

# MILITANT

FOR LABOUR AND YOUTH

VIETNAM  
MASSACRES  
p. 2  
TEACHERS  
STRIKE  
p. 4

QUEEN,  
CRUSHED  
BY POVERTY  
AND CROWN-  
JEWELS

See p. 3



NUMBER 56

DECEMBER 1959

SIXPENCE

# LOW-PAID: ACTION NOT WORDS

By BOB FAULKES (E.P.T.U.)

When Jack Jones, General Secretary of the Transport & General Workers Union, addressed the largest management conference in this country consisting of 1,300 delegates to the Institute of Personnel Management, one could imagine the uneasy feeling in the audience when he said: "I detect a real mood of rebellion among groups both in private industry and public services who have been regarded as low-wage." ("Financial Times", 13/10/69). The mood of rebellion has now burst into open revolt.

The example was given in the "Sunday Times" (16/11/69) of a town hall watchman in Liverpool: "For a 50-hour week he takes home only £11.11.1d a week, yet he is being paid more than the minimum rate for watchmen." The almost unbelievable figures published in the "Employment and Productivity Gazette" (October 1969) in a sample survey of low-paid workers working at least 30 hours per week, showed that, despite free board in some cases, tips, etc. some men earned less than £6 a week—caretakers, car park attendants, lavatory attendants, sub post masters, and a sandwich-course student ("with free board"). The sample taken for women earning under £6 was even larger—trainee nurses, cleaners, clerks, sub post mistresses, to give but a few examples. Such cases no doubt could be repeated a million times over.

With the victory of the Fords machinists last year, the revolt of the lower-paid has really begun to snowball. Little wonder then that, shaken by these upheavals, "The Times" (18/11/69) said: "Now that the ambulance men, dustmen, miners, and firemen have driven a coach and horses through public policy" (should read P.I.B.) "the teachers want a crack of the whip."

## TWO STANDARDS

But when it comes to their own class, how different is the tune! In a "Sunday Times" article last year ("Directors on the Breadline" or the "Savoy Grill Hunger March", shown in a cartoon accompanying) the author, Keith Richardson, reveals the heartrending story: "Although I know the chairman of one of the biggest companies who swears that without his wife's money he would not be able to send his children to university without taking a cut in his standard of living." But the pay of this board-room pauper was £7000 a year, or "£140 a week take-home pay, ten times as much as a manual worker." With effort one manages to hold back the tears and wonder how many workers wouldn't mind staggering through the week on this sum!

Even the Labour leaders' statistics reveal the terrible plight of the low-paid: "That ten per cent of all male adults earn less than £15 per week is significant in that it represented in 1968 the calculated requirements of a family with two children and an average rent to keep them at the supplementary benefit standard of living." (Labour Party N.E.C.'s "Agenda for

CONTINUED ON PAGE 4



Italian workers challenge state-power

## Italy: Biggest General Strike in history!

By JULIAN SILVERMAN (N. St. Pancras L.P.)

The fantastic determination of the industrial workers of Italy is drawing behind it all sections of the working population and causing havoc in the chambers of the ruling circles.

The "hot autumn", which world big-business had been dreading, started with a vengeance on 1st. September itself. To back up the wage demands as new contracts of employment started to be renegotiated the workers in Fiat, Turin staged a massive demonstration. Police thuggery caused a riot, and the management sent 30,000 workers home on half-pay. Immediately the whole of Italy was ablaze. 1 million car and metal workers began a series of national and regional stoppages. They were joined by gas workers, 900,000 building workers, 200,000 chemical and pharmaceutical workers, 40,000 cement workers, brick workers. 2,500,000 were out in one week.

12,000 strikers were locked out of the Pirelli Rubber factory in Milan. They occupied the works, and the whole of Milan came out the next day in sympathy.

In Rome 100,000 hovel-dwellers from catacombs used by the early Christians and shanty towns comparable to the worst infested African townships took over prominent long-empty big-business property in the centre of town. When the council persisted in doing nothing except threaten evictions, they publicly burnt their huts to the ground, to force the authorities at least to provide water, electricity etc. for a start, and to give them no legal case for evictions.

During the last week in October the postal workers and newspaper workers came out. Together with the industrial workers, the tram and busmen, there were a total of 3 million on strike. A national strike of railwaymen was called off when the cabinet immediately conceded all their demands at a cost of £19 million.

