BOSSES’ MARKET
BOSSES’ BRITAIN
NO CHOICE
DON’T VOTE!

ON JUNE 5th, the great flood of confused, repetitious argument about the Common Market will finally reach its climax.

Should Britain stay in the economic alliance through which the capitalist classes of the EEC hope to g. a wider ‘home market’ and build up larger economic units the better to compete with US and Japanese capitalism?

Or should Britain attempt a different policy — turning to different economic alliances (with non-EEC European nations, with the Commonwealth, with the USA), or less likely, to protectionism?

These questions have been looked at again and again from the angle of ‘what is best for Britain’. While many have claimed to speak for the interests of the working class, the British working class has no interest in helping British capitalists to undo other capitalists; we have every interest in following the elementary socialist principle ‘workers of the world unite’.

From that angle both the alternatives, in or out, are to be opposed. Neither a capitalist Britain inside the EEC nor a capitalist Britain outside the EEC offers any basic advantage to workers. We should abstain on June 5th and fight for the international workers’ unity which will be necessary in or out of the EEC.

Almost all the bigger and more vigorous capitalist interests favour staying in the EEC. But in the working class movement, other than the most direct spokesmen of those capitalist interests (people like Jenkins, Healey, Wilson), support a Yes vote.

Workers’ unity

There are a few who argue that the EEC could give better chances for international workers’ unity. Possibly greater economic integration will give greater opportunities for revolutionaries to get the idea of setting up things like international combine committees more easily accepted. But at the same time the EEC will probably mean greater attempts by capitalists on a European scale to divide workers, and it will not in the least help unity between European workers and the working people of Africa and Asia.

One imperialist alignment rather than another means no automatic benefits for workers’ unity. In the ‘Vote No’ camp, by contrast, we find the great majority of the labour movement, together with a few Trotskyites and the National Front. Paradoxically, however, it is the attitude, the traditions, and the prejudices of the right wing — the most bone-headed, backward looking elements of the right wing, that dominate in the No camp.

The fundamental driving idea of the ‘Vote No’ campaign is the wish to keep foreigners from meddling in “our” British state. This idea is completely nonsensical, since Britain, like every other advanced capitalism, is closely intertwined with the world economy, and cannot be independent. More important, the idea is totally reactionary. Socialists have always argued that workers must strive to unite internationally (socialism cannot be built in one country alone) and must regard ‘our’ national capitalist class as our worst enemy, our main enemy, because it faces us most directly.

To argue otherwise is to fall for the poison of “national interest”, replacing class struggle with the sicking off of the working proletariat.

This fundamental ‘Vote No’ argument comes in a bewildering variety of forms. We should be able to point out the worst of the lot — usually the Trotskyites or the more ‘revolutionary’ Marxist plunage. Most popular is the rallying cry to defend “our”
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diversity and sovereignty against the Brussels bureaucracy. The EEC’s "revolutionary left" take up this cry in the form of dire warnings about the "strong European" and its devastating effects of Europe-wide concentration of capital.

Here comes a strange sight! The anti-EEC left proclaim themselves ready to smash capitalism at a stroke, but in practice they emerge out in the British cockpit—but for now they are white at the gills and terrified of being seen in the face of this mighty EEC "capitalist con spiracy". (And at the same time the left from the Market tyrants, they talk piebaldly about a "socialist Europe". How, in the past process, a 'No' vote helps a socialist Europe, they never say.) But what a tragic illusion of this 'super-state'? The infamous Brussels bureaucracy has a social democratic heart, much more power than the British Department of Health and Social Security!

**Diversion**

Socialists should oppose capital ism whether in Brussels or Whitehall—and fight instead for workers control and a whole new social relations thing on the conveniently vague and distant horizon. But this bogeysman can be regarded as a diversion from effective class struggle. Against this, we can organise not a fight for higher wages rising automatically with the cost of living, but a fight for "Get Britain Out!". Against unemployment, the answer becomes, no factory occupations and a fight for work or full pay and nationalisation without compensation, but voting 'No' on June 5th. (The major results of the anti-EEC hullabaloo is that leaders like Benn and Foot and the others, while demanding a vote for the workers' cause in the class struggle, are also using their reputation by their national demagogy against the EEC. And the revolutionary left have helped them in this.

