

# The Week

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS  
Vol. 4, No. 18. 11th November, 1965

6<sup>D</sup>

- THE "CAMPAIGN FOR SOCIALISM"
- LETTER FROM CUBA
- THE DRIVER'S LOT
- FOUNDRY WORKERS ANGRY
- THE CENTRE FOR SOCIALIST EDUCATION GOES AHEAD

# STEEL: NOT WHEN BUT WHETHER

**Sponsors:** Frank Allaun, M.P. - Perry Anderson - Chris Arthur - Julian Atkinson - Michael Barratt Brown - Norman Buchan, M.P. - Neil Carmichael, M.P. - Raymond Challinor - Henry Collins - Lawrence Daly - John Daniels - Peggy Duff - Ray Gosling - Richard Fletcher - Trevor Griffiths - Eric Heffer, M.P. - Ellis Hillman - Dave Lambert - Ralph Miliband - Stan Mills - Jim Mortimer - Tom Nairn - Dick Nettleton - Stan Newens, M.P. - John Rex - Ernie Roberts - Alan Rooney - David Steele - Professor E. A. Thompson - E. P. Thompson - Tony Topham - William Warbey, M.P. - Raymond Williams - Bert Wynn - Konni Zilliacus, M.P. - Robin Blackburn - Ken Coates - Chris Farley - Ralph Schoenman - Eric Varley, M.P. - Earl Russell, O.M. - Malcolm Caldwell - Tony Brewer

54 Park Road, Lenton, Nottingham

Subscription: £2 per annum and pro rata

Contents

PAGE	1	Editorial.
"	2	C.S.E. goes ahead.
"	3	After the Bristol docks' strike.
"	4	Foundry Workers say "get off our backs".
"	5	The Campaign for Socialism.
"	6	Those "elections" in Portugal.
"	7	American authorities Versus a G.I. refusing to fight in Vietnam.
"	8	Letter from Cuba.
"	9	U.S. capital infiltrates West Germany.
"	10	Preobranshenski's Ghost.
"	11	"The Young Socialists - Labour's Lost Youth"
"	12	The driver's lot.

NOT "WHEN" BUT "WHETHER"

Steel nationalisation, whilst not dropped from the Labour Party programme, will be like a mirage, ever on the horizon but ever out of reach. Who wrote this? some cynical leftwinger, after Blackpool? No! this was written by The Times in a first editorial on the Monday the Blackpool Conference opened. The piece was entitled "Entirely free of socialism" - a statement which has been echoed in Parliament by the Liberals, this week - and has proven, sadly, to be prophetic in more than one respect.

Mr. Wilson tells us that there <sup>is</sup>/no time for steel nationalisation in the Parliamentary timetable. Yet there is time for the Immigration White Paper, the so-called "early warning" legislation and other measures which were in Labour's election programme. Surely even the blind can see that the dropping of steel nationalisation is a sop to the Liberals. The alternative argument: that Mr. Wilson is putting forward a programme designed to win an election, that after this election with a big majority he will then go ahead with steel nationalisation, does not hold water. It is not possible to manipulate people like this. The de facto dropping of steel nationalisation from Labour's programme will make it very difficult - if not impossible - to build up a climate of opinion in the country which will support the measure. So the issue is not "when" but "whether".

Those Labour M.P.s who have been shocked by the omission of steel nationalisation from the Queen's Speech should press their criticisms and not be put off with promises. If the rot is going to be stopped it will have to be stopped on this issue.

RHODESIAN MERRY-GO-ROUND

One gets bored with the proposals, counter-proposals, Royal Commissions, trips to Rhodesia, trips to Malta, etc. which have filled the headlines since the Rhodesian crisis began. However, certain things are quite clear: Mr. Wilson is quite unprepared to do in Rhodesia what he did in Aden, but at the same time he wants to appear to be doing something which is not capitulation to Ian Smith and the White settlers. Mr. Wilson is in favour of <sup>an</sup>armed solution in Vietnam, but not in Rhodesia. The purpose of the Royal Commission was <sup>to</sup>give more time to avoid facing the issue. In a very short time the crunch will come and our Government will have the opportunity to prove that it can be as tough with Mr. Smith as it is with unofficial strikers, Borneo rebels and Aden.