All along the line, the bosses and the government have been forced to yield concessions. After massive demonstrations, a year's rent-freeze was enacted. The confidence of the workers has been rising. Strikes have been virtually 100% solid throughout Italy. The demands amount to a 35% wage increase, the right to meetings and union activity during working hours, more holidays to give a working year of 234 days. All the demands are completely justified in Italy's booming economy where profits have been mounting at an unprecedented rate.

The Italian workers have suffered from the lowest wage-rate in the Common Market. The cost of living shot up 60% since 1953. The economic "miracle" floated over the heads of millions of workers. Now action is uniting them against their enemies.

The strike-wave up to the end of October meant 249.7 million hours "lost" (compare this with the 32 million or so in Britain complained at in the Government's White Paper on Industrial Relations). These figures, in any case, do not include the extra 160 million hours lost to the profiteers during the General Strike on 19th. Nov.! The Rome newspaper "Il Tempo" said, "This is a record no people will take from us, unless they have a revolution."

Action is seen to pay off. "The extremists have achieved huge results..." wrote the "Sunday Times" (23 Nov.) "...their pay-claims in industry have forced the orthodox unions to bid up their own claims, and there has been a pace-setting round of pay settlements at around 30%". The November General Strike won an immediate increase in housing funds. The police themselves, low-paid, and—many of them—"immigrant" peasants from the starving South, are in turmoil. They are

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3

## Militant is worth fighting for!

MILITANT was the only paper to give full coverage and support to the Derry Labour Party's correct international stand on the events in Northern Ireland.

Our shop steward supporters on Merseyside and in GEEC were able to give up to the minute information on the cynical moves of Weistock and his sacking plans.

If this is to continue and MILITANT's role is to be further developed, the paper must expand. In October/November, magnificent donations of £20 from Paul Orton (Nottingham LP), £5 from an ETU member in Hackney CLP, amongst others, were received, for which we thank supporters.

**SEND YOUR DONATION NOW!!**  
..... to MILITANT,  
197 Kings Cross Rd., London, W.C.1.

### MILITANT PRESS FUND ANNUAL DRAW

The Draw took place on 1 November 1969 at 197, Kings Cross Road, London W.C.1. The results were as follows:—

#### PRIZE

1. Luxury Portable Record Player  
D. G. Malcolm, 11, Windmill Rd., Glasgow, S.3.
2. Tan Hide Document Case  
B. Costello, 444, Kenley Close, Sheil Rd., Liverpool, 6.
3. Franz Mehring's "Karl Marx"  
Wally Dewsnii 14, Carmarthen Str., Gloucester
4. Haig Scotch Whisky  
C. Crackett, 217, Carter's Mead, Harlow, Essex
5. Leather Wallet  
I. Gregory, 44, Pendle Rd., Manchester M34 1BB



"Green Berets" (Above). Their murder of an "oriental human-being" has led to the revelation of further outrages.

## MASSACRES: IMPERIALISM UNMASKED

By DAVE GALLASHAN (Cardiff L.P.)

The allegation that a US infantry unit massacred 567 men, women and children at "Pinkville" in Vietnam is another addition to the bloody history of Imperialism in its suppression of the struggle of the world's workers and peasants for liberation from the poverty and corruption of landlordism and capitalism. This incident should not obscure the fact that it is only one amongst many others perpetrated in the name of "keeping Vietnam safe for Democracy"—the type of democracy which characterises American support to every type of reactionary regime under the sun from Latin America to the Middle East. It has been a common practice in Vietnam to exterminate "suspect" villages with shelling. It is even admitted that the National Liberation Front enjoy the mass support of the villagers, particularly in the central region of Vietnam where the massacre occurred. There is even a computer used to sort out which are the best villages to exterminate and the amount of bombs to be used. The High Command in Vietnam is reported to be thinking in terms of using a computer in order to "eliminate" 33,000 individual Vietnamese civilians who are determined—by the computer—to be Vietcong sympathisers! (Sunday Times 23/11/69) Yet another device which could help mankind so much is cynically used to bring about destruction.

As if to confirm the ruthless cynicism with which the capitalist system accepts war as a naturally occurring event, George Brown steps in and lets the cat out of the bag again by saying that the Americans "should stop weeping and get on with winning the war." He also stated that he doubted whether Britain's military history is entirely free from the stains of atrocities. He is dead right about the latter. Back in the early 1950's, British Imperialism was offering bounties for the heads of resistance fighters in Malaya. The death pangs of the same colonialism was marked by the slaughter of Indian workers on strikes and demonstrations.

