

The Week

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS
Vol. 4, No. 20. 25th November, 1965

6^D

- INCOMES POLICY
READ IN
- BRITAIN'S HUGE ARMS
BILL
- C.S.E. PLANS
- YUGOSLAV POLEMIC
- KEN COATES'
EXPULSION—LATEST

VIETNAM— JOHNSON'S LIE

—STEWART'S LAST EXCUSE GONE. ACT
NOW TO CHANGE LABOUR'S POLICY.

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 - Alan Sillotoe

CONTENTS

Page	1	Editorial
"	2	C.S.E. to bring out incomes policy "read in,"
"	3	Manchester Socialist Conference very representative.
"	4	C.S.E. directory.
"	5	L.S.E. to have "teach-in" on British economic policy.
"	6	Blackpool and Scarborough.
"	7	The B.B.C. and censorship.
"	8	Britain's defence bill one of world's highest.
"	9	An appeal for South African freedom fighters.
"	10	Planning, centralisation and the market in Yugoslavia.

Supplement: Statement of aims of the Centre for Socialist Education.

JOHNSON'S VIETNAM LIE AND LABOUR

The truth has come out: Johnson's talk of "unconditional negotiations" has been exposed as a mere smokescreen to justify escalation of the Vietnam war. Three times the offer of talks has been turned down by the U.S. Government - three times the bombing of the North has been intensified. It is claimed that our Government knew nothing of these offers. We find this very difficult to believe but let us assume that it is true. If that assumption is made, there is every reason for Mr. Wilson and Mr. Stewart to repudiate Johnson. Hasn't it been the continued argument of the Labour Government that it was Hanoi that was the obstacle to negotiations? Didn't Mr. Stewart (and Harold Davies) use "Johnson's willingness to negotiate" and "Hanoi's intransigence" at Blackpool to justify their whole Vietnam policy?

The position is clear: the last fig-leaf of the Government's Vietnam policy has fallen away. There must be a renewed campaign to force the Government to break with U.S. policy, to demand the withdrawal of American troops and the immediate cessation of the bombing of the North. There can be no excuse whatsoever for the Government not to adopt this policy. Its own arguments lead directly to this demand. Every Labour Party, every trade union branch and every individual member must demand that the Government comes clean on Vietnam.

TWO NEW SPONSORS

It is with great pleasure we announce that Tony Brewer, secretary of NALSO, and Alan Sillitoe, the Nottingham novelist who has become a best selling author without losing the "common touch." The Week has always worked on the assumption that one of its most important functions is to unify the left and progressive forces in Britain. Unify them not only in the sense of bringing together people of marked different political views into a working alliance, but also unify the various strands of the movement: the Young Socialists, trade unionists, Parliamentarians, intellectuals, socialist students, CLP rank-and-filers, and others. We see these two new additions to our list of sponsors as a very important step in this process.

KEN COATES' EXPULSION: THE LATEST: Since we last reported, two important victories have been gained in the struggle for Ken Coates' reinstatement. Ken's own ward, Abbey ward, has repudiated his expulsion, and Nottingham City Labour Party has expressed its opposition (to the accompaniment of a walk-out by Councillors and Aldermen). Numerous Labour Parties, trade union branches and individual members have expressed their concern.

C.S.E. TO BRING OUT INCOMES POLICY "READ IN" from Ken Coates

The newly formed Centre for Socialist Education is preparing a "read-in" on incomes policy to be published in time for next year's trade union conferences. At a meeting of the Centre's steering committee last Saturday it was agreed to give this project priority. Preliminary schedules of work and lines of selection are being prepared for mid-December.

Other projects are under active consideration. One involves the creation of a "Counter-plan" to that of the DEA, making explicit a strategy of structural anti-capitalist reforms and exposing the anti-democratic and technocratic bases of the George Brown model. This is seen not simply as an alternative "blue-print", but as a serious discussion of socialist priorities, especially that of workers' control. A further team is being assembled to explore work on corporate incomes, exposing the manoeuvres of corporations in the same way that Professor Titmus has dealt with personal incomes in his "Incomes Distribution and Social Change." More information is being sought on the possibility of preparing an "Anti-Devlin Report" on the docks and a publication on workers' control in municipal public services.