Although only in existence less than a fortnight, the Centre for Socialist Education has evoked an enthusiastic and serious response in many parts of the country. We have had some reports - but by no means all - of the plans of supporters of the venture:

Yorkshire: A regional conference has been provisionally booked in York for Saturday 4th of December. Tony Topham, 1, Plantation Drive, Anlaby Park, Hull, is the convenor and interested readers should write to him. Mr. Topham would also be very pleased to receive from readers as many names and addresses of interested (or likely to be interested) people. Time is short so please rush the information to him.

Nottingham: A committee of 20 was elected to get the project off the ground at a meeting on Sunday. There was enthusiastic support for the venture from the audience which was made up of Labour Party and trade union activists. Among the plans drawn up were (1) to hold regular monthly public lectures on socialist theory and practice, (2) to establish industrial seminars, based upon local industries and factories, and (3) to organise a large conference on interested people before the end of the year.

The following officers were appointed: Secretary, Geoff Coggan, 47, Brindley Rd., Bilborough, Nottingham, and treasurer, Jill Westby, 19 Greenfield St., Dunkirk, Nottingham. Enquiries should be sent to the secretary.

Birmingham: A meeting has been arranged for this coming Sunday, November 14th, to discuss the establishment of local Centre. Students from Pircroft College and the University, Labour Party and Young Socialist activists have been invited. Enquiries should be made to Barbara Allen, Kings Norton 3960.

In addition the convenor has received enquiries about membership and the formation of local Centres from Glasgow, Manchester, Ruislip, London, Derby, Lincoln, Colchester, Long Eaton, Edinburgh and elsewhere.

Editorial note: We would ask all supporters of the Centre for Socialist Education to send reports in post haste for publication. It gives the greatest encouragement, and helps to keep up the momentum, if everybody knows what everybody else is doing.

BRISTOL LIAISON COMMITTEE MASS MEETING

by Tom Nicholls

Over 500 Bristol dockers packed into Fairfax Hall on Saturday morning, November 6th, to hear members of the London Portworkers Liaison Committee. Mr Jack Dash who was to have spoken unfortunately went down with the flu, and was unable to attend, but 6 other members of the committee were present. The purpose of the meeting was to present and explain the 11-point charter, which the Bristol dockers have now adopted. Mr. Albert McGrath, secretary of the Bristol and Avonmouth Committee said that they now had well over 400 members and that bundles of applications were coming in every day. Speaker after speaker urged the men present to take the charter back to their union branches, to revitalise their section of the TGWU and make sure that the officials were serving the interests of the members. A number of speakers stressed the importance of nationalisation. They also made it clear why the National Dock Labour Board must retain control of labour, a point also brought out in the Charter.

Three financial facts emerged from the Bristol and Avonmouth docks' strike. It was generally assumed that the strike cost "the country" a million pounds. The Port of Bristol Employers' Association on two separate days paid a sum of over £600 for two whole pages of the Bristol Evening Post in which to tell the public that the rotten dockers were costing the Port of Bristol an Almighty packet.

Twice, the Transport and General Workers' Union, in bold attempts to tell their striking workers that they were irresponsible, hired Bristol's magnificent Colston Hall at £100 a time. Sad to say though, both these latter attempts at whipping some sense into we irresponsibles failed: the last meeting barely giving us time to appreciate just what our hundred nicker was giving us.

The cost to the Port Employers of these two pages in the local rag was about the exact amount that would have settled the affair of the packaged timber on the ship in dispute - the Gloucester City.

It seems that strikes cost everyone a packet, except the poor old docker himself! He, whilst on strike, can draw the princely sum of £10. 10. Od a week, according to our local newspaper again. That is, if he happens to have six or eight kids! Heaven help him if he is single, or just got his wife - then he is told, as were so many of them, to GO BACK TO WORK - only in a more technical manner.

The interim agreement that sparked off the bitterness of the strikers soon dropped into second place, as the positive hatred of the useless machinery of the T & GWU Docks' negotiating machinery produced nothing but that well-known answer of the last ten years - "All in order". The union officials' attitude remained - "take it or leave it". Leave it is what the Bristol dockers did - for exactly three and a half weeks. The stubborn refusal of the officials to take a further look at the ridiculous interim increase of  $\frac{7}{8}$  of a penny stank to high heaven. It must now be concluded that the Devlin's Committee's question as to "whether the Union has lent slightly towards the employers" can only be answered with a strong Yes. Many of us in these parts are now saying that the Union has definitely keeled right over in that direction. The saying "to get to the guvnors you must first get past your Union official" has now become established in our docks.

The strike has now ended. It came dramatically the day after another pitiful meeting at the Colston Hall, which saw a mere ten minutes of sheer comedy. Here the local Docks Group Secretary put a James Bond touch to the statement that a Government Inquiry had been ordered overnight: and that now "as it has become Government business I ask you to return to work." This was after he had stated emphatically that there could be NO discussion and NO questions.

One day I might write a book about the whole soggy affair, and call it "A Modern Comedy of Errors." On the other hand I might just sit back a little longer and ask myself - "Are We really the Union?" One thing is almost certain, Mr. Gunter appears to be having the last word, AMEN, AMEN, AMEN.

\* Mr. McGrath is a leader, of the Bristol Dockers Liaison Committee.

At last month's Trades Union Congress important decisions were made that will affect the standard of living of millions of people in Britain, yet, surprisingly, one of the most vital issues before Congress, which dealt with the Government's policy on incomes and prices and with the fundamental right of the trade unions to function freely to improve the wages and conditions of their members, was the subject of steamroller tactics.

Four days before Congress opened, Mr. Brown hastily visited Brighton to meet the T.U.C. General Council for a full day, to explain the fact that the Government intended, on the resumption of Parliament after the summer recess, to introduce legislation that would give them powers (by Order in Council) that would require the trade unions to notify the Prices and Incomes Board of claims relating to pay, hours or other major improvements and prospective terms of settlement. These claims are to be deferred until after the Board has reported on them.

The T.U.C. General Council decided to ask Congress to agree to the T.U.C. being a voluntary body which would examine claims that the unions were to submit to the employers. By setting themselves up as a reviewing body it was hoped to achieve the objectives intended by the Government. It is worth noting that many of the Unions present at Congress were unable to consult their own executive members, as they had only three days in Congress to decide their unions' policies to the proposals.

A pertinent question could be asked - Why did George Brown wait until the General Council had gone to Brighton before he decided to go there and outline the Government's policy? In view of the fact it was already decided to introduce legislation, this information could have been given previously to the General Council in London, so that all the unions, prior to Congress, could have studied the proposals and decided on their attitude. These rush tactics might pay off to get decisions but the test will remain to see if the unions will allow to have taken away from them the fundamental right to free collective bargaining for their members.

It is becoming all too popular for Labour, Tory and Liberal leaders to turn their attention to the Trade Unions and blame them for the fact that Britain's economic crisis is not being solved. The real cause of the economic crisis is the fact that we still have a monopoly capitalist system, and after 13 years of Tory rule we have witnessed the complete stagnation and bankruptcy of their so called free enterprise society. What we need now are measures to make capitalism work, but a change in the structure of society that will put the ownership of production in the hands of the people; the application of new techniques to serve not the few, but for the benefit of the whole community; a substantial reduction in military expenditure; and some rethinking on foreign policy. This is the answer to our crisis and the way forward. A stop must be made to any attempts to weaken our trade union movement; the urgent need today is for the privileged few to get off the backs of the workers and let us get down to the job of improving the living standards of the people.

\* Editorial from 'The Foundry Worker', monthly journal of the Amalgamated Union of Foundry Worker's. It was written by W. Thompson, the Assistant General Secretary.

LETTER FROM 'CAMPAIGN FOR SOCIALISM'

We would like to draw the attention of 'The Week' readers to the existence of the newly formed 'Campaign for Socialism.' This new organisation, set up amongst constituency party activists represents the culmination of a period of mounting dissatisfaction with the record of the Labour Government. Amongst a whole list of important issues: Vietnam, the whole complex of defence and foreign policy, steel nationalisation and many others, we have isolated two which we consider as fundamental to the continued existence of socialists within the Labour Party. It is these two specific policy issues on which our campaign is to be fought. They are: 1) a reversal of Conference decision on immigration and a return to the initial demand of the Labour Party for the repeal of the 1962 Act on immigration; 2) a mobilisation of forces within the constituencies and unions to resist any proposed Government anti-union legislation.

We would like to invite all active members of the Labour Party, who are prepared to subscribe to these two policy planks to join the Campaign. An organisational meeting to discuss the next steps forward is to be held on Wednesday, 24th. November. Anyone interested in attending is asked to telephone me at Primrose 1541 any evening.