The massacre has been passed off by Brown as the inevitable consequences of war. The excuse is made that, after all, the American soldier cannot distinguish between an ordinary peasant (adult or child!) and the N.L.F. This testifies still further to the mass backing for the N.L.F. But it also raises the question why the American soldier is put in such a position in the first place. The vast majority of the Vietnamese people do not want American Imperialism in Vietnam. The wearing of black

armbands by G.I.s who are against the war,—the refusal of some units to fight and the tremendous demoralisation of American troops generally—the 36 million people who supported the first moratorium—all this shows that a large section of the American people do not want them there either.

Imperialism normally finds it impossible to employ the ordinary soldier in systematic terror against a native population. For this task they need special detachments made up of S.S. scum elements. It is a measure of the brutalising effect of this war that a small proportion of G.I.s could sink to the bestial level which made the "Pinkville" massacre and the equally horrendous Hill 192 possible. That it is only a minority of thugs in uniform is testified to by the subsequent revelation of these incidents by ordinary American soldiers who were horrified by what they saw. They came forward in some cases at the risk of a bullet in the back from those implicated in these massacres. The blame must be put clearly on the cause of the war in the first place—the deliberate attempts of Imperialism to prevent the tide of revolution from spreading any further.

The Labour Government still give their support to the war in Vietnam. Wilson, has expressed his concern at the stories of the atrocities. After the shameful record of the Government's support of the war, it would be naive, to say the least, to think that they would suffer much loss of sleep over it. The whole significance of the incident receiving such belated publicity at the present time, is a reflection both of the tremendous opposition to the war in America itself and the coming victory of the Vietnamese workers and peasants. The Labour Government has refused to make any attacks at all on the capitalist system at home and their attitude to the Vietnam war is an extension of this policy abroad. By refusing to take on the capitalist class they are forced, to bow to its pressure and attack the workers by means of its Incomes Policy—the same logic forces them to support the suppression of the workers and peasants of Vietnam. The left M.P.s confuse the issue when they portray Brown's speech as some form of moral lapse. Brown simply recognised what other more 'moral' supporters of Imperialism do not want to recognise—that in a savage, unpopular and demoralising war of oppression, such as this one,—Capitalism cannot avoid resorting to the most dirty methods. It is inconsis-

ent to condemn the methods without condemning the aims, and the whole system.

Imperialism's most notable representatives can offer mankind no release from this terror. If Imperialism is not removed then, in the cold sombre words of Robert McNamara, America's "greatest" Defence Secretary:

"Man has lived now for more than 20 years in what we have come to call the atomic age. What we sometimes overlook is that every future age of man will be an atomic age. If, then, man is to have a future at all, it will have to be a future overshadowed with the permanent possibility of thermo-nuclear holocaust." Evening Standard 19/11/69.

Another excuse is the alleged equally brutal approach of the forces of the N.L.F. Of course there has also been indiscriminate killings by some sections of the N.L.F. But this has been caused by the daily terror to which the mass of the Vietnamese workers and peasants are subjected. Napalm, anti-personnel bombs, bullets which explode on impact and blow holes a foot wide in a man are just some of the measures employed to defeat the struggle of the peasants for the land. Is it any wonder that sometimes in blind fury the peasant has reacted with the same methods as his persecutors? But this should not obscure who is responsible: Imperialism and its support for the suppression of the centuries-long struggle of the peasants for the land. At the same time it has to be recognised that George Brown and the Labour leaders are themselves in no position to condemn the nationalist limitations of the Vietnamese Revolution, which sometimes expresses itself in individual terror. A real movement for socialism in Britain and the advanced industrial countries would link the struggles of the colonial masses to a democratic socialist network of states and look forward to a Socialist Federation. And the main reason why this has already not come about is the refusal of the workers' political representatives to give this lead in the advanced countries.

No amount of apologies will cover up the bloodstained history of Imperialism. But we must realise that war is not an incidental misfortune of the human race; it is a necessary part of the capitalist system. No amount of pious phrases should blur the fact that the best help we can give to the workers and peasants struggling against Imperialism is to fight for a socialist change in Britain.

## DISCUSSION ARTICLE FROM A 'SOCIALIST CHARITIST'

HUGH ANDERSON

Last year's Labour Party mid-term Manifesto was, after all the expectations, pathetic. Perhaps that was all one could expect from an N.E.C. dominated by ministers more interested in vindicating the Government than analysing the causes of their failures. The various recent policy documents are only a marginal improvement. With the exception of the timid, inadequate, but important proposals on taxing wealth, the N.E.C. have opted for platitudes rather than honest examination. Despite a few new ideas, the documents are intellectually bankrupt. They make no contribution to the fundamental problem facing the Labour Movement today: until this central problem is faced and a solution found, no amount of clever reforms will be of much importance.