Somehow, the 'left' keep insisting that the EEC is a "super-international working class struggle". If we can block the centralisation and concentration of capital represented by the EEC—every one of the anti-EC Marxist leaders there is a nationalist gut reaction. Beneath all the sophistry about thwarting the bosses, one simple notion that things will be all right if only we can be left to fight it out in Britain without foreign interference. The Parliamentarians fear that legislating socialism is against the rules of the EEC as if it isn't against the rules of the British State, not to mention being against the laws of the bosses.

And the 'revolutionsaries' feel that outside the EEC, we are safe from outside physical intervention. Oh, strange such fantasies in the face of this class's clinging to the rules of cricket!

**Social Contract**

The real struggle involved in the EEC debate is not a fight of the right wing 'Yes', against the left wing 'No'. Those who are 'left' are really thought of as the 'left' are more right wing than the right wing on this question.

The 'No' campaign does not stand alone, but leads left wing ideas, left wing measures, which are the ones which is enable species such as Social Capitalism to maintain itself, a left wing image on the basis of nothing.

"One of the arguments against having any truck with the opposition to the Common Market is that after entry, working class defence against any attacks by the ruling class will be impossible. The Common Market itself being the cause of the pressures on the working class. Conditions which are quite likely to be as bad outside as financially, if not more than, under capitalism. The typical petit bourgeois confusion of the Communist Party would have a natural breeding ground among workers who would be confused into a 'Get Britain Out' campaign."

From IS & The Common Market, published as a document inside the IS group in 1971 by the Trotskyist Tendency, forerunner of WORKERS FIGHT!

---

**Against the tide**

NEARLY all the papers and periodicals of the Working Class, Socialist Worker, Workers Press, Red Workers Society, the Trotskyist - wherever they have been campaigning hard for a NO vote. WORKERS FIGHT have been doing their best, and not always without success. They have things entirely their own way.

Moreover, it is known that the Trades Union Congress is opposed to the EEC, and that the TUC has asked for an extensive membership of the EEC to be withdrawn by the February 1972 deadline. It is strongly believed that the TUC will use this argument to get the state to intervene in the EEC debate.

One problem with this argument is that it contradicts the line put out by many of the Labour left, for example by the Communist Party, who say that the British capitalist economy is suffering from the EEC, and that leaving would be much more prosperous outside. The evidence, however, is that the British Labour Left is divided into two groups, and that the point and the anti-EEC revolutionaries are just as much against the EEC as the Labour Left.

But the basic laws of development of capitalism cannot be abolished by voting 'No'. Once capitalism continues, so also will the international centralisation and concentration of capital continue.

---

**Smaller units**

In the unlikely event of a majority voting 'No', the British capitalist government will not be content to achieve a mere "inclusion of the workers". They will insist on an attempt to "create" a new CBI, perhaps a "British version of the EEC". The British working class will... continue a struggle against the small and the concentrated.
No, it wouldn’t be the end of the world...

The debate between supporters and opponents of the Common Market has turned, among other things, on the effect on Britain of a so-called "Norway plus" arrangement. The opponents claim that the introduction of "Norway plus" would be disastrous for Britain. The supporters believe that it would be beneficial...

In this context, it is important to consider the views of the proponents of the Common Market. They argue that it would provide a number of benefits, including increased trade and economic growth. However, opponents of the Common Market argue that it would lead to higher prices for British consumers and a loss of national sovereignty...

TheCommon Market is a complex issue, and the views of both proponents and opponents are valid. It is important to consider the long-term effects of any decision before making a final determination. In the end, the decision will likely depend on a variety of factors, including economic conditions, political considerations, and public opinion...
WHAT DO European revolutionaries think of the chauvinist anti-EEC urge which is now thundering through the movement? What do they think of the fact that the revolutionary group, one after another, has joined the European anti-EEC chorus?

We have been watching how the views of the French Trotskyists have developed on the capitulation to British chauvinism by the British International Socialists (IS). The IS has made the usual, pro-British statement about the issue, but it has also maintained some fringe righthanders who are talking about lynching IS itself. LO itself has been keeping a low profile, but it did issue a leaflet criticizing IS in May. LO has been heavily criticized for this in France, and even in IS itself.

The British Labour movement is divided on the question of whether Britain should remain in the Common Market. The Labour Party is split with the left calling for a referendum, while the right continues to support the government. The Trades Union Congress has decided to support the government's position.

The real problem is that the workers refuse to participate in the vote. Whatever the result, it can only serve the political interests of the government, and at the same time enable the Labour Party to left to restore its image as an opposition. This is not the case taken by the comrades of International Socialists. They have chosen to wage a campaign to vote NO. In this way, they have joined the positions of the Labour Party and trade-union left. The latter, like the Communist Party, use every demagogic argument they can to defend the interests of the workers. They thus, the 'National Front' which is out of a just struggle to prevent the social fascism and its fascist message to be received in the army of the Bourgeoisie and the trade-union movement to demonstate a solid and spectacula opposition concerning a matter of social revolution. This is also the case of the IS, which has recently started a campaign to fight for an alternative to the Labour government.
"Abstentions carried" the convened solver

TOM looked up from his machine and listened slightly puzzled, as the sound of silence slowly fell from the meeting. The atmosphere was charged. Everyone was quiet. Everyone breathed heavily. He sat there in silence for perhaps another two minutes. The silence was too long.

"OK, brothers and sisters, let me have your attention, please. The convention is underway. Let me have attention, please. The convention is underway. What do we do?" he asked, as he got settled with a cup of tea, rummaging through his stack of papers. He gazed around the table, as if trying to find some clue to his next move. He looked at the faces before him, as if searching for a sign of support.

"TOM sat back with a frown."

Not a hand was raised. That, anyhow, put the situation to the test. "All in favour of the motion?" he asked, as the convention was raised. "Abstentions?" asked the solver, "I don't know."

The room was silent. The room was silent. The room was silent. The room was silent. The room was silent.

TOM looked at the local Labour leaders. There was a hush, but it was broken. The room was alive with the sound of voices. "Two MPs were staying in the other side of NO. TOM sat back in the room and looked around to see who he knew. He noticed 10 people from the room talking, but he couldn't hear what they were saying."

The meeting started, and both the speakers said something about the best way to deal with the situation. One said that prices would have gone up out of the Market. The other said, they would have gone up even higher. One said that prices would have gone up, even more would have been out of a job. As TOM sat back, they were both just guessing, and he knew that the best way to save jobs was to fight for a Labour government, but the best way to deal with inflation was to stay where they were.

Tom sat back with a frown. "The Market solver dwelt a lot on the remote benefits of the 'NO' on the 'loss of British sovereign power and making for more marginals' for the bigger firms. All these countries had had their doubts. The local government had had more tied up in red tape concerning the situation, and they had been fast to fight for better working conditions and they were in a hurry to stop the workers striking out of the Big Creep."

The meeting ended, and both the speakers said something about the best way to deal with the situation. One said that prices would have gone up out of the Market. The other said, they would have gone up even higher. One said that prices would have gone up, even more would have been out of a job. As TOM sat back, they were both just guessing, and he knew that the best way to save jobs was to fight for a Labour government, but the best way to deal with inflation was to stay where they were.

Tom sat back with a frown. "The Market solver dwelt a lot on the remote benefits of the 'NO' on the 'loss of British sovereign power and making for more marginals' for the bigger firms. All these countries had had their doubts. The local government had had more tied up in red tape concerning the situation, and they had been fast to fight for better working conditions and they were in a hurry to stop the workers striking out of the Big Creep."
ARMED FORCES CONTROL TIGHTENS IN PORTUGAL

SOME OF the facts are now clearer about the slaughters in the Algarve on Friday, when five CP members were killed. Apparently the demand of the two armed groups was for "military justice" for CP members; in fact, one of the leaders of the armed groups, Lourenco, has more influence than the CP leader. Another leader of the armed groups, Pastor, was killed over the paper originally in circulation: "The genuine workers' government will become a pawn in the CP-BP-MP game."

But the question of 'Republica' seems to have been totally submerged by the general political crisis. The Armed Forces Movement is increasingly taking the role of the leaders; they have ended their rounds of meetings which they had planned for the past month; they have suspended their party's debate, so that they could certainly be a step away from the movement. In wider sections of the population, the movement seems to be spreading.

Whatever it or not this turns out to be the case depends largely on the ability of strikers to fight for a real understanding of their struggle.

The LABOUR MOVEMENT continues to be weakened. Troops Out Movement, held in London on Saturday, May 24th, was described by the organiser of the largest demonstration ever in Britain on the streets of London, as "the last major demonstration" attended by some 500 people. The National Executive Committee of the Labour Party has yet to delegate from trade union to trade union, to fight for what they really mean. This movement has a policy which could certainly offer a step forward in a real discussion of the situation.

The organising committee of the BNCC has published a statement on the British Labour Movement. The people of the British Labour Movement are striking for the second time this month. The statement has been prepared by a group of workers and trade unionists who are participating in the movement.

Not only was Abbe not denounced, but the question of "Troops Out" demand was again discussed. The ABF, led by Gary Lawlor, defends the "Troops Out" demand that the government abandon its policy of "military justice" for CP members. The ABF is playing a key role in the movement.

Paddy Prendergast said that the movement was trying to widen the scope of its activities. "We have not done anything to stop the movement. (I) have no idea what is happening. I am aware of the activities of the French people, including the new movement in Brittany."

In response to this statement, the organiser of the British Labour Movement has said that "Troops Out" demand is not being abandoned. The ABF is fighting for the right of the workers to have their voices heard in the British Labour Movement.

The British Labour Movement is a mass movement of workers and trade unionists who are fighting for their rights. The movement has been growing rapidly in recent weeks.

FIGHT FLOPS WITHOUT FILE AND RANK ACTION

As militants in the Chapel have decided to call off the strike, the official wage and redundancy are negotiated by the South Lancashire Newspapers as good as lost, on account of the failure of the Chapel to come to agreement on file action.

All the letters of closure of one of the SLN's weekly papers carried on the 15th, the NUJ responded by a letter to the Press Association, demanding that the Press Association should be in charge of a national redundancy scheme and that the Press Association should be in charge of a national redundancy scheme.

The THE STRIKER strike committee is determined to continue until the new conditions are met. The NUJ has committed itself to a four-firm policy of stoppages, where one has a stoppage on getting to and from a N.W.

NORTHAMPTON Workers' Fight meeting on the Wednesday and Thursday, Tuesday 3rd June, at the Civic Hall, The Avenue, Northampton, off the Kettering Road.

NOTTINGHAM Workers' Fight meeting on the Wednesday and Thursday, Tuesday 3rd June, at the Civic Hall, The Avenue, Northampton, off the Kettering Road.

NATIONAL ABORTION CAMPAIGN meeting on the Wednesday and Thursday, Tuesday 3rd June, at the Jeannette Hall, The Avenue, Northampton. Speakers: Broadside and the NUJ.

MANCHESTER National Abortion Campaign meeting on the Wednesday and Thursday, Tuesday 3rd June, at the Jeannette Hall, The Avenue, Northampton. Speakers: Broadside and the NUJ.
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