It was reported to the committee that applications for membership of the Centre and enquiries about its work had been received from socialists in about thirty cities and towns throughout Britain. A series of conferences is being held to co-ordinate support and enable socialists to discuss the possibilities the Centre presents.

YORKSHIRE C.S.E. REGIONAL CONFERENCE from Tony Topham

An inaugural meeting to discuss the formation of the Centre for Socialist Education and the possibility of establishing a Yorkshire Regional Committee has been fixed. It will be held in York on Saturday, December 4th, in the York Educational Settlement, Holgate Hill, York, starting at 2.00 p.m..

It is hoped that all readers of The Week in the Yorkshire region will make every effort to attend, and to ensure that socialists with whom they work attend too. The meeting - after general discussion on the whole project - will discuss the establishment of a regional machinery, and local Centres.

THE COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOLS COMMITTEE

The aims of the newly established Comprehensive Schools Committee are stated as: 1, the elimination of selection, by examination or any other means, at the age of transfer to secondary education; 2, the end of the segregation of children in different types of secondary school, and the rejection of the idea that separate but equal types of education can or should be provided; 3, the exploration of different ways in which the comprehensive ideal may be realised; and 4, the rapid introduction of comprehensive education and the provision by the Government of the necessary finance.

Sponsors include: Dr. Cyril Bibby of Hull College of Education; H.L. Elvin, Director of the Institute of Education, University of London; Brian Jackson Director of A.C.E.; Margaret Miles, headmistress, Mayfield School; Peter Shore, M.P.; the Bishop of Southwark and Professor Peter Townsend. A brochure explaining the aims, activities, etc., of C.S.C. can be obtained by writing to Mrs. J. Pryke, 24, Mulberry Close, Cambridge.

The official report of the Manchester Socialist Conference states: "Ninety people attended. Eighty were from the Manchester area and ten were from other parts of the country as follows: Nottingham 3, Sheffield 2, Crawley 2, Hull 1, Oxford University 1 and Bradford Technical College 1. Among those present were individuals associated with ward and constituency Labour Parties, trade union branches and trades councils, covering engineering, plumbing, furniture, foundries, print, mining, clerical, woodworkers and bricklayers, the Young Socialists, NALSO and student societies at Manchester University and College of Commerce, Labour's Voice, the British Council for Peace in Vietnam, the New Left, the Communist Party and the YCL, the Manchester Campaign for Comprehensive Education, the Centre for Socialist Education, the International Socialism group and the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and Youth CND....."

"Professor Worsley was in the chair and, in opening the Conference, he thanked the AEU for the hire of the hall, and the TGWU, ASSET and the Centre for Socialist Education who had sent copies of their policy statements for distribution..." after discussion "the following motions were submitted and put to the vote.

'That the Manchester Socialist Conference shall work for the establishment of a new political movement based on socialist principles, composed of all socialist sections within Britain, with a view to attaining political power in order to bring about a socialist order within our society.'

"Moved by C.A. Farrer and seconded by A. Fowler. On being put to the vote this was defeated overwhelmingly.

'This conference agrees to establish the Manchester Socialist Conference. The Manchester Socialist Conference should discuss the question of affiliation to the national Centre for Socialist Education, but should never allow itself to become a mere discussion group, but in every sphere should attempt to inform and provide all possible assistance to working class and socialist struggles.'

"Moved by J. Lee and seconded by C. Barker. On being put to the vote this was carried with one abstention.

"A motion on comprehensive education was moved by J. Hall and was referred to the committee, to be appointed, with the agreement of the mover. Suggestions re a subscriptions scheme and proposals for activity, made in the course of the discussion, were referred to the committee.

"The following were elected to serve on the committee: Colin Barker, Ken Bodfish, Bruce Bebbington, Maurice Butler, Rosalind Delmar, Chris Farrer, John Hall, John T. Hull, Ross Hill, Phil Jackson, Dick Nettleton, Alan Rooney, Geoffrey N. Smith, Ted Woolley and Peter Worsley.

The following emergency resolution was accepted and adopted unanimously:

'That, having heard of the expulsion from the Labour Party of Ken Coates by West Nottingham Constituency Labour Party, for the expression of socialist opinions, this meeting is dismayed to note the emergence of the Labour Party as the party of intolerance.'

"To be sent to the Labour Party and Nottingham Labour Party."

N.B. Enquiries about the MSC should go to: C. Barker, 43, Daisy Bank Rd., Manchester 14.

The Scarborough Labour Party has practised its peculiar anti-democratic arts for so long that the members of the Executive Committee are blandly unaware as to whether or not they are acting constitutionally!

The committee decided to abandon monthly general meetings in May, June, July and August. The September meeting was held after the Blackpool Conference had begun. This crude but effective stratagem was adopted in order to prevent resolutions from being debated by the membership of the branch and then moved at the conference. At a clandestine meeting of the Executive Committee, the treasurer, Mr. R.A. Leadill, was "appointed" to act as delegate. Mr. Leadill is an arch-reactionary who often seeks to present himself as a left winger. In this way he keeps such organisations as the CND, MCF and CARD under close observation. He suffers from an acute impediment to his speech and even had he wished to do so, he would not have been able to contribute to any of the important debates that took place in Blackpool.

The continuing existence of the Scarborough Labour Party serves to make the adjacent Labour marginal seat of Cleveland more vulnerable than voting figures would seem to indicate. This, at least is the language of expediency and for that reason, we appeal to the NEC to disband the Scarborough Labour Party and then allow it to be re-formed on the basis of strict adherence to the principles and constitution of the Labour Party.

AN APPEAL FROM SCARBOROUGH NEW LEFT CLUB

A recent circular put out by the Scarborough New Left Club concluded: "The New Left Club appeals to all socialists and progressives to apply for membership of the Scarborough Labour Party. If the present abysmally unsatisfactory Executive Committee could be removed from office by a majority vote of the rank and file membership, it would then be possible to rebuild the party, so as to ensure that it becomes a vital instrument of social reform in the Scarborough and Whitby Constituency.

"Applications for membership should be made in writing under a certificate of posting to the secretary, Mr. R.W. Grant, 15, Ryndle Walk, Scarborough, or the Graham Sea Training School, Paradise, Scarborough, Telephone 2740."

TGWU TO DEMOCRATISE JERSEY

from a special correspondent

The Transport and General Workers' Union in Jersey, Channel Islands, has 5,000 members. Its District Committee has now formed a political committee which held its first meeting on November 19th. Afterwards, the chairman of the District Committee, Mr R. Hansford, a docker, issued the following statement:

"We have money in our political fund and we shall use it to finance a candidate at the next election and pay his wages to sit in the Chamber. We want to see paid MPs elected on a declared political programme, instead of the present system of electing unattached representatives on an honorary basis. The workers never vote at elections because all the candidates belong to the same old gang of rich businessmen and wealthy retired company directors. We accuse the Government of overspending and taxing the workers - but not the rich. Chancellor of the Exchequer Cyril Le Marquand has said that income tax will never go higher than 4s in the pound while he is in office. We say there should be supertax on the very rich. There are over 20 millionaires on this island."

When an official from the Soviet Embassy complained about the Penkovsky papers being published in this country he was blandly told: "We have no censorship here." However, it would appear that this claim rests on a rather insecure base. Early next month, Mr. William Hamilton, Labour MP for West Fife is to ask in the House of Commons how many times has the Postmaster-General used his power under Section 44 of the Licensing Agreement, in the last year, to stop certain items from being broadcast.

The question has arisen because of press reports that pressure from Whitehall has stopped the showing of a television film, "The War Game." The most informative of these reports appeared in the November 14th Sunday Times. By Cal McCrystal, the report stated: "Mr. Peter Watkins, producer of the controversial television film, "The War Game," who resigned from the BBC last month suspects that the Home Office played a part in the suppression of his film. He told me last week that he has asked the Corporation to name the non-BBC personnel who viewed the film privately on September 24, but so far has received no reply. Last week, the Home Office stated 'The War Game, which is about a nuclear attack on Britain was seen privately by a Home Office representative' in the BBC viewing theatre. 'This was on the invitation of the BBC,' the spokesman said, 'but it is up to them to name the representative.'"

The report concluded: "As far back as autumn of last year, when Huw Wheldon (then head of TV documentaries) told Watkins he could start research on "The War Game", there was doubt whether the film would ever be screened. Watkins said: 'I was to start research on the assumption that I might not get the final go-ahead.' At the beginning of April this year, he was told he could start filming, but was again warned that the film might not be transmitted. The Home Office apparently had misgivings about the project even in the research stage. 'In January or February,' said Watkins, 'I went to the Civil Defence department of the Home Office and discussed the matter with three people. One of them implied that the making of the film was immoral.'"

We are only given hints as to what the authorities found objectionable in the film. However, it is pretty clear that one of the things which caused uneasiness was Mr. Watkins graphic realism. Translated into practical terms this amounts to a political censorship, the Home Office doesn't want it brought home to people just how right the CND is when it points out the absolute futility of civil defence in the nuclear age.

THE REASON FOR INCOMES POLICY

by a special correspondent

A speaker at the Industry, 1965, Exhibition at Earls Court, London, confirmed the thesis, put forward by socialist writers such as Ernest Mandel and Andre Gorz, that the desire for an incomes policy arises, not from the so-called wages-prices spiral, but from technological development within the framework of capitalism. Professor B.C. Roberts stated that modern technology, which has made long-term planning possible, will make tighter control over wage bargaining at all levels inevitable. Speaking at the closing session of the five-day conference which had been attended by big business executives and trade union leaders, he said that the unions would need to adjust their pattern of organisation effectively to participate in the planning process. What was most needed, he continued, was a definition of the role and responsibility of union organisation at the enterprise level; an obvious reference to the need to control shop stewards.

U.K. spending on "defence", measured as a percentage of the gross national product, is among the highest in the world, according to a survey conducted by the Institute of Strategic Studies. According to this survey, titled "The Military Balance", U.K. expenditure amounts to 6.7% of the GNP. Among NATO countries it is second only to the U.S.A., which spends 8.9% of its GNP. Outside of NATO, only Israel (10.7%) and the U.A.R. (8.6%) spend more. Even measured in terms of a percentage of total central government expenditure, U.K. outlays are still among the highest at 26%.

On another tack altogether, the survey shows that the strategic superiority of the U.S.A., in terms of long-range missiles, over the Soviet Union is less than it was a year ago. In early 1966, the survey estimates, the U.S.A. will have a lead of three to one over the Soviet Union, compared with the ratio of more four to one in early 1965. This is partly due to the U.S.A. having scrapped some missiles it considered obsolete. In terms of fleet ballistic missiles (Polaris), however, the U.S.A. has increased its superiority to over four to one.

Dealing with China, the Institute claims that the Chinese air force is seriously short of modern aircraft and spare parts for its existing fleet. Although China is receiving no assistance from any other of the leading industrial powers, it is believed that she is starting production of modern tanks, fighter aircraft and submarines.

SHIPYARD "RATIONALISATION" INEVITABLE SAYS LLOYD'S BOSS by Dave Windsor

A major rationalisation of the British shipbuilding industry, with some of the yards going out of business, was inevitable, said the chairman of Lloyd's Register of Shipping, Mr. A.C. Grover, on November 20th. Mr. Grover, who had just returned from a six-week tour of the Far East, which included visits to Japanese shipyards, stressed the speed at which Japanese yards built. The general level of productivity, he said, so far as large oil tankers and bulk carriers was concerned appeared to be twice as high as in Britain. In this country, said Mr. Grover, there "must be a concerted effort by the unions to overcome the handicap of delayed delivery and of slow production." Comparing the British and Japanese shipbuilding industries he did not think that Japanese wages were much lower than in the U.K. With "fringe" benefits included, he stated, there was little to choose between them.

When asked how he would like to see rationalisation proceed in the U.K. Mr. Grover suggested the grouping - financially and in the industrial organisation sense - of the bigger shipyards in such areas as the Tyne and the Clyde. "There is a large number of yards in this country competing for the same sort of business," he declared. There was also a considerable amount of "overlapping" at the design and drawing office stages. In terms of modern equipment a number of British shipyards were as well or even better equipped than the best Japanese yards. "Many of our yards, I am sure, can turn out ships as quickly and as cheaply as Japan, given some rationalisation and good will between managements and unions," concluded Mr. Grover.

It is to be hoped that active trade unionists will take note of the increasing talk of "rationalisation" of the shipyards. Despite all the honeyed talk of "the national interest", etc., we know that moves will be taken without any regard for the social consequences of large scale shutting down of yards.

Three months ago the South African police in a dawn swoop arrested eleven courageous Anti-Apartheid fighters, banned leaders and members of the South African Coloured Peoples Congress. Under the hard conditions of South African prisons, they were put into separate gaols in different parts of the Cape in complete isolation, awaiting trial under the notorious Suppression of Communism Act. They were refused bail, and despite the fact that they were remanded from time to time, no specific charges have yet been made against them. These brave men, who have given their whole life fighting for freedom for their people at tremendous sacrifice, are in desperate need, both legally and materially. Most of them are married with families, whose sole supporters they were. In one case - that of William Bok - he was breadwinner for a wife and eleven children, and now his wife is expecting a twelfth child. Under Verwoerd's police state these men are likely to be held for a long time, and the chances of them obtaining a fair trial are extremely slim. Money is therefore needed urgently, not only to provide for their dependants, but also to ensure that they will receive a fair trial.

Since news was first published about these soldiers of freedom in the International Bulletin of the South African Coloured Peoples Congress, a little money trickled in. The SACPC is now making a second appeal, and it asks all progressives and liberal-minded people to give generously. All monies should be forwarded to Defence & Aid, 2, Amen Court, London E.C.4.

STRATHCLYDE UNIVERSITY DEBATES IMMIGRATION POLICY from James D. Young

There have been two debates on the question of immigration policy at Strathclyde University this month. On November 11th there was a parliamentary-type debate in the Union. The Labour Government putting forward a motion defending the open door policy (I disassociated it from the Government in Westminster). This motion was carried by a decent majority. In the debate I laid the blame for housing and other social problems at the door of the Liberal and Tory parties and their system of capitalist ownership. I also called on the labour movement to return to its own best working class traditions.

The other debate took place at the University Labour Club on November 5th. This proved to be the best meeting the club has held this session. Mr. Treble, of the Economic History Department, addressed the meeting on the Government's White Paper on Immigration. In a few pungent and pithy sentences Mr. Treble exposed and demolished the facile and fallacious reasoning behind the Government's policy. He began by making a strong moral condemnation of the racial discrimination implicit in the White Paper. He then subjected it to a thorough-going economic analysis, and called upon the Labour Party to take up a principled stand against controlled immigration and racialism before it was too late. He also criticised the Labour Government for getting inveigled in consumer policies by pandering to racial prejudice.

Mr. Treble covered many aspects of the problem: the fact that the White Paper pandered to the xenophobic propaganda of racist organisations; the arguments of Sir Cyril Osborne that the immigrants were lazy and sponged on the welfare state; he contrasted Mr. Gaitskell's stand with present policies; he pointed out the contradictions in Government policies on the question of Britain's labour shortage; he demolished the arguments of Mr. Pannell; and summed up by saying "There is still time for a change of opinion. But the Government had to take the lead in moulding public opinion, not following it."

In his reply to Andrew Miller's note about planning in Yugoslavia, Ken Coates takes up once more a theme stated in his article in 'Towards Socialism' - that Yugoslavia may yet be regarded as 'an object lesson in pitfalls'. Here, in contrast to Todorovic's brave and futuristic words about 'self planning... without leaders or followers,' Coates presents us with a strange and undefined alternative - 'bureaucratic anarchy'. The Yugoslav system is said to have brought about 'decentralization', 'the growth of differentials, and reliance on market forces there produces 'the growth of working class apathy,' since it is 'impalpable and uncontrolled.'

As a characterization of either features or trends in Yugoslav society, these observations, decentralization apart, are just inaccurate. In 1944, the Yugoslav communists initially faced the future amidst the ruins of their previously backward society, in terms of stalinist orthodoxy. The grandiose central plan for industrializing their country in five years did not only fail because of the rifts with the Soviet Union. It is now admitted that it was misconceived from the start, although some centralization may have been necessary for a short period in the complete breakdown which was the aftermath of the war. Yugoslavia, the only communist country to have fully emerged from communist satellite states, provides the fullest detail of the idiocy of fully centralized planning, be it democratic or totalitarian. The plan detailed the exact number of shoes to be produced five years later; the exact number of olive trees to be planted, the exact number of glass containers for medical use, etc. etc. The completed plan was over 1½ tons in weight. Every enterprise had to submit between 600-800 progress reports a year. For the whole of Zagreb there was one retail business and one consumer's co-operative, and the two largest beaches on the Adriatic had one type of cake a day, produced by one firm for all shops, hotels, restaurants. As Bicanic comments, 'Today the savings of large scale production are less, but the cakes are better,' (cited in Waterston, A., 'Planning in Yugoslavia,' 1962.)

The important points are (a) that even a relatively simple society is too complicated for centralized directive planning of a total nature, let alone one like ours. (b) That detailed directive planning is incompatible with consumer freedom of choice - though this is relative, and may not matter where the economic level is very low. Thus, where peasants have had no shoes at all, they are unlikely to grumble because they are not offered a choice, initially at least; so long as the shoes they get meet their needs, and are not all left footed, as has been known to happen! (c) That centralized directive planning, even if decided democratically by the majority, must severely control the degree of self management that workers can have. For self management is not merely a question of deciding how an externally imposed target can be met. It involves the real decision, subject to the interests of the whole population, of what is to be produced, of prices, and of wages.

The qualification, 'subject to the interests of the whole population', is crucial, for it emphasizes the difference between totalitarianism on the one hand, anarchy, which Ken Coates seems to believe exists in Yugoslavia, on the other, and socialist democracy, or 'associationist socialism' as the Yugoslavs sometimes call it. The market is the only means by which citizens or workers can directly exercise a choice, and the greater the abundance produced by technological innovation, the greater the importance of this. But the use of the market does not automatically entail the release of an 'impalpable and controlled force,' leading inexorably to 'bureaucratic anarchy.'

(Incidentally, the staff of the Federal Planning Institute is less than $\frac{1}{3}$ of what it was in the centralized period, and from 1948-55, the number of employees was reduced from 43,500 to 8,000. What kind of bureaucratic trend is this?) For the Yugoslav market is a very different beast from our own. Its fangs and claws have been drawn; it is domesticated.

The problems of a market economy are shortly those of monopoly; of unequal development; of wasted resources; and of unemployment, due to differences between estimation of demand and capacity. In Yugoslavia, there is minimum wage legislation, and an extremely good system of social security, which has been described as the best in the world, in relation to earnings. There is restrictive legislation covering the setting up of monopoly, and the Government can also use import controls to make sure there is no internal exploitation. Subject to this, the worker's councils themselves can decide to merge their enterprises. There is legislation to enable the control of price increases, either over all, or in certain key sectors, and this has been used to hold in check inflationary tendencies in 1962 and 1964.

The even development of the economy is controlled on a national level by the control of allocations for major capital projects, so that the major part of the development funds go to underdeveloped regions, and within Republics, which also show marked regional disparities in some cases, by similar control at the Republican Government level. The taxation system on enterprises ensures that regional wealth or enterprise profitability are reflected in the funds received at Republic and Federal level, and can thus be balanced in increased investment elsewhere. Investment statistics show this to have been successful in the decentralization period. Finally, the banks can be, and are, used as regulators.

