

# The Week

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS

Vol. 4, No. 9. 9th September, 1965

4110  
w  
6<sup>D</sup>

- WILSON AND INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY
- BRISTOL LABOUR REVOLT
- VIETNAM SHIPS BOYCOTT
- YOUNG SOCIALISTS CAMPAIGN
- THE CONTRADICTION OF DEVLIN

## FREE SPEECH

LET BRITAIN HEAR THE VIETNAM  
FREEDOM FIGHTERS CASE!

Subscription rates : 13 weeks 10/-  
26 weeks £1  
1 year £2

Students 25% discount

Business Address : 54 Park Road, Lenton, Nottingham

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 Schoenemann



As is explained in the dossier published in The Week, Lord Russell invited three representatives of the Vietnamese National Liberation Front to come to this country for consultations and to appear at various teach-ins.

Now the Government has been forced to answer, after a long delay. Its decision is shameful.

On the 27th August the following letter appeared in the New Statesman:

"We wish to associate ourselves with Lord Russell's attempt to obtain visas for the spokesmen of the N.L.F. of South Vietnam and his two colleagues. We consider it of great importance that people in Britain should have the opportunity to listen to the Liberation Front whose case has not as yet been heard here. Those who heard the representative from Saigon could now hear both sides. It is our hope that the Home Office will grant them visas immediately."

It was signed by Asa Briggs, Ruth Glass, Kingsley Martin, Iris Murdoch, Ralph Miliband, +Thomas Roberts, Lord Silkin, +Mervyn Stockwood, K.W. Wedderburn and Field Marshall Sir Claude Auchinleck.

It would be desirable if the case for admitting the N.L.F. representatives could be expressed more widely. We should like to take a full-page advert in one of national papers, at a cost of £1,500, in order to advocate it. If you are prepared to endorse the above letter, and pay a minimum of 10/- in order to contribute to the cost of such an advertisement, will you please return the form below with your money? We hope that in particular persons with an active history in the Labour Movement will support this appeal.

Further, if every reader of The Week sent his 10/-, we should still not have sufficient money to pay for the advert. So can you canvass your friends, six or a dozen or more of them, and collect their contributions also?

-----p-----  
I endorse the New Statesman letter, and enclose my donation of.....(minimum 10/-) towards the cost of the advertisement in the national press.

Name.....

Address.....

.....

.....

.....

Any position in the Labour Movement which you wish to have listed for identification purposes only.....

P.T.O.



The following persons have also agreed to endorse the appeal, and send the listed amounts:

Name	Address	positions	amounts
------	---------	-----------	---------

All contributions will be gratefully acknowledged by the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, and should be sent to:

Free Speech Fund,  
Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation,  
3-4, Shavers Place,  
Haymarket,  
London S.W. 1.



CONTENTS

Page	1	Editorial
"	2	Mr. Wilson and industrial democracy.
"	3	Bristol Labour Party members speak out.
"	4	The contradictions of Devlin.
"	5	<u>The Week</u> to produce docks pamphlet.
"	6	Affluence and Labour's votes.
"	7	Scottish "Save the Young Socialists" campaign.
"	8	Mexico bars ships for Vietnam war.
"	9	Independent Vietnam is a symbol.
"	10	Dossier on the proposed visit of N.L.F. spokesmen.
"	11	Vietnam and the Labour Party conference.
"	12	Young Socialists prepare for battle.

A NEW LOW FOR MR. STEWART

The dossier which we publish on page 10, concerning the Government's attitude to Bertrand Russell's invitation to the three spokesmen of the Vietnamese N.L.F., is yet another sign of the disgraceful retreat which has been made by the Government, not only from socialist principles, even from elementary liberal fundamentals. Coupled with the prohibition which has been placed upon the performance of the Bolshoi Ballet which was to have been given in aid of the Russell Peace Foundation, everyone will see it as an attack on the greatest living exponent of British liberal thought. But at the same time, it reveals a new low in cowardly evasion of responsibility, in smug dedication to reactionary causes which happen to pay off in dollar loans, in perfidy, deceit and lying demagoguery.

At his carefully rehearsed and thoroughly hollow performance at the Oxford Teach-in, Mr. Stewart tried, with some measure of success, to present himself as a seeker after truth, a man prepared to see reason, a statesman confronted with tragic alternatives, but humane to the last degree. It was essential, he said, for British people "to have access to news, information and comment from all over the world...to form their own opinions and to express those opinions freely." His veto on the visas of Professor Nguyen Van Hieu, Mr. Dinh Ba Thi and Mr. Pham Van Chuong, invited here precisely in order to bring "news, information and comment" from a forbidden quarter in which all of us have an extremely lively interest, can only be interpreted as a repudiation of his own sentiments, which are thus exposed as completely cynical deference to the mood of his rightly hostile audience. If the Vietnamese came here, Mr. Stewart would have to debate with them. His stature would not gain therefrom: there is a distinct possibility that they would gain overwhelming sympathy once their voices could be heard. So Mr. Stewart acts in the one way which should be unthinkable for a socialist. He muzzles the unpleasant truth. This is a sneaky act, the act of a mean little, apprehensive man. Such a man can hardly be thought fit to represent British labour anywhere, leave alone in the vital field of foreign affairs.

We must react sharply. Emergency resolutions must be tabled to the Labour Party Conference, demanding that the N.L.F. speakers be allowed to come here for these teach-ins. Letters and deputations must be poured on the heads of the Home Secretary and Mr. Stewart. Every M.P. must be pressed to declare where he stands on this vital question of free speech\* The whole country must resound with the clamour we raise on this crucial matter.

\* Reports of all such activities should be rushed to The Week.



Speaking at a Labour Party rally in Bristol on Saturday, 4th September, Mr. Wilson said that it was necessary to establish factory committees which will "identify and get rid of every practice on either side which is an impediment to production." He went on:

"...I hope that these committees can go on quickly to expand their activities to exports so that managements can ask for co-operation in obtaining a good order or speeding its fulfilment...workers anxious about their future employment perhaps, might press a laggard management to go after openings in export markets...."

In this context he attacked failures in communication, and insisted on a free and frank discussion between both sides of industry on production difficulties. "This", he went on "will be industrial democracy in practice."

Those of us who have for years now been campaigning for industrial democracy will be glad that Mr. Wilson has come to feel that he needs to pay tribute to the idea. However, his remarks show that he interprets it in a most damaging and one-sided way. It is impossible to speak of industrial democracy without campaigning for a great extension of trade union powers. But Mr. Wilson, in the same speech, attacks these very powers. His condemnation of "restrictive practices" has none of its teeth bared in the direction of the monopolies and the employers, but on the contrary bites hard at the areas of workers' control of hiring, firing, promotion, work disposition and control of supervision, which have, with great difficulty, been won by the unions in their day-to-day struggles. His attacks on recent strikes are precise cases in point. His threats against the NUR, on the case of the liner trains, support the power of neo-capitalist rationalisers like Dr. Beeching, against the demands for consultation and controls which have rightly been made by the railwaymen.

If Mr. Wilson can abandon these attacks on trade union freedoms, and work to extend the power of the workpeople in all fields, there is no doubt whatever that they can greatly boost production. But to do this, Mr. Wilson must align himself with the shop stewards against their detractors and opponents. None of them are free to drive for greater production while their members' rights are under constant menace. Further, real industrial democracy means that all the totalitarian rights of management must be ended. This, as Clause Four makes plain, implies a change in the ownership of the factories, and the complete availability of all accounts and other secret information to the workpeople whose support is being solicited. To think this can be done without major acts by the Government is very naive indeed.

Unfortunately, it appears that Mr. Wilson is here using democratic rhetoric to sell a very undemocratic proposal: that the workers should abandon their trade union strength in the factory, and the rights they have won, in favour of a modified form of joint consultation. This practice has been widely tried, and completely fails to guarantee the rights of workpeople. In a context of Government squeeze on the economy even the limited concessions which have been available through this means will be brought to an end.

Ed. Note: The above article was written for Briefing which is being distributed to all TUC delegates at Brighton.



YES, MR. WILSON

from Tom Nicholls

(Editorial note: the following is the text of a leaflet which a number of Labour Party members in Bristol signed and distributed at the meeting addressed by Mr. Wilson on 4th September. The statement is being circulated for further signatures and support. The idea was originally suggested in the Bristol Left Club, but the actual leaflet was signed by Labour Party members only. Among those who signed it were two councillors and Mr. Wedgwood Benn's election agent. Over 100 representatives of local Labour movement and peace organisations took part in the demonstration outside the hall where Mr. Wilson spoke, and 2,000 of the leaflets were given out)

Yes, Mr. Wilson, we support you in modernisation.

But how will you modernise while financiers at home and abroad do not want a Labour Government to succeed?

One way only - use the pound as a tool of reconstruction, not as a standard international currency. Britain lives by producing goods - only a section of it lives by international finance.

Yes, Mr. Brown, we believe in a wages and profits policy.

But how can you win people's confidence when the employers know our wages, but nobody can truly know their profits?

One way only - open the books so that we know what their true profits are.

Yes, Mr. Stewart, we support any move for peace in Vietnam.

But how can any successful peace move be made by a government thoroughly committed to the cause of the invader?

One way only - public dissociation from U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Yes, Mrs. Castle, help underdeveloped countries.

But how can West Africa get over the hump of economic development while buyers' rings force the price of cocoa down by a half in five months, to its lowest since the war? (And have chocolate prices fallen in Britain?)

One way only - stop what 'War on Want' calls the "Insanity fair", in which we take away far more in trade than we give in aid. Control overseas trade.

Yes, Mr. Wilson, we are party members who worked for your victory, and are used to serving the Labour Party loyally.

But many of us are disillusioned, public enthusiasm has waned, and you are in electoral danger.

One way only - stop using Tory policies, and inspire Britain with an immediate initiative towards a new society. Bring into public ownership and control the real centres of power.



The Devlin Report's main theme is the "abnormality" of employer-employee relations in the docks. To this theme it returns again and again, its principal thesis being that, to eliminate "indiscipline", "irresponsibility", and inefficiency, "normal" industrial relations must somehow be created. The intrusion of the Dock Labour Board as the "holding employer" prevents the development of normal ties between worker and employer, which would produce a sense of discipline, a feeling of security, and sentiments of trust. This is the Devlin picture of "normal" industrial relations in 1965! The docker is awkward because he has never experienced the full sense of the wage-worker status. In other words he is not subservient, not disciplined. Traces of a pre-industrial sense of independence cling to him. (Mr. Brown, of Glacier Metal, in his book "Piece-work Abandoned" found that piece-work also conferred on the worker an undesirable sense of independence.) Devlin argues that if the docker is placed in the circumstances of normal employment relations, he will respond to that conditioning by losing his specific and difficult characteristics. The docker has (some) freedom without responsibility, says Devlin, and the solution is to deprive him of his freedom. (The term "freedom" here is used obviously in a strictly relative sense.) Shorn of his freedom, his "irresponsibility" will be transformed. (The term "responsibility" means here, disciplined, subservient - in fact the very opposite of "responsible" in any meaningful, socialist sense.)

Whilst recognising therefore the specific character of dock labour, Devlin is led by his wholly orthodox view of normalcy, into a series of recommendations which work against the dockers' traditions, and seek to force him into the conventional mould. (This is not to idealise the present situation: the dockers' "freedoms" are of a strictly limited and negative kind, unaccompanied by any kind of authority or responsibility in our socialist sense.) Assuming that structural changes do occur in the industry, so that every docker is placed in the employment of a specific boss, would we see the development of that cosy, trustful relationship which Devlin envisages? Is twentieth century capitalist industry such a haven of harmonious, paternalistic innocence? At certain points, Devlin recognises that this is not so, for he switches about between faith in the personal worker-employer relation, and reliance on the "new science of management and persuasion"! These he argues, can only be practiced in a rationalised, modernised structure of port employer companies. With a "Devlin" looming up for the car industry we might wonder whether industrial harmony, discipline, etc., will be found to result from the "skills" of large-scale management in that context. Devlin's "solutions" begin to look more and more like reactionary utopianism, a woolly liberalistic idealism - though dressed up in forceful language to appear hard-headed and practical. But it is even worse than that. For Devlin's own recommendations concede that in the context of dock labour's history, the ideal is unattainable. The Dock Labour Board, that intrusive and special feature, cannot just be eliminated. (Except, of course, under conditions of nationalisation with workers' control, which Devlin rejects, and to which we shall return later.) For if the pattern of multiple, private employers is retained, (however modified by mergers and rationalisation as Devlin proposes) an agency to handle the equitable and efficient transfer of temporary surpluses and deficiencies of labour between the separate employers must remain. Moreover, the "spirit" of the NDLB system is one which Devlin recognises could not be eliminated without total opposition from unions and dockers. Hence he is forced to retain the Board, and contradictory-wise (for Devlin's position is nothing if not contradictory) actually to extend its

continued over/



Devlin...continued/

disciplinary function from the present scope of the "pool" men, to the whole of the "regular" employees. He dare not in other words, carry through the logic of his position by proposing that the individual employer should have the normal powers over his employees. The solution is a bastard form in every way. Further, the prospects of a successfully functioning disciplinary machine after the change, when a docker is supposed to be the employee of a firm, are much less bright even than under the present system - the "pool" man has at least some kind of relationship with the Board. It is likely that under the Devlin solution, the worker representatives on the Board will feel that they are being asked to do the dirty work of discipline for the employers, in a much sharper and clearer way than at present.

Devlin gets into this dilemma because of his unshakeable belief that the docker must go through the historical phase (or in his philosophy, be fixed in the timeless ideal status) of being a fully subservient wage-worker. In fact, the specific character of dock labour as it has developed here, places the docker in a very special way poised for a transition which by-passes this phase. For a genuine (rather than a mechanical and superficial) solution to the contradiction of the dock workers' status, leads straight in the direction of self-management - which in its turn is inconceivable without social ownership. The contradiction "freedom without responsibility" can be resolved in a progressive sense and fully, only by granting the power without which "responsibility" means its opposite. This natural transition is resisted by Devlin because of the anti-socialist bias which is built into the report. The artificiality of Devlin comes out many times. For instance, he is clear that there are too many employers. In the case of Hull he recommends a reduction from ninety to ten. As one docker expressed it to me: "If it can come down from ninety to ten, why stop there? One concern is the answer." Precisely. The arbitrary solution is necessary to Devlin in order to construct the longed-for norm of a few big, managerial-style, private firms. Moreover, if the logic of one employer - a publicly-owned concern - is granted, what becomes of the holding employer, the NDLB? The original purpose of joint control over labour having been eliminated, could the public authority take over NDLB functions? By no means, for this would destroy that essential "spirit" of the Dock Labour Board. That spirit, in other words, in a context of social ownership, would lead straight in the direction of workers' control.

The value of the Devlin Report lies precisely here: in pursuing the destination of decasualisation the contradictions have been exposed with startling clarity. No doubt enormous pressures - including the threat of Government legislation - will seek to force the industry into the narrow cul-de-sac which Devlin has sign-posted, but the rubble which has obscured the alternative strategic route can now be cleared away. The lessons will not be confined to the port transport industry.

#### THE WEEK TO BRING OUT SPECIAL DOCKS' PAMPHLET

Because of the immense interest which has been displayed in the movement over the Devlin Report and possible socialist alternatives, The Week editorial team have decided to produce a special issue in the form of a pamphlet devoted to this question. In London supporters of The Week have been interviewing dockers for their comments on the articles we have produced on the subject. These, together with similar articles from other ports, and special articles by specialists will be reproduced. We should be pleased to hear from any reader, especially if he is associated with the docks, who has any comment.



Mr. J.H. Goldthorpe, in a paper to the Sociology Section of the annual meeting of the British Association, presented the conclusion of research workers at King's College, Cambridge, that contrary to widely accepted opinion, working-class people who are affluent do not tend to become middle-class in attitudes to politics, employment or community life. In the 1950s the working classes became more and more affluent and politicians and others attributed the decline in Labour votes at successive elections until and including that of 1959 to increased middle-classness. This was a view that certain eminent sociologists of the past had also put forward. Mr. Goldthorpe and his colleagues found no evidence of this.

A group of 229 workers at progressive manufacturing concerns in Luton were chosen as the subject of the investigation. They earned at least £17 a week regularly, lived outside typically working-class localities and had hardly ever known unemployment. In other words, the group was chosen as the most likely to show the effects that were so widely believed. A control sample was also chosen of 54 white-collar workers from two of the concerns. In employment almost all the manual workers had one attitude - it was money that counted and the work had no interest. Among the white-collar workers the attitude was different. Liking the work they did was the reason most frequently mentioned for staying in it.

In community life too the customs were different in the two groups. Middle-class ways of making friends from people not necessarily neighbours or workmates, had certainly not spread to the manual workers, many of whom it should be mentioned were house-owners. In addition there remained a considerable degree of status segregation, well over two-thirds of the manual workers finding their chief companions entirely within their own class. They did not appear to see in middle-class life a style to be emulated. Investigations of political attitudes showed 80% of the manual group voted Labour at the 1959 Election, a substantially higher proportion than Mark Abrams' estimated national figure of about 60% for the upper working class. Moreover, the high level of voting for Labour had been fairly consistent from 1945 onwards. There was no trend whatever towards greater Conservative voting in the course of the 1950s. Mr. Goldthorpe inferred that "one must not jump directly from economic circumstances to political action."

By far the most frequent kind of reason given for attachment to the Labour Party was one phrased in terms of class and class customs. So affluence in itself had done little to erode the class basis of Labour support. The widely accepted chain of events, affluence to middle-classness to Conservative voting, is unsupported by the findings of this research group. Middle-classness is not simply a matter of money and politics and cannot be reduced to a mere "epi-phenomenon" of economic conditions. "Our affluent workers remain, in spite of their affluence, men who live by selling their labour to their employers. There is as yet little basis for expecting any particular change in the political attitudes and behaviour of these workers."

Thus, one can conclude from Mr. Goldthorpe's work, there is no basis for right-wing "theoreticians" blaming successive election defeats on the bourgeoisification of the working class. It seems much more likely, on the contrary, that policies which stress the working class nature of the Labour Party will give electoral dividends.



Following the initiatives taken by Young Socialists in other parts of the country, Woodside (Glasgow) Y.S. convened a meeting of Young Socialists concerned about this situation. Members from Clydebank, Dunfermline, Govan, Pollock, Springburn and Woodside branches attended a meeting held in Glasgow on August 29th. After much forthright discussion the meeting resolved:

"The decisions regarding the organisation of the Regional and National Conferences have been taken unilaterally and without prior discussion or consultation with any sections of the Labour Party. As members of the Labour Party and as Young Socialists we protest against these actions. we feel that the Y.S. should have as much say in running of its own affairs as any other constituent section of the Party.

The meeting further decided:

(1) to ask for support from branches and/or individual member throughout Scotland for the formation of an ad hoc committee to be composed of one member from each branch or part thereof; to co-ordinate activity between now and the Scottish Regional Y.S. Conference.

(2) to hold a meeting of the ad hoc committee on Sunday, 10th October at 2.30 P.M. in Woodside Labour Party rooms, 38, St. Clair St., Glasgow N.W., to discuss the situation prior to the Scottish Conference on the 16th.

(3) to support the remit back of the Youth Report to be presented to the Conference on the 16th.

(4) to hold a meeting of Conference delegates immediately following the Conference, to discuss the position of the Young Socialists in light of Conference decisions.

It was also felt that the campaign could be helped if Y.S. branches had speakers from the working committee to explain the situation in greater detail. Any Scottish reader who wants further information or would like to help the campaign should write to:

A. Miller (Secretary Working Committee),  
97, Otago Street,  
Glasgow W.2.

SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE C.L.P. PROTESTS

from a Bristol correspondent

The following<sup>ing</sup> is the text of an emergency resolution that the Executive Committee of South Gloucestershire C.L.P. are submitting to the Labour Party Annual Conference, subject to the approval of the G.M.C.:

"This Conference believes that an active and well-informed Young Socialist movement could play a vital role in the Labour Party. To this end the Annual Conference of the Young Socialists should be organised on democratic lines and should be allowed to discuss all matters concerning socialists. The Young Socialists should be guaranteed the right to elect its own officials and should be given control of its own journal."

SOUTH NOTTINGHAM C.L.P. JOINS PROTEST MOVEMENT

from a Nottingham reader

At its September meeting the South Nottingham C.L.P. roundly condemned the way Transport House has clamped down on the Young Socialist movement. The resolution, which was worded in strong terms, went through by a large majority despite the efforts of the Regional Organiser, Jim Cattermole, to justify Transport House action.

P.S. The Ilkeston Y.S. has also gone on record on the same matter.



## MEXICAN GOVERNMENT BARS SHIPS FOR VIETNAM

from a special correspondent

The Mexican Government has prohibited the entry of Mexican vessels into war zones, including South Vietnam. The Director of Merchants Ships of the Mexican Ministry of Navy announced this on August 26th in connection with the freighting of Mexican vessels for shipping arms to South Vietnam. The paper La Prensa, which carried on August 27th the statement of the Director, quoted him as saying that the Mexican Government from its stand for peace, would avoid as far as possible the traffic of arms and war materials.

## GREEK CREW REFUSE TO SHIP U.S. ARMS TO VIETNAM

based on A.P. report

The crew of the Greek freighter Stamatios S. Embiricos has refused to transport a cargo of U.S. war material to South Vietnam because "they disagree with U.S. policy in Vietnam," according to an Associated Press report from Long Beach, California, dated August 31. U.S. officials were reported to have disclosed that it was a 3,000-ton cargo of war material "badly" needed by the U.S. troops in South Vietnam. The Greek crew's action would cost the U.S. Government a 10-day delay on a Long Beach dock.

The U.S. Government had originally chartered a Mexican freight El Mexicano for transport of the material. As the Mexican Government prohibited the entry of Mexican vessels into war zones (see above item), a U.S. military transport agency was compelled to unload the cargo and hire the Greek freighter for transport.

## FIVE YEARS FOR DRAFT-CARD

BURNERS

from a U.S. reader

A law providing prison sentences and fines for American people who "knowingly" destroyed or mutilated their draft cards was signed by U.S. President Johnson on August 31. Since Johnson announced the buildup of U.S. troops in South Vietnam in July, many American young men across the country have burned their draft cards in public as a form of protest. This move is obviously designed to intimidate such action. U.S. Congress rushed through a Bill in early August which provides for a five-year term of imprisonment, a 10,000 dollar fine or both.

## VIETNAM WAR AVERTED U.S. RECESSION SAYS 1st NATIONAL BANK

from an economist

Military expenditure for Vietnam has changed the minds of many who are anticipating a possible recession next year, the First National City Bank said in its September economic letter. The bank noted that military build-up means <sup>that</sup> an increased defence expenditures will be super-imposed on rapidly growing federal welfare programmes and higher business and consumer spending. The Administration, the Bank letter said, has so far sharply reduced the deficit in the balance of payments, although Government officials emphasise that the problem is far from being solved.

Overall, the Bank reported, the economy has been growing at a somewhat faster pace than originally estimated. The U.S. Department of Commerce has revised its calculations of Gross National Product and, on a new basis of measurement, estimated the GNP for 1965 at close to \$670,000million. Though the remainder of the year only a fraction of the economic push will be spurred by increased military spending. But next year there may be an increase of from \$5,000 million to \$10,000 million.



There are two important things to bear in mind in celebrating the anniversary of independence for the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. The first of these is that the people of Vietnam, as with few other people, have had to sacrifice whole generations in their determination to be free of foreign domination. The second is that Vietnam has become a symbol of resistance to a world system of exploitation. In Vietnam, the United States' military industrial system has committed itself, and all other peoples who wish to advance socially and economically and to enjoy national sovereignty must watch the struggle of the people of Vietnam with intense concern and deep feelings of support. The Vietnamese people are engaged in a struggle which is peculiar. The most powerful industrial nation on earth has committed its full resources to the subjection of a peasant people whose victories have been gained through the use of primitive arms and an unconquerable sense of purpose.

The defeat of the United States military in Vietnam, therefore, will be a victory for justice in the world. In an important sense, I believe, it will also advance the cause of peace. At this time, the gravest threat to peace comes from U.S. attempts to dominate the developing countries of the world and to retain control over their natural resources. For as long as this basic policy motivates the United States the world will be faced with crisis after crisis and the ever-present danger of world war. The victory of the Vietnamese people will contribute greatly to the discrediting of this American policy and will stimulate opposition to it within the United States, just as the defeat of France in Vietnam and Algeria has led to a new and more rational policy on the part of that nation.

If, as may well be the case, American imperialism is not deterred by its impending defeat in Vietnam, it will, at least, be less able to inflict on others the suffering which it has caused the people of North and South Vietnam.

I send my warmest greetings to President Ho Chi Minh and all people of Vietnam on this day of independence celebrations.

\* Message sent to Ho Chi Minh on August 27th, 1965, on the occasion of the anniversary celebrations of Vietnam.

#### MR. WILSON REFUSES TO SEE DELEGATION OVER BOMBING OF DAMS IN VIETNAM

As a footnote to a previous item in the Week we reproduce a press statement issued by Bertrand Russell on September 2nd:

"The Prime Minister has refused to meet a delegation of well-known public figures to argue against the destruction of the dams in North Vietnam. In a letter to me today from 10, Downing Street, it is stated baldly that Mr. Wilson "regrets that he is unable to receive your delegation" No explanation is given, which leaves one to assume that the Prime Minister realises he would be unable to defend a policy which led to mass starvation and possibly widespread death by drowning. It is important for people in the West to realise that the threat of these war crimes hangs daily over the heads of the Vietnamese people."



DOSSIER ON THE PROPOSED VISIT OF THE N.L.F. SPOKESMEN

(1) Letter from Sir Frank Soskice to Lord Russell (31/8/65)

"Dear Lord Russell,

You wrote to me on 21st July asking for visas for three persons, Professor Nguyen Van Hieu, Mr. Dinh Ba Thi and Mr. Pham Van Chuong, to come here for discussions and to address public meetings on the war in Vietnam.

I have given careful consideration to this request in consultation with the Foreign Secretary. I have concluded that it would not be in the national interest for me to agree to a visit in present circumstances by these persons.

Yours etc."

(2) Letter from Lord Russell to Sir Frank Soskice (2/9/65)

"Dear Sir Frank,

Thank you for your letter of 31 August in reply to mine of 21 July. Your decision to refuse visas to the spokesman on foreign affairs of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam and his two colleagues is a matter of concern. I should wish to request you to receive a delegation drawn from the signatories of the letter to the New Statesman and others, including Members of Parliament. The signatories were: Field Marshal Sir Claude Auchinleck, Lord Silkin, Archbishop Roberts, the Bishop of Southwark, Professor K.W. Wedderburn, Professor Asa Briggs, Professor David Glass, Dr. Ralph Miliband, Dr. Ruth Glass, Iris Murdoch and Kingsley Martin.

"We shall be organising a nation-wide campaign on this matter and should wish to discuss the reasons for your decision and our view of it. I hope you will receive the deputation at the earliest possible moment and should be glad if you could let me know your decision shortly,

Yours etc."

(3) Press statement issued by Lord Russell on 1st September

I have been informed today in a letter from the Home Secretary that, after long consultations with the Foreign Secretary, my request for visas for the spokesman on foreign affairs of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam and his colleagues has been refused on the ground that it is not in the national interest for them to speak in Britain. The Foreign Secretary contradicts his own words at Oxford on the essential need for the people of Britain to

"have the opportunity of having access to news, information, and comment from all over the world....to form their own opinions and to express those opinions freely."

This decision, which violates British traditions of freedom of speech, flaunts the wishes of a broad section of the British public. We have received requests from socialists at Eton, Oxford, Cambridge, and all parts of Britain to hear the N.L.F. spokesman. We cannot accept this decision as final and shall request the Home Secretary to receive immediately a deputation drawn from the signatories of the letter in the New Statesman, M.P.s and others. We shall seek the reversal of this decision and begin a national campaign to demonstrate the extent of public feeling to this Government until the decision is reversed.



The article by Ralph Schoenman in a recent issue of The Week was timely. The indications seem to be that the left, the Communist and Social-Democratic, has failed dismally in its response to a situation far more serious than that which existed in Spain before the war. Wilson intends to use the cry "Negotiations" to avoid the censure of the Party at Blackpool. He may well carry much of the left with him. It is entirely natural that people should grasp at straws in the hope that the slaughter in Vietnam might be ended, but the call for negotiations conceals many dangers.

We cannot call for negotiations as neutrals between the two sides. The National Liberation Front is a populist movement of a type which socialists have supported many times in the past. The South Vietnamese Government is a militarist regime, supported by U.S. imperialism. As so many of the South Vietnamese people have decided to take to arms to oppose the present regime, we must support them. It is very difficult to negotiate a military dictatorship out of existence. At the moment, however, owing to the puny reaction of the leaderships of the Communist countries, the NLF may have to negotiate - but that is entirely its own decision.

Militant U.S. imperialism, encouraged by the quiescent attitude of the USSR, has already been successful in action in the Congo and the Dominican Republic. Victory in South Vietnam will greatly encourage the U.S. in dealing with liberation movements in Latin America and other places - politically and militarily. Vietnam is a rehearsal. Neutralism in this vital war, and the others which will follow, would place us in the position of appeasers of the U.S. generals. The contempt which this would earn us in the eyes of those people fighting so desperately in the "Third World" would be richly deserved.

ADVERTISEMENT

North West Region C.N.D.

Manchester

Ken Coates is:

DISCUSSION FORUM

A lecturer at the extra-mural department at Nottingham University.

THE LABOUR PARTY

AND C. N. D.

British editor of the International Socialist Journal, an international discussion forum.

Discussion will be opened by

Chairman of the Nottingham City Labour Party.

KEN COATES.

At the Saints Registry Office,  
Cavendish Street, off  
Oxford Rd., Manchester.

Sponsor and former editor of The Week,

An ex-miner.

Friday, 17th, September at 8.00 p.m.



YOUNG SOCIALISTS PREPARE TO FIGHT by John Strauther (Stoke Newington Y.S.)

Over 250 Young Socialists attended the meeting on Sunday, September 5th, in the Mahatma Gandhi Hall, London, organised by the "Save the Young Socialists" campaign. The Campaign is protesting against proposed constitutional changes in the Young Socialists organisation. These would allow the Young Socialists' National Committee to be appointed by regional Labour Party executives instead of being elected by the Y.S. conference, abolition of the regional federations, and reduce the scope of the conference to discussing youth and organisational matters and documents prepared by Transport House on "Rebuilding Britain" and "Industrial Training for Youth".

Although several M.P.s supported the meeting, none was unable to attend. The main speakers were Mike Pilfram, John Palmer, Peter Taaffe and Mike Caffoor. All stressed that the attack on the Y.S. was a result of its political stand in relation to the Labour Government and its record. Because of its political ideas and criticism of the Labour Party in office, the Young Socialists movement had become an embarrassment to the Labour leaders. Many of those present were not willing to accept the new restrictive framework imposed on the Y.S. and intend to challenge it at the Labour Party and Young Socialists conferences. If the framework was accepted the political nature of the Young Socialists movement, established over the last five years would be lost, and no democratic national organisation remain.

RUSSELL PEACE FOUNDATION DIRECTORS SPONSOR "THE WEEK"

Chris Farley and Ralph Schoenman who, together with Earl and Countess Russell, are directors of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, have become sponsors of The Week.

Chris Farley, who is 31 years old, has been active in the peace movement since the early 'fifties. Former secretary of the Committee of 100. Has travelