader in the French Air-force, and Vice President of the French National Assembly. In 1975, it became public that he received bribes from the US plane-maker Northrop. He was found dead soon after that. Editorial.

wrongdoing. Such events have a cost for capitalism however: The bourgeoisies implement the changes - the world over and in the US itself - but they (bourgeoisies) lose respect and confidence in the system.

The European Common Market (EEC⁴) presents itself with an *economic* face, but it was not created for economic reasons. It was created when European capitalism decided to confront the political competition of the Workers States as well as that of the European masses. For capitalism, the biggest sources of social unrest are in the key capitalist countries: Britain, Germany, France, Spain and Italy.

The European capitalists agreed to draw closer to each other following their decision to face down the Workers States and the European masses. This is why they are so keen to keep Britain 'in Europe'. They view Britain's reticence as harmful to their interests.

Having obtained exemptions, caveats, rule changes, rebates and promises, the British government joined the EEC in 1973. This year (1975), the Wilson government yielded to further EEC pressure to guarantee British membership by means of referendum. All this was done discreetly and subtly to avoid rousing the British proletariat. It is all very defensive. It is not as if those in the EEC were coming together from a position of strength. The thread behind it all - British referendum included - is capitalism seeking to avoid revolution.

It is for war that capitalist Europe 'unites':

Capitalism cannot exist without competition. Competition is its irrevocable condition and contradiction. Capitalism can only exist through it. For its part, the EEC is nothing but a giant multinational. If the capitalists within it had confidence in the future, you would see them today competing against each other madly. The reverse is the case however. If anything is shown by their integration, as they call it, it is their fear of the

⁴ The **European Common Market** became the European Union, **EU**, at Maastricht in 1992.

future. Indeed, how could they feel confident with their insoluble crisis on a one hand, and the Workers States on the other?

Wherever in the world British capitalism sets its foot, it triggers situations that its system can no longer cope with. It loses control at every turn, but it cannot leave off tampering with other countries either, as in Lebanon⁵ and surrounding region. Finished the time when the capitalists could simply barge in, decree and impose. Now, they must 'negotiate'. And as they do so, they must remember to keep Israel on-side and fight-ready, even as the boomerang returns to hit them on the nose. The matter of the referendum in Britain is not separate from all this.

The world capitalists talk of a "United Europe", but it is for war that they 'unite' Europe. The "Economic Community" they talk about is more political and military than economic. This is exactly how Yankee imperialism wants Europe 'united'. US capitalism has no interest in a capitalist Europe that competes successfully against the economy of North America, but this is what happened to a certain extent. The US had to accept this. Such are the contradictions of the capitalist system.

The top sectors of world capitalism had to accept that the greater political and military 'integration' of Europe could not avoid being *economic* as well. US capitalism tried to avoid this. Its view of a 'united' Europe always was: All the European capitalists in a line, behind the United States please, and under its command. This is how the top US administrators wanted things. When they realised that this would not be possible, they

⁵ The **civil war in Lebanon** had just started in 1975. It would last until 1990. Many of the refugees of that war are still displaced today (2017). From 1920-43, the French colonial power had favoured the Christians, who sided with the West in this civil war. The Maronite Christians were led by Camille Chamoun. The hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees (who had been expelled from Israel) tended to side with the Soviet Union. Lebanon had a Nationalist Movement of its own led by Kamal Jumblat. Some Nationalists, like Bashir Gemayel, supported the Palestinian PLO. When he was alive, Nasser had called for a Federation of the Arab States. In 1975, Callaghan was Labour Foreign Secretary in the Wilson government. With the United States, Britain was intervening in this region to counter the continuing influence of Nasserism. They also feared the influence of the USSR, of Syria and of the Palestinians led by Arafat. In 1978, Israel invaded Lebanon, and again in 1982. Editorial.

opted for the next best thing: The US would put up with some European competition, but it would keep it penetrated and manipulated under its command. Britain served the US in this matter, and France too. In return, the European countries were granted easy access to all the uses of nuclear technology. We are told that Germany cannot rearm itself – as per the last war – but no one says that it cannot be supplied.

The 'no' of the Labour left forms part of a maturing process:

The referendum in Britain asked people whether they wanted to remain in the EEC. This was a golden opportunity for the workers' organisations to discuss 'Europe' and take clear positions. It is true that this referendum was a strict inter-bourgeois conflict, and that there was nothing in it for the working class. Less advanced workers voted 'no' for fear of immigration and unemployment, and a sector of Labour recommended the 'no' to exploit this fear. There were huge abstentions, but what else could the mass of the workers do?

The Labour 'no' offered nothing to the working class. The Labour Party could opt for 'yes' or for 'no' without the Labour government feeling obliged to implement the Party's programme of nationalisations. And so, the workers abstained. They were given a choice - 'yes' or 'no' - but all they could see was Harold Wilson straining to unify capitalist Europe against the world socialist revolution.

Harold Wilson⁶ is cautious with the Labour left. He never confronts it head-on. He makes deals now with Tony Benn, now with others, in the hope of never having to clash directly with the worker's base. He is scared of it. He has had plenty of occasions to observe how far ahead of Labour the British working class actually is⁷ - what with the miners' strike, the

⁶ Harold Wilson became Prime Minister in Feb-March 1974. He took over from Ted Heath.

⁷ With their **second Miners' strike** in 1974 (the first in 1972) the British workers managed to bring Labour to government with an absolute majority (plus 3 seats) in October 1974. They brought down Ted Heath and defeated his hope of regaining control.

closure of the Birmingham Saltley Coaking Works⁸, the Upper Clyde shipyards' occupation, the engineers' strikes, the strikes of the postal workers, etc, etc.

The determination of the workers is so strong that it inspires the Labour left. Because the workers are so resolute, the Labour left felt confident enough to adopt a programme of nationalisations as part of a wider anti-capitalist programme⁹. It is the first time that the British working class succeeds in stimulating a Labour-left bold enough to clash with the Labour Party machine, and strong enough to create a distinctive left-wing in the Party.

In this referendum, the Labour-left threw its weight behind the 'no' vote in a way that did not allow it to discuss the EEC on an anti-capitalist basis. This gives the measure of a still very uncertain left. All the same, the left 'no' collided with the official Party's 'yes'. This broke the old pretence of Party 'consensus' and 'unity'. All this forms part of a process where the Labour left matures.

Tony Benn said 'no' to the EEC but not to the market economy:

⁸ On 10.2.1972, the British Miners were on their first national strike. That was during the Conservative government of Ted Heath. The Miners sent pickets to the **Saltley Coaking Works**, in the West Midlands, to force the closure of this gas-based strike-breaking installation. After direct confrontations between police, the Miners and some 10,000 workers who had come from all over Britain to support, the Works were forced to close. Heath accused the Miners of creating fuel shortages. He soon announced the "Three Days Week", allegedly because the economy was running out of fuel. In reality, the greatest shortage had come from 'the oil crisis' provoked by an OPEC embargo. The Miners were blamed in order to turn public opinion against them, and their strike. In October 1974, however, Labour won its second general election, and with an absolute majority. The Miners and the working class were absolutely instrumental in this second Labour victory. Editorial notes.

⁹ Although Labour was still in opposition, the Labour Party Conference of 1973 had voted for an extensive programme of nationalisations. When **Harold Wilson** drafted the 1974 Labour Party's electoral manifesto, it contained many of the Conference decisions. By 8.6.1975, Wilson had implemented some of these and repealed the Tories' *Industrial Relations Act*. A *National Enterprise Board* was then projected, along with measures of industrial democracy. Editorial.

In this referendum, the British proletariat did not see a struggle between the social classes. It only saw a conflict between the bourgeoisie of the 'yes' and the bourgeoisie of the 'no'. Tony Benn called for a 'no', but he was only opposing the EEC, not the market economy upon which it is based.

One thing is certain however: The bourgeoisie did not abstain. It split between 'yes' and 'no', but it did *not* abstain. Those who abstained were the workers, as well as some petit-bourgeois layers and conscious people who objected to both options. This abstention of the workers was an intervention. This will show in the next period.

Habitual abstentions apart, a good 30% of other abstainers did not vote because they do not admire the EEC. If you add to their numbers those who voted 'no', the result is a crushing majority against staying in the EEC! The 'yes' was declared the winner however, because such is the way of bourgeois electoral consultations. They are stratagems. People are deeply contemptuous of 'elections', their manoeuvres, their results.

The official victory of the 'yes' does not impress the proletariat and the advanced petit bourgeoisie. For them, this referendum was a bourgeois device to keep capitalism going, to hinder the revolutionary progress of Europe and to build a European front against the Workers States.

This 'yes' for the EEC does not indicate strength:

Don't give too much weight to sectors like Enoch Powell¹⁰ [semi-fascist right, opposed to the EEC]. Types like him do not decide, however many they are. Those who decide are the European capitalists. It is to compete as a block that they draw closer together. They know that each of them will crumble if they stay separate. They wanted very much this 'yes' result because it helps them shore-up European competitiveness

¹⁰ John Enoch Powell: 1912-1998. Member of Parliament for the Ulster Unionist Party. Minister of Health 1960-1973. Made violent speeches against immigration.

against the rest of the world, the US included. None of these things are signs of strength.

The European capitalists eventually realised that their inter-capitalist competition was weakening them too much. Feeling increasingly vulnerable as separate countries, they looked for a political leadership able to speak in the name of them all, or at least in the name of the most powerful amongst them. In this way, they hope to save their system from its decadence and disintegration. Their leaders incriminate loudly the oil crisis and too much competition, but these are false reasons. The true reason is that the capitalist system is in a crisis without solution.

Everything cries out for social change and human dignity:

The leader of the French Socialist Party, François Mitterrand¹¹, said recently that "although the crisis of capitalism is total, there will always be more capitalist crises". This is not true - or rather, it is true only as long as capitalism is not overthrown. Mitterrand does not think in terms of capitalist overthrow. He says this to reassure the bourgeoisie along the line of: 'Don't worry, the Socialists are still on board'.

Mitterrand calls the crisis "total" like someone desperate. The word 'total' does not necessarily mean that everything falls down this minute, but it surely means that everything is at stake. Indeed, this is what is happening in France, from the economy, to society. There, the so-called prostitutes are in the streets demanding their human rights. Everything cries out for change: the economy, investments, consumption, production, the church, the police, the army, the prostitutes.

Capitalism's defeat in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia has not finished reverberating around the world. This major blow at the foundations of capitalism strengthens the Workers States.

¹¹ **Francois Mitterrand**: 1916-1996, President of France 1981-1995.

Everywhere, the victory of the Vietnamese masses inspires the world working class and the exploited. It fills people with an enormous joy. The example of Vietnam edifies everyone, all over the world, particularly the millions forced to live on the margins of society.

The victory of Vietnam sends a message of confidence. It raises the so-called prostitutes above the brutality of their condition. These persons no longer feel degraded by the corruption that surrounds them. Seeing that deep social movements are already marching under the banner of human dignity, they want to participate. Prostitution does not represent the struggle for human dignity, but the protest of the prostitutes does. It forms part of the quest of humanity for its dignity.

The defeat of imperialism in Vietnam is central. It is infinitely significant. The European proletariat, the workers' centres, the Communists and the Socialists must base themselves on this. They must create *Parties/Trade Unions United Fronts* to overthrow what remains of bourgeois life. There is no other way to eliminate the crisis, unemployment, prostitution and degradation.

There is no prostitution in the Workers States! In liberated Saigon¹², the prostitutes were immediately integrated into the tasks of the revolution. This is how they recovered their human dignity. As shown in the above example in France, the prostitutes want the right to live as human beings. As a category in society, the condition for these persons to start living as human beings is the overthrow of the capitalist system. The existence of prostitutes is the direct expression of bourgeois relations. Because indignity is inherent to capitalism, human dignity will only come with the elimination of the capitalist system.

¹² **Saigon, 1975:** The United States stopped bombing Vietnam in August 1973. In April 1975, North Vietnam proceeded to recover the South of its country, capital Saigon, from the claws of US imperialism. In this particular war, US imperialism killed at least two million people. Apart from the environment disaster which it provoked, it also caused generations of people to be born, to this day, with genetic malformations. Editorial.

Imperialism goes from defeat to defeat:

Let us dwell a little on the US defeat at Mayaguez¹³. This was a month ago: the US military invaded Cambodia in the same off-hand manner it had used in Tonkin¹⁴. In spite of the very violent US slaughter and mayhem in Mayaguez, Yankee imperialism still failed, and was thrown out. When it decided to throw-in the towel and flee, it was not suddenly trying to respect treaties, as we are told! It was stopped. It was stopped by the Soviets, mostly, who were watching, finger on the trigger.

At Mayaguez, US imperialism re-enacted the entire scenario of lies and provocations that it had employed in the Tonkin attack. This time however, the Soviet Union was not playing balls any more. This gave wings to the Cambodians fighters who redoubled their efforts in defence of the Socialist advance of their country. It is important to note that the Cambodians who captured the crew of the Yankee ship were all youngsters - the youngest was barely fourteen!

It is to reassure their world bourgeois allies that the Yankee imperialists go on battering country after country. 'We are still

¹³ On 12 May 1975, a detachment of US marines initiated the invasion of a Cambodian Island called **Mayaguez**. The immediate excuse of the US government was that the crew of one of its merchant ships had been taken hostage on the high seas by Khmer Rouge soldiers. The real reason is probably that the US, thrown out of Vietnam, was looking for a new foothold in the region. The 3-day battle ended in a complete fiasco for the US and the loss of many of its marines. A number of Yankee combatants 'disappeared' (from such a confined space that they could not possibly have become 'lost', as J. Posadas underlines below), in a way suggestive of desertion. Faced with the irrational and lunatic ferocity of this Yankee action, the Cambodians kept their courage and uprightness. They released the crew of the merchant ship unharmed, and this last act of the war on Vietnam completed the rout of Yankee imperialism.

¹⁴ In 1964, the US had claimed that its destroyer 'Maddox' was attacked twice in the gulf of **Tonkin** by North Vietnamese torpedo-boats. It 'retaliated' of course, but the pretext was soon proven false, and the lie was made public. The large US army contingent was finally defeated, and in 1973, Nixon had to sign a peace treaty with North Vietnam. In 1975, North Vietnam and the Vietcong reunited Vietnam.

on top', they say. Indeed, what guarantees the continued power of those bourgeois allies is the continued power of the Yankee imperialists. But what guarantee is that? In Mayaguez, the guarantee the US imperialists gave to their world allies is that they were beaten by Cambodia and by the Youth of Cambodia.

When the Mayaguez episode ended, the US marines gave interviews. They said that they had all been freed and allowed to return to their ship. One of them said: "The Cambodians treated us well, they left us alone, but our side kept killing them for no reason". This episode is no small matter, considering that 84 US marines died in the whole operation. We are told that another 40 disappeared. Disappeared? In less than 30 square yards?

A Government of the Left is needed in Britain, with a European anti-capitalist programme:

Events in Britain must never be separated from the preparations of world capitalism for 'the final settlement of accounts'¹⁵. Britain must always be seen in this context. Capitalism/imperialism prepares for all-out war against the Workers States and the world masses. It is true also that this warmongering is constantly being undermined by the debacle within capitalism itself. Add to this that, due to their inherent and ungovernable need to compete, North American, Japanese and European imperialisms will always be at loggerheads.

In the EEC referendum in Britain, the proletarian vanguard abstained with the feeling that the answer is elsewhere. The 'no' advocated by Tony Benn sought to keep in contact with this feeling, but this was not adequate.

The choice this referendum offered to the dockworkers, shipbuilders, postal workers, engineers, miners and millions of

¹⁵ The final confrontation between the forces of imperialism and those of humanity, where imperialism is going to be smashed and superseded, as a system. Editorial.

others, was no choice. It left millions unrepresented. The workers wanted jobs and job security, but they had no voice. And so, they abstained. They abstained with much determination, as we have seen, and this level of determination will show soon, in other ways.

It is important to analyse the nature of Benn's opposition. His 'no' to the EEC tried to acknowledge, however superficially, the existence of an opposition in the Labour Party. This represents an important change in Britain. Indeed, it is the first time in the history of Labour that the Labour-left expresses so clearly, so publicly and so firmly its disagreement with the official Party position. This sort of thing used to happen in the past, but from the right-wing! Roy Jenkins - who voted enthusiastically 'yes' with the Conservatives - is now being left behind¹⁶. A Labour left is not only imposing itself on the Party's right and centre, it is unmasking them too. On the part of the Labour left, a 'no' to the Labour right-wing and centre is a 'no' to the bourgeoisie. This encourages the proletariat.

Having pushed the process so far within Labour, the British proletariat has every reason to hope for eventual Labour revolutionary and class tendencies. The overall situation cries out for anti-capitalist responses. In the matter of the EEC, every concern has started to take a European dimension. This invites the Labour Left to elaborate programmes for Europe, and not just for Britain. Appeals must be sent to the European Communists and Socialists, to the European Trade Unions, to the workers presently in struggle in the rest of Europe. The Labour left needs to address them and draw for them conclusions from this UK referendum. This will not happen at once, but something of this sort will happen because it is needed.

The official victory for the 'yes' does not mean that Harold Wilson has support. The proletariat and the British population

¹⁶ Roy Jenkins (1920-2003) was a centrist bourgeois figure in the Labour Party for many years before this referendum. He eventually broke from Labour to help create the Social Democratic Party (SDP) with David Owen, Shirley Williams and others. This did not 'disappear' the Labour Party. It is the SDP that disappeared. Editorial.

have not supported him, only a minority has. Those who insist that 'abstention is always high in Britain' are hiding the truth. The level of abstention in this referendum is unusual, considering that all the bourgeoisie went to vote. Those who abstained were the proletariat, a large part of the petit bourgeoisie and similar sectors not only in England and Wales, but also in Scotland and Northern Ireland.

The bourgeoisie voted integrally because it was integrally interested. It made a united front with Wilson to tear the Labour right and centre away from the Labour left. The outcome of this referendum has shown to the Labour left the need to focus less on the EEC and more on an anti-capitalist programme: A programme resembling more closely that of the *Popular Union* in France¹⁷ for instance. The Labour comrades should try this. Then they will find the struggle in the Labour Party much easier.

The solution to the crisis in Britain does not revolve around 'in' or 'out' of the EEC, but around the anti-capitalist programme and a *Government of the Left* on 'Popular Union' lines. The EEC is not the question. To focus solely on the EEC exonerates the bourgeois Labour leaders from their duty to explain why they do not fight for the working class.

The Labour left and the Trade Unions need to link up organically:

Under the lead of the United States, world capitalism prepares for world war. The capitalist interests dictate that the economic unification of Europe must stay under US domination. To increase the overall political and military coordination of the capitalist system, the US lower the force of their competition towards the EEC. They all attenuate the violence of their relations, but there is no way the capitalist system can stop

¹⁷ In 1972 in France, the Socialist and Communist Parties, and the Left Radicals, had signed a *Common Programme*. It proposed very important measures of nationalisations, but what frightened the bourgeoisie most was this unity which challenged its power. To cap it all, the alliance of the Socialists with the Communists was pulling the rug from under the Socialist right and centre. Editorial.

competing. This drives inter-capitalist division deeper and wider around the world.

It is necessary to appeal to the European proletariat, and to the large Communist and Socialist Centres. Comrades must call for the creation of a proper left in the Labour Party, whilst still appealing to Tony Benn and others. It is necessary to address the left in the Trade Unions formally, and to do this in the name of the Labour left.

There is nothing to stop the Trade Unions holding meetings to make a balance of the referendum's result¹⁸. Nobody can stop the Unions calling meetings, making analyses and launching appeals. The EEC is no answer to the present crisis, or to the decline in living standards. What it has to offer, it offers it only to capitalism! And capitalism uses it to repress the masses and prepare for war.

The alliance of the Labour left with the Trade Unions needs to become organic and programmatic. This is already in train, but most of the programme of the 1973 Party's conference remains ignored. The Wilson's leadership no longer mentions it, and those who voted 'no' made no reference to it.

The 1975 'Manifesto' of the Wilson's government contained promises for "industrial planning" and "workers' directors"¹⁹ - but capitalism was never going to agree to such things. Every Labour left programme must start from the recognition that capitalism is against. The Labour left and the wider Labour

¹⁸ In 1975, the United Kingdom(UK) had been only two years in the EEC. In 1973, Ted Heath had brought the UK into the EEC without consultation.

¹⁹ The plan for a **National Enterprise Board** (NEB) was outlined by the Wilson government in 1974. Its remits were published in 1975. Workers' participation would ratify the employers' rationalisation of capitalist functioning. This was eventually rejected by the Trade Unions, even the most right-wing ones.

In Dec 1975, six months after this text was elaborated, the **Bullock Committee** was set up as part of a *Social Contract* between Labour and the Unions. Its proposal for workers' participation responded to a European Commission's attempt to harmonise workers' participation in Europe. As the *Social Contract* would commit the workers to wage restraints, however, this too was eventually rejected by the British Trade Unions (TUC).

movement must base everything they do on the knowledge that capitalism will not, and cannot accept their demands.

For a Government of the Left and a Socialist Republic in Britain:

The advance of the economy requires a Republic, a Socialist Republic. The elimination of the monarchy is a logical consequence of the development of the economy. The superiority of the Workers States will come to be accepted in the Labour left.

The Workers State is the solution to the problems that the EEC cannot solve. The Workers State eliminates unemployment, crisis, repression and war. The conditions are growing in Europe for popular insurrections, and the rise of rebels like the prostitutes. In the Workers State, there is no economic crisis, no unemployment and no reduction of living standards.

In Britain, a *Government of the Left* with an anti-capitalist programme is necessary; a government that nationalises the banks and the main centres of production. A government that allows workers control; a government that relies on workers control to carry out its programme.

The present situation needs the development of workers' and employees' committees in the workplaces. Eventually, these must be allowed to become the essential levers for the development of the economy and society.

Meanwhile, one must say loud and clear: 'Down with the monarchy!' and 'Long live the Socialist Republic!' - never forgetting, meanwhile, to give and receive support from the rest of the workers' movement, in Europe and the world.

J. POSADAS

8.6.1975