This central dilemma—stripped of its inessentials—is how this country can pursue a socialist policy within the context of an international monetary system based on capitalism and capitalist values. Rephrased, in language more familiar to the Government, the dilemma can be put as how we can immediately pursue expansionist economic policy, and a generous social policy, when we are—to a large degree—in the control of a capitalist class, who believe in deflation and cuts in public expenditure. The last five years have shown the impossibility of pursuing even revisionist ideals, when permission for successive policy options has had to be sought from the I.M.F. Even the most hardened Gaitskellite must doubt whether equality and social justice can ever be achieved when the ultimate control is with those who don't believe in them.

But this belated awareness of the power of international capitalism to prevent even compromised and timid measures of social and economic reform comes at a difficult moment. In the West, Tory economic policies—twice defeated in general elections—have been imposed on the victors by the I.M.F. At the same time, policies of liberalisation and reforms, which had clear mass backing, have been cynically trampled on by Stalinist military power in another Eastern European country. It appears that neo-imperialism is sufficiently entrenched in both West and East that moves towards human socialism in any country are to be prevented, whatever the extent of popular support. The policies of the USSR clearly rule out any simple transfer of trade, loyalty and alliance from NATO to the Warsaw Pact. Developments in Stalinist countries are no more encouraging than developments among capitalist nations. There is no solution there.

But, faced with this dilemma, the attitude of the traditional left seems to be pitifully inadequate. Horrified at once by the realisation of the power of capitalism to make a Labour Government betray its cautiously expansionist and reformist policies, and by a further indication of the tyranny at the heart of Stalinism, they have sunk back into a defeatist pose. Whenever anything happens they "protest", but the urgency of the dilemma demands something more. There is some truth in Wilson's charge that the left are frightened of power: they would rather protest at someone else's use of it. The traditional recipe both for purity and ineffectiveness has far too wide support.

So also does the anarchism into which many younger socialists have retreated. Regular protests at successive, predictable betrayals are no worse than a general naive rejection of "the system". Marcuse's latest ex-

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3

## ITALY

(CONTINUED FROM P. 1)

split into the hawks, who want to "have a go" at the 20 million, and those, who are becoming increasingly drawn into the general revolt themselves. The near-riot among the Milan police brought tear-gas attacks from one section of the force on to another. One result will at least be a short sharp rise in police pay!

The leaders of the T.U.'s have been shocked into activity. It is openly admitted that none of them was seeking this strike-wave. They have been forced to head it off for fear of being outflanked by the numerous left groups springing up throughout industry. Even the car and metal workers are only 15% unionised. Instead of going all out for a clear alternative programme on socialist lines, they have preferred to spend the militancy in 24 hour stoppages, strikes in one area, successive strikes in one industry on different days during the week, hour-long token stoppages. But all these different upheavals are part of one tremendous movement to change society, which is beginning to sweep throughout Europe and the World. Even the massive gains made by the workers will be corroded away so long as capitalism remains. Already top generals are preparing for a coup at some future date, when the left wing parties will have demonstrated their inability either to "make capitalism work", or to create a planned socialist economy, which could provide the way out from the present morass.

Big business is furious with the Minister of Labour, Cattin, for appearing more militant than even the "Communist" Union leaders, and thus goading them further left. The secretary of the ruling party, the Christian Democrats, has resigned. The dominant grouping within the party has split asunder. There seems no doubt that the government will collapse for the second time during a matter of months. The traditional ruling parties of big-business are unable to govern. As the Times (24/10/69) puts it, the collapse of Christian Democracy throughout Europe "presents an awkward case" in Italy, "since there is no alternative governing party apart from the Communists."

What a tremendous opportunity for socialists! Every section of the exploited is ready to move as never before. Up to 20 millions have been out at a time—in the biggest general strike in history! The ruling class is unable to govern! All the bourgeois politicians can do is chase one another round in circles, trying to find some form of coalition, which will keep the Communist Party out, knowing as they do, that new elections would only mean a massive growth of the left, as they did earlier this year. All the leaders of the biggest Communist Party in the West can do is half-heartedly beg to be let into a "progressive" "democratic" coalition, to be led, as always, by the representatives of big business. But the big business politicians will not be grateful. They will use the time gained for them by a "Popular Front" interlude to prepare for a massive onslaught on the workers and the left, as happened time and time again in the pre-war period in Europe.

But already the Marxist alternatives for the future are beginning to arise. Within the Communist Party itself there is an official left wing opposition with its own journal "Manifesto". Left wing groupings are arising within the unions, for example: "Potere Operario" ("Workers Power"). Out of the great events that are impending a mass Marxist force can emerge, and the way to socialism can be cleared.

The excuse of the C.P. leaders for their lap-dog cringing is that "nothing should be done to provoke the extreme right".

But the capitalists are understandably very loth to take on the 20 million at present. The more resolute the workers, the more they draw the rest of the exploited population behind them, the less able or willing are the bosses to attempt to go on the offensive. As the "Sunday Times" put it: "The small group of leading industrialists (in private as well as nationalised industry) who hold the key to power in Italy are for the most part solid West European democrats. As one industrialist said... 'We Italians, after all, know what Fascism is, and we don't like it.'"

They should certainly know what it is. They used it once before and they would use it again as a last resort against revolution. But at present there is absolutely no base for such a movement.

Although reaction attempted to crawl out from under the stones—100 thugs in Milan beat up several Maoist students (and one plainclothes policeman attempting to infiltrate them)—nevertheless the "small group of leading industrialists" would be only too pleased to pass through their nightmare peacefully. They are preparing to bank on "the new respectability of the Communists" (Sunday Times", again) whose leaders also seem to yearn for nothing better than a quiet life.

When the C.P. leaders argue that socialism cannot be won without the support of the peasants and the lower middle class, they are correct. But an alliance with the Christian Democrats etc. is an alliance with the worst enemies of these "intermediate" layers. The now higher cost of labour will probably force the monopolies—in their greed for profits—to squeeze out the small capitalists, farmers etc. still further. The same processes are taking place in France, and throughout the Capitalist world. A real alliance with these sections of society could only be forged by supporting their tremendous struggle, and giving it a clear direction. Socialism could guarantee credit and aid to the small man as part of its national plan of production for the needs of the population, and not for the profit of a few. An alliance of all SOCIALIST parties, on a Marxist programme could carry through the massive industrial upheavals to a clear political conclusion. Otherwise the basis for reaction in the future is laid.

hortation to a campaign of "guerrilla warfare" against bourgeois society could not be better designed to provoke a backlash. Personal alienation is no excuse for deliberately alienating others from one's ideas and values. Faced with the same dilemma, anarchist solutions are, objectively, counter-revolutionary and defeatist.

It was to answer this dilemma, yet avoid the pitfalls, that the Socialist Charter was founded. Left M.P.s, perhaps aware of their own ineffectiveness, have sponsored what could emerge as a mass movement to restore the Labour Party to Socialism. It is based on the simple, yet essential awareness that although Labour has been in office for five years, the real power in the country has remained—unchecked—in the hands of the same property owning class. If policies are to change then power must be transferred from the hands of the few to

those of the many. The only possible instrument for doing this is the Labour Movement.

There are, despite the gloom implicit in some earlier remarks, many hopeful signs. The recent T.U.C. Conference demonstrated genuine radicalism in the place of a half-hearted consensus view. The Left-wing leadership in the T.&G.W.U., A.E.F., and others, offer hope of the effective control of the Labour Movement by both Socialist policies and a militant working class. The role for the Charter is obvious: to fight for the success of left-wing ideas and people in a Labour Movement in which much is now possible. The Charter has the broad backing and correct analysis which are essential for this. It now needs the support of anyone sharing its hopes and analysis.

(This is a discussion article. A reply will be in the next issue.)

## Monarchy: Weapon of the Boss-Class

By PETER TAAFFE

Hot on the heels of the dustmen, fireman, and the miners, in November the Monarchy also pitched in with a "wage claim". Led by "finger out" Phillip the working people have been treated to a sorry tale of woe as to the parlous circumstances of the Queen and her family. Aided by the press and television, it has been hinted that the "Duke" might have to cut down on polo, which would mean that he would be idle for nine months in a year instead of six. Worst of all has been the prospect of the Royals by sheer penury being driven from Buckingham Castle to the modest palaces of Balmoral or Sandringham. But in the welter of tear jerking appeals and "reasoned" appeals by the capitalist press on behalf of the monarchy enough has been revealed to demonstrate the blatant hypocrisy of this latest campaign.

The immediate cause of the latest "wage claim" has been the Civil List given by Parliament to the Royal parasites. This comes to £475,000 a year. In addition £168,000 is yearly doled out to the Queen's immediate family. This has to be added to the expenditure borne by the State for the seven palaces (how many homeless or working class kids denied university places could be accommodated from this), the yearly £½ million for the Royal Yacht, £½ million for the seven "Royal" aircraft etc. Added to this are the massive amounts laid out by the Ministry of Building and Public Works to maintain the Royal estates.

But what has been conspicuously ignored by the popular press is the extent of the Monarchy's massive income. This arises from investments made by Queen Victoria, which she was only able to make by means of the free gifts of the State to her. Today this has resulted in the piling up of a massive fortune for the "Royals"; it is estimated that the assets of the Queen amounts to at least £60 million. This has allowed her to amass a collection of 20,000 paintings, and a stamp collection worth £1 million. After all everybody should have a hobby! Which brings us to the Duke's favourite sport, polo. It has been estimated that he could "save" £1,000 a year by cutting down on his polo! What a terrible mockery of the miserable lot of the pensioner, and the sick—forced to scrape along on a pittance! Perhaps this was why the Old Age Pensioners answered the Duke's appeal by sending him 70 packets of polo mints!

Many Labour MPs have quite correctly reacted by denouncing this latest effrontery of the supporters of the Monarchy in the face of the poverty and deprivation, which scars the lives of millions of pensioners and low paid workers. But what has been lost in the furore is the whole social role of the Monarchy in Britain today.

The capitalists have not maintained the trappings of the Monarchy merely for decoration. Theirs is a conscious political policy. One of the strategists of the capitalists in the nineteenth century WALTER BAGEHOT, clearly set out their purpose in maintaining this feudal relic. In his book on the ENGLISH CONSTITUTION he states... "The use of the Queen, in a dignified capacity is incalculable. Without her in England, the present English Government would fail and pass away" p82. While in present conditions this might be an exaggeration, nevertheless Bagehot's attitude to working class is secretly not very different from that of the capitalists today, and his fears are also theirs... "We have in a great community like England crowds of people scarcely more civilised than the majority of two thousand years ago". This in turn leads him to assert that one of the means of keeping this "crowd" (that is the working class) in check is the Monarchy. A deferential attitude towards the monarchy is to be encouraged... "A family on the throne is an interesting idea also. It brings down the pride of sovereignty to the level of petty life. No feeling could seem more childish than the enthusiasm of the English at the marriage of the Prince of Wales... They treated as a great political event what, looked at as a matter of pure business, was very small indeed... The women—one half of the human race at least—care fifty times more for a marriage than a ministry. A princely marriage is the brilliant edition of a universal fact, and, as such, it rivets mankind". It is almost as if Bagehot were speaking of the recent investiture of the Prince of Wales, which was designed for the same purpose, and also to counter the growth of Welsh nationalism. But the real purpose of the monarchy is underlined by Bagehot, when he states "...The nation is divided into parties, but the crown is of no party". In other words the idea that the Monarchy is above the class struggle is deliberately encouraged in the minds of sections of politically backward workers and the middle class. And for what purpose? "...The king too possesses a power, according to theory, for extreme use on a critical occasion, but which he can in law use, on any occasion. He can dissolve; he can say to his Minister, in fact, if not in words, 'This Parliament sent you here, but I will see if I cannot get another Parliament to send someone else here'" (Our emphasis). Bagehot cynically underlines here the role, which the capitalists have marked out for the Monarchy, and the House of Lords,—an extra parliamentary weapon, to be used against the Labour Movement, in the event of a crisis which threatens their power. Although Bagehot wrote these lines over a 100 years ago, they are as applicable today as they were then. The Government is still in theory "Her Majesty's", the Queen is privy to Cabinet decisions and discussions, and she still in theory appoints and dismisses Governments. Although this power is mainly latent, it can be imagined how it can be used, and "constitutionally justified" by the "experts" if, for instance, a Labour Government were to propose the nationalisation of a profitable industry as opposed to those ruined sections, which are normally taken over. As in 1926 they would declare war against the Labour Movement, and one of their weapons will be the Monarchy and the House of Lords.

Instead of tinkering with the Monarchy through "select committees" etc. the Labour Leaders should be explaining its role, and campaigning for its abolition. The re-inforcing of the Monarchy by the Labour leaders, is preparing a trap for the Labour Movement in the future. The cries of poverty by the Duke should be taken as a declaration of bankruptcy, and the Royalty should be put out of the abject misery once and for all by reducing them to ordinary citizens; This step combined with the expropriation of the capitalists is the way to answer their plans for dealing with the Labour Movement in the future.

## Read the Militant