These legislative and economic controls are supplemented by pressure from three social organisations. Each enterprise sends representatives to the appropriate Economic Chamber for its industry, so that the policies of each industrial enterprise are discussed by all the enterprises concerned. Within the enterprise itself, the League of Communists and the trade union branches act as pressure groups, though they have no statutory authority, towards socially orientated rather than selfish, long term rather than short term decisions.

How far is planning democratic? Long term plans are now purely predictive and general. For the 7 year plan, 1964-70, initial drafts from the Federal Planning Institute, were widely circulated to Economic Chambers, enterprises, trade unions, communal organisations, etc. and many amendments and additions incorporated. The yearly plans are in theory obligatory, though this is legally meaningless, as there is no specification as to the responsibility for non fulfillment. They are drawn up on the basis of enterprises' annual returns of their capacity and investment plans, together with national estimates of investment and trade. They are published in draft form, and again widely discussed, before final amendment and acceptance by the Federal Assembly. The plans are short and general. The 1961 plan was only 25 pages in length. There are, no doubt, improvements that could be made in this procedure, but it contrasts most favourably with the presentation of our own, so called, National Plan.

Do we find either, the 'rampant growth of differentials and incentives,' or 'worker's apathy' in Yugoslavia? My own research there in 1961 and 1964 does not confirm either statement. Differentials are, on the whole, low, compared with either the Soviet Union or the west. It would be nice if every-

one had the 'socialist consciousness' to accept the same reward as everyone else for their own work, and if groups of people whose skills were in short supply would forego their privileged bargaining position. But this is hardly reasonable to expect in the first 20 years' socialist experience of a developing country. Thus, limits of 1:4 were maintained up to 1960 (in very large enterprises 1:8 was allowed). In this year differentials were made the responsibility of the worker's councils. Such was the shortage of engineers, however, that differentials in some plants shot up to 1:12 or 1:13, although only one man might be earning the high figure. This began to even itself out as the supply has slowly improved, and in the factories I visited in 1964 in the Sarajevo area, the maximum differential appeared to be about 1:4, 1:5. The workers council meeting I attended voted a small reduction in differentials, and I think this is part of a general, long term trend. 'Incentives' cannot be seen in the same light in a self managed enterprise as in a privately owned or manager controlled one, as the whole idea of payment is different- c.f. the discussion in Singleton and Topham's Fabian pamphlet- but schemes for 'payment by results' have not spread widely among teachers or doctors; and, judging by the difficulty the workers council in the Tvornica plyboard factory had in assessing the value of its maintenance department, abuses will not be tolerated for long. As to apathy, this is again a relative matter, but I interviewed young peasant workers in four factories in Sarajevo, a recently industrialised area, and it is my impression that their knowledge of, and interest in their enterprise was markedly higher than that of groups with comparable skills I have interviewed in this country. The four Directors I interviewed, all with experience of the 'administrative period' were unanimous in agreeing that there was a totally different atmosphere in the factory nowadays- at least one was openly unhappy about the way his powers were curtailed. Meister's research in Smederevo Commune indicates, as one might predict, that activism is related to skill level/education/urban background, and Kozomara's longitudinal study in the Famos factory at Sarajevo, that it develops with length of stay and emancipation from peasant background. We can safely say that the decentralised system has neither produced general apathy, nor is tending that way. People do not feel at the mercy of "impalpable" market forces.

There is perhaps more validity in a general criticism of the lack of a political opposition party in Yugoslavia, but one must be very careful of this. There is no settled tradition of nationhood. If other parties were allowed now, as Djilas advocated, there is no doubt that what would emerge would be a reactionary peasant party which would revert to Catholic nationalism in Croatia, and attempt to exploit the differences in investment between rich and poor regions - some groups in the richer areas feel they are being "milked" to provide for the underdeveloped sections. This would be a tragedy for Yugoslavia. But there is, at last, choice of candidates in elections at all levels, and the right of recall is, occasionally at least, being used. It seems likely that in a society with no great divisions of principle, elected representatives will not form stable parties, but shifting pressure groups, as different combinations of individuals reach different assessments of different problems. As long as Yugoslavia exhibits an extension of the area of real political choice, associationist socialism is evolving; we need not necessarily expect a stable party system to form.

This may seem to be an apologia for Yugoslavia. In as far as the situation there has been misrepresented, it is....the Yugoslav experience is crucial in discussing the problems of interrelating planning, self-management, centralisation and freedom of choice. Socialists have for so long made a fetish of planning and a bogey of the market; such a simplistic approach cannot any longer be sustained, at least for industrialised society.....The theory and practice of Yugoslav associationist socialism provides a more complex, but more realistic alternative. It should be at the forefront of our discussion...Insofar as Preobrazhenski's ghost contributes to the fallacy of centralised, directive planning, it requires exorcism, not invocation!

CENTRE FOR SOCIALIST EDUCATION

STATEMENT OF AIMS

For socialists in Britain, no task is now more important and urgent than the reassertion, by word and deed, of socialist principles and purposes.

In opposition to the whole trend of thought and policy which now dominates the Labour movement, socialists need to insist that they are concerned, not with the shoring up of capitalism, but with its abolition and replacement by a socialist society based on common ownership and industrial as well as political democracy.

Against the attempts to defeat socialist and revolutionary forces in all parts of the world, and particularly in the Third World, socialists in Britain also need to insist upon their solidarity with these forces and upon their determination to help them.

The socialist struggle must assume a wide variety of forms, political, industrial and cultural. But that struggle can only be waged effectively by men and women who are able, on the basis of their own knowledge and understanding, to present socialist solutions to the evils they oppose. Only thus can they hope to help come into being that mass socialist movement which is the first and essential condition for the achievement of a socialist society.

We are well aware of how strong and determined are the forces, not least in the Labour movement, which seek to prevent the spread of socialist consciousness. But we believe that conditions at home and abroad offer excellent opportunities for the spread of socialist ideas. In any case, we feel that socialists need not only take opportunities when they arise, but to create them when they do not.

It is for this purpose of socialist education that we have created the Centre for Socialist Education and that we call upon fellow socialists to join with us. This work of socialist education does not mean remoteness from the immediate struggles

P.T.O.

CENTRE FOR SOCIALIST EDUCATION

CENTRE FOR SOCIALIST EDUCATION

in which trade unionists and others in the Labour Movement are engaged: we intend the work of the Centre to be of direct assistance in these struggles.

The Centre will foster socialist education by way of books, pamphlets, the provision of documentation to interested individuals and organisations, conferences, meetings, debates, lectures, etc. This activity is not conceived in any sectarian spirit: membership of the Centre is open to all socialists, whether they are members of a party, trade union or other group, or of none. Nor is it intended that all activity should proceed from a national headquarters. On the contrary, we wish to create a decentralised and federal organisation, with local Centres engaging in every suitable form of socialist education in their own areas, with a national committee charged with the task of such coordination as is necessary, the pooling of information, and the organisation of activities which can only be undertaken at national level.

We hope you will wish to become a member of the Centre and to help in its work.

Provisional Steering Committee

Perry Anderson	Ruth Glass	Tom Nicholls
Robin Blackburn	Bob Gregory	John Palmer
Ken Coates	Pat Jordan	Alan Rooney
Rosalind Delmar	Walter Kendall	Mike Rustin
Chris Farley	Mary Klopfer	Peter Sedgwick
Richard Fletcher	Ralph Miliband	Ken Tarbuck
Charles Van Gelderen	Stan Mills	Tony Topham

- * I wish to join/know more about the Centre for Socialist Education.
- * I enclose (£1 minimum) annual membership fee.
- * I am prepared to sponsor/call a meeting of my friends to discuss/ assist the work of the Centre.
- * Please send me a banker's order form for regular donations to the Centre.

Name (capitals)

Address

.....

I am a member of the following organisations

.....

** Delete whichever is inapplicable.*

Please return this form to the Convenor, CSE, 19 Greenfield Street, Dunkirk, Nottingham. All donations will be gratefully acknowledged.