N.B. PRIMROSE is a London T.N.

Yours etc,  
Steven Rose.

LINCOLN Y.S. MOVE ON RHODESIAN QUESTION, from G. Hibbett.

At a recent meeting of the Lincoln Young Socialists, the following resolution was carried:- "That this Party calls on the present Labour Government to suspend immediately the 1961 Constitution of Rhodesia and take over the responsibility of governing the country, until such time as a Government can be elected on National Suffrage and should in support of this action, be willing to use any measures, whether economic or military."

On being put to the General Committee of the Lincoln Labour Party, the resolution was defeated and an amendment, which called for action only in the event of U.D.I. being declared, was passed. The amendment did not contain any mention of what form the action should take.

LESSON LEARNT IN CAMBRIDGE, From Ian Taylor.

The Cambridge University Labour Club, replete though it is with budding future Ray Gunter's and others 'impressed with the ability of the Labour Government to govern," has come out for socialist measures in most of the resolutions passed since the beginning of term. The immigration White Paper was decisively condemned at the 300 strong opening meeting. At a policy making<sup>meeting</sup> on Sunday, October 31st., a motion was overwhelmingly carried, demanding that troops be sent to Rhodesia to enforce progress towards majority rule. The continuation of neo colonialist measures in Aden by ex-M.C.F.er Tony Greenwood was also condemned.

The signs are that even those who talk in terms of full support for the Labour Party in Government, regardless of the direction of its policies are being forced by left wing pressure into a more critical position. The heightening of consciousness among the potential parliamentary candidates bodes well for the future of the left wing in this most reactionary of universities.

## THOSE "ELECTIONS" IN PORTUGAL\*

There is not much doubt about the outcome of the November "elections" for the "National Assembly" in Portugal. Since the Fascist regime took power in 1926, there has not been a single genuine election in unhappy Portugal. The last "elections" for the National Assembly were held in 1961. Out of 8.5 million Portuguese, according to the 1953 census, 4.8 million, or 56% of the total were old enough to vote. But in a country where over 30% are illiterate, this proportion is disfranchised, except for a few who have some property. In addition only those women who have completed secondary or university education are allowed to vote, and these restrictions bring the number of possible voters down to about 2½ million. In fact, on the electoral roll there were only 1.3 million names, of 15% of the total population, compared with 68% in Britain.

The franchise is further reduced through the repressive measures of the government. Any person suspected of opposing the regime is crossed off the electoral register. The democratic opposition is not allowed a legal existence in Salazar's Portugal; no political parties are permitted except the Fascist "União Nacional". The unorganised opposition is given one month before the "elections" to draw up a programme and arrange meetings. Only 10 days were given this year to present the candidates. According to Decree Law 24,631, of 6/11/34, "persons who profess ideas which tend to promote the subversion of the fundamental institutions and principles of the society", that is, anybody whom Salazar or the PIDE (the political police in Portugal) consider dangerous to the regime, cannot be elected to the "National Assembly."

Yet, despite all this, the Portuguese people have fought memorable battles in past "elections", taking all the opportunities that were offered to show their love of liberty, their hatred of the cruel regime of Salazar and PIDE and their desire for a better and happier life. In 1961, the democratic opposition again demanded that their voice should be heard. They sought minimum democratic safeguards such as: free inspection of the electoral roll in order to check who had been arbitrarily deleted or falsely registered; freedom of speech and meetings, and supervision by both sides of the actual poll. They drafted a detailed programme of democratic changes in the country that they sought to achieve and put forward 84 candidates - liberal, republican, monarchists, etc. - from all sections of the opposition in 10 electoral districts.

Salazar's officials saw that thousands of democrats were deleted from the rolls. In Lisbon, the opposition list of candidates had to be redrafted 3 times due to objections by the authorities; the Monarchist list was refused because it was presented 2 minutes after the deadline. In Ponta Delgada, in the Azores Islands, candidates were arrested. Halls and rooms for meetings were refused to the democrats, due to pressure from the authorities. Hundreds of people were arrested. Public demonstrations were forbidden, but this did not prevent thousands of people coming on to the streets, all over the country to show their opposition to Fascism.

In Lisbon great demonstrations took place on October 29th, and November 2nd and 11th. In Almada, facing Lisbon, 20,000 people demonstrated on November 11th and 14th resisting police brutalities and shooting. Faced with all kinds of irregularities and no satisfactory action for their basic demands for fair elections the opposition withdrew just before the election.

\* Based upon an article in Portuguese and Colonial Bulletin (10, Fentiman Rd. London S.W. 8.)

## AMERICAN ARMY VERSUS A G.I. REFUSING TO FIGHT IN VIETNAM

from 'National Guardian.'

P.F.C. Winstel Belton, the Negro soldier who began a hunger strike rather than accept assignment to Vietnam, was sentenced to five years at hard labour by an Army court-martial Oct. 5th and then- in accord with an agreement between Belton and the army- the sentence was reduced to a one year prison term, sentence to be suspended.

The 26 year old Milwaukee soldier, a graduate of Arizona State University, who in civilian life was active with the Civil Rights movement had been charged with 'malingering by starvation.' He began his 7 day hunger strike at Ft. Benning, Ga., Aug. 7th and ended it after his unit was shipped to Vietnam without him. The agreement which led to a reduction in sentence, according to sources close to the case, stemmed from the army's desire to avoid a major test of the legality of the U.S. military involvement in Vietnam and to minimise publicity of the case. Belton's civilian lawyer, George Altman, who donated his services free to defend the soldier, had intended to argue, among other technical points, that the order to send Belton to combat was illegal because Congress had not declared war and that the President was acting in violation of the constitution in the Vietnam situation. These same informants said that the army told Belton that if the lawyer persisted in arguing the legal merits of the war in Vietnam, the five man military tribunal would sentence the rebellious soldier to five years in the stockade and a dishonourable discharge. If, however, Belton agreed to enter a 'negotiated plea of guilty' the sentence would be reduced during an automatic review by Lt.Gen. Robert Colgazier. The offer was stressed during a two-hour recess in Belton's one-day trial. Upon returning to the courtroom, Belton told his attorney he would plead guilty and instructed him not to launch a legal fight. Soon after, Colgazier reduced the sentence to one year and suspended penalties. It seems probable that Belton will not be sent to Viet Nam and that he will receive a general or honorable discharge when his two-year Army service is completed.

The Army would not discuss its reasons for initiating the agreement, though military spokesman Capt. Stephen Kite-Powell told reporters that: "We wanted to play it as low key as possible and avoid publicity." It is known that the Army and the government have received many letters in defence of Belton and that at one point before the trial, an Army officer implied that Belton would receive a reduced sentence "if the committee was called off." (Presumably the Winstel Belton Defence Committee) This offer was rejected. The Belton Committee, which is composed of seven local peace and student groups, will dissolve now that the case is over and- since Belton probably will not be sent to either Viet Nam or prison- a victory has been scored. "However," Gilman said, "the Belton case is just the beginning for us. We are in the process of reconstituting ourselves into a new, and expanded, committee. Now, with twelve groups agreeing to join, we are about to form a committee concerned with any and all soldiers who do not wish to fight in the Viet Nam war. There are enough of them, I think, to keep us busy."



"LAS LAGRIMAS DEL CROCADILO" (The Tears of the Crocodile) from Alexander  
Scott\*

Yesterday, from a small restaurant, I phoned a friend and said in Spanish "I am going to Camarioca!". A sudden silence enclosed the room, and it was clear that the Cuban occupants thought that I was a Cuban running for a Yankee hand-out. A frail, 85 pound nervous wreck of a woman with agitated hands, aged between 25 and 50, walked past me and left the room. I learned later that she had seen her mother burned to death by Batista men. A grey-haired, motherly woman then told me of the day when the Batista police threw the bodies of two local youths onto the corner of her street. Their trousers had been torn down, exposing the mutilations they had suffered before death. She crossed the street to avoid the sight, but they forcibly took her back and compelled her to look, asking "Is one of these your son, d'whore?" Those bodies lay for three days decomposing in the tropic heat, before the relatives were allowed to collect them.

Camarioca! A name suddenly world news, as the small boats ply back and forth over the few miles that separate it from the U.S.A. A profitable enterprise for the Florida boat-owners, whose "humanitarian motivation" appears to be God's best friend the Dollar, for they have spent the last few years trying to throw Cubans out of Florida. The little port is really an extension of the beautiful Varadero beach, one-time rich man's paradise (American whites, of course. No black body dipped in those blue waters, or lazed on those soft sands). About twenty American motor launches and sports fishers bobbed gently on the sun-gilt waters. With the boats arrived about 100 Miami Cubans, and a group of American journalists. They are here without the permission of the U.S. Government, but they have Cuban permission and cooperation- an observation on the state of impotence of the greatest imperialist power when confronted by the will of the people. Viet Nam, et al.

The hurriedly-put-together facilities of the little port are under the control of the Cuban Home Office, and include the normal services of an embarkation centre, with reception, sleeping accommodation, restaurant, medical services and boat-repair depot. The Cuban authorities even collect the outgoing families and relatives and transport them to the centre. All of this is well-organised, smoothly-running and completely without charge to the users of any part of its comprehensive service. There are no violent dramatics here, despite the capitalist press. Nobody shouts for help to jump into the water. The drama here is in the reunion of families parted artificially by U.S. policy. Here lingers the shadow of the frightened giant of the north, compelled to watch his continental power-structure of military dictatorships crumbling before the onslaught of the Latin-American people, with Cuba at their head.

It is one of the great triumphs of the revolution that these people are free to speak, free to choose for themselves. They may come and go as they please. It was the imperialists that imposed restrictions on the Cubans' ability to leave, not socialist Cuba. It is the U.S. Government that is still illegally obstructing the constitutional rights of its own citizens to travel.

Factory workers in Havana told me: "They leave for many reasons. Not all are against the revolution, senor. Some, because they are joining relatives who were forced out by terror or unemployment during the dark years before the revolution. Some, because they are not strong enough

continued over//

Cuba article cont'd.

to accept the terms of the struggle imposed upon us by Yankee imperialism. Yet others, because they are not conditioned to share the privileges that were once exclusively theirs."

During the Batista dictatorship, twenty-two thousand Cubans were tortured to death, and the bodies were piled on many streets. In the last fifteen years, three hundred thousand Bolivians have met the same fate. The story is the same throughout Latin-America. In Viet Nam, the most modern and barbarous methods are used to exterminate the whole population. Wherever the U.S. eagle flies, death comes to the common people! At no time during the course of these events has Florida offered succour to the suffering masses. Perhaps now, after Elizabeth's (a town in Florida) offer to take 25,000 Cubans, we may be permitted to expect similar offers that could include the Watts district of Los Angeles, or the workers of Aden. Failing this, there is a danger that suspicious people may regard it as a hypocritical attempt to discredit socialism.

\*Editorial note: this article was written especially for The Week by our correspondent who is working in Cuba.

"DER SPEIGEL" WORRIED BY U.S. CAPITAL INFILTRATION from a German reader

The well known West German weekly, Der Spiegel, is worried about the ever-increasing penetration of German industry by U.S. capital. In the October 6th issue, the journal quoted the Paris representative of the U.S. Morgan Guaranty Trust Company as saying "We will buy up the entire German industry." It further stated in that issue that the total U.S. investment in West Germany had increased from 4,000,000,000 to 9,200,000,000 West German Marks (approximately £356 million to £820 million) from the beginning of 1961 to the middle of 1965. The number of U.S. industrial and commercial enterprises in West Germany increased from 350 in 1957 to 1,150 by mid-1965. The paper said that many U.S. businessmen "have stepped through the door of the Common Market where they are now enjoying the fruit of tariff reduction."

Describing how U.S. capital infiltrated gradually into West Germany, the weekly said that the "clever gentlemen" of the American enterprises first of all spent a few dollars to set up a sales point in West Germany, then they invested the profits in some West German companies or factories. In a few years' time, they could afford to buy over or rebuild one factory after another. In particular, the medium-sized West German enterprises in difficulties were the victims of the U.S. take-over, it noted. As competition became sharper, these enterprises had to either affiliate themselves to the stronger competitor, or sell out. U.S. capital had frequently swallowed up West German enterprises through such a kind of cooperation.

U.S. capital had also managed to obtain the bulk of the stocks of a certain West German enterprise by purchasing them piecemeal and thus gaining control over it, the paper added. Disparity in the rate of exchange between the dollar and West German marks was also a great stimulus to the penetration of U.S. capital, it said. The official rate was one dollar for four West German marks, but actually, its purchasing power today was only equal to 2.6 West German marks. This enabled U.S. big business to buy up West German industry more cheaply, the paper went on. No doubt Der Spiegel has overstated its case in order to chill the blood of its readers, but nevertheless it makes interesting reading.

Andrew Miller's interesting article in The Week (4th November, 1965) raises a number of questions which need wide discussion among socialists. How far can socialists rely upon market mechanisms as indicators in the advance towards socialist forms of distribution? Does the experience of workers' self-management in Yugoslavia prove that the "orthodox" marxist approach to the market was one-sided or erroneous? Is self-management impossible without decentralisation and the growth of differentials?

On all these matters I think that the Yugoslav authors quoted by Andrew Miller are wrong. Todorovic, for instance, counterposes the model of a plan which is "an inflexible programme, a lid that covers everything, based on force" to the system of self-management. But in fact there is no rigorous logic which demands such contradiction. Self-management and centralised planning, in the short to medium run, are independent variables. That is to say, you can have one without the other, but you equally well have both together. In the long run, of course, self-management demands a central plan, if it is not to evolve through syndicalism to an increasingly stratified and undemocratic situation: while central planning demands democracy as a basic ingredient if it is not to become stifling and self-frustrating, as indeed it appears already to have done in key sectors of the Soviet economy.

The key question is that of whether it is possible to combat the tendency to bureaucratic control of the economy simply be "decentralisation" and reliance on the market. It is very clear to me that you cannot, even in advanced economies: while to imagine that it might be possible in relatively backward countries could even be suicidal. Reliance on market pressures, far from inhibiting the growth of bureaucratic powers, fosters such growth - both in the way it encourages the widening of differentials and in the way it produces the growth of working-class apathy, as the impalpable and uncontrolled force of the market poses increasingly strong demands on the political structure and creates a more and more fragmented working class. When Todorovic attacks bureaucratic centralism, he evokes all our sympathy. But market-dominated, decentralising answers to this problem replace it, not by democracy, equality, and the optimisation of social control of the economy, but by a more unpleasant phenomena altogether. Bureaucratic centralism becomes bureaucratic anarchy.

Much of the former progress of Yugoslavia was underpinned by its central planning machinery: the conscious development of such "unprofitable" areas as Macedonia, the fostering of an industrial base, the stimulation of welfare services, would all be impossible without rigorous control over the play of market forces, and a firm central control. The growth of workers' self-management, to be consummated, would logically require that the determination of such priorities as these should be by a fully democratic decision, in which contenting interests would voice their claims, and in which decisions would then be truly popular ones. Such democratic planning requires as a precondition the establishment of an open and free political debate, within the framework of the institutions of a planned society. Instead, rather than make this political advance, the Yugoslavs have opted, up to now, for more market-control, for rampant growth of differentials and "incentives", and have even moved to pay wages in the education and welfare services "by results", with what could only be baneful results.

continued over/

Preobrashenski's ghost continued/

While this experience needs sympathetic study and discussion, a more helpful one, I would suggest, is to be found in the Cuban debate on just this problem, in which Guevara and Mandel put the case for democratic central planning and "moral" incentives against Mora's view that material incentives and market stimulants should not be the centre of Cuba's development strategy. (A useful summary of this debate is to be found in De Santis' article in ISJ no. 10). In this context the extraordinarily valuable work of Eugeni Preobrashenski "The New Economics", which has recently been published by Oxford University Press in a most lucid translation by Brian Pearce, needs careful study by everyone who is interested in these problems. Preobrashenski's ghost has certainly been working overtime in Cuba in the last year. When it walks in Belgrade, Eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union, we shall be at the beginning of a new humanist era.

### "THE YOUNG SOCIALISTS - LABOUR'S LOST YOUTH"

Most of this Young Guard pamphlet by Mike Coggins is given over to a comprehensive history of the Young Socialists since its inception in 1960. This section is thorough, reasonably objective and tells the story of the depressing "evolution" of the Y.S. Some points of emphasis can be faulted. In discussing the faction fighting within the Y.S., Coggins comments, "Many of the leading members of the left factions had achieved a political sophistication that enabled them to discuss issues which to an outsider would seem obscure and trifling." I would be tempted to use a word other than "sophistication", unless it was meant in the original sense.

Coggins also scores highly when he discusses what steps should be taken to get the Y.S. out of its present impasse. He favours autonomy within the Labour Party for the Y.S. An executive committee must be allowed, with democratic control of New Advance and the right to discuss politics at all levels of the organisation. NALSO is even given a pat on the head, in spite of its "small" size. Coggins estimates the Y.S. as having 5,000 members. NALSO has some 7,000. All this will, no doubt, please those Y.S. members who, at the 1962 Y.S. Conference, voted for a "NALSO-like constitution." Even posthumous support is welcome.

It is unfortunate that Coggins falls into the usual semantic trap. He calls for an autonomous and fully integrated Y.S. "This demand is not, as some have suggested, a contradiction in terms...." Unfortunately it is. As any Regional Youth Officer would have told him, and Len Williams most definitely, an integrated organisation acts on the same policy as the adult party and has a national advisory committee as opposed to an executive committee. This, of course, does not affect Coggins' argument for a self-governing youth movement with the fullest links with the adult party at local level.

Coggins' pamphlet is a start to the reappraisal and argument that is necessary before Labour can achieve a strong and useful youth movement. The delegates at Malvern later this month are left with the responsibility for deepening the analysis and organising to exert pressure to get their conclusions implemented.

Ron Kirk.

(Editorial note: this article has been extracted from a longer one which the author wrote for Motor Transport, the journal of the Road Haulage Association. Mr. Law presented his argument in the form of a conversation between a lorry driver and his wife. Mr. Law is Birmingham Group Trade Secretary of the TGWU.)

Wife: "How much is your basic wage, dear?"

Husband: "£10 12s 3d if I drive a small lorry - £11 1s if I drive a medium lorry - and £11 8s 9d if I drive a big one."

Wife: "But you do earn much more than these amounts, how does that come about?"

Husband: "Because I spin the job out so that it takes all day, and I can book 11 hours, and 12 on two days of the week, making 68 hours each week, and by doing that I can make my wages up to around £21 4s per week of six days."

Wife: "Per week?...I thought a week for a worker was 40 hours."

Husband: "For ordinary workers, yes, but not for lorry drivers. We have to work five weeks to an average man's four in order to get the same money...The national average earnings of manual workers is £18 18s 2d for 47½ hours. To get £18 18s 2d I have to work 62 hours on a 5 to 10-ton vehicle."

Wife: "That means that each week you must work 14½ hours more than the average worker in order to pick up the same wage?"

Husband: "Yes, and if I only worked average hours, I would only pick up £13 4s."

Wife: "That means your wages for the national average hours would be £5 14s 2d below those of the average worker?"

Husband: "I am ashamed to say they would be.".....

Wife: "Do all drivers work as cheap labour, like you do?"

Husband: "Certainly not, in the industrial areas such as Birmingham, drivers employed by the car manufacturers receive an average of 9s per hour."

The article then goes on to outline various wage differentials in industries and localities, the piece concludes:

Wife: "Well, you had better go to bed, you must be up at 4.00 in the morning. I think I will go and get a job in the factory and you can stay home and look after the kids!!"

#### ADVERTISER'S ANNOUNCEMENT

A prize of one year's subscription to one of the handful of outstanding socialist journals in English, will be awarded to the 20 most useful, comprehensive and apparently reliable (judging will be carried out by the editorial board) replies received on or before December 9th\* to the following request for information: which is (or are) the most suitable bookshop(s) - university, specialist or general - dealing in politics, sociology, economics and psychology, which have magazines on display. This much needed information refers to both bookshops and organisation bookstalls in Britain and abroad, and information will be welcomed from informed readers of The Week (whether in Adelaide, Edinburgh, Dar-es-Salaam, Dublin, Chicago or Zurich) as long as other socialist literature is also sold. Above all, please write your address and the shop or stall address clearly and indicate, if more than one piece of information is included, what the priority of one shop, etc., is as compared with another (e.g. literature and socialist journals, college bookshop with a number of departments, small specialist shop with few callers, or main specialist in the town or country) all correspondents whose information is at all helpful will receive immediately after the deadline, a copy of the latest issue of Views (approx 110 pp). Write now, with the facts which you take for granted, and which we'll like to have, to Prize Information, 27, Lindfield Gardens, London N.W. 3.

\* Closing date will be extended for four weeks for foreign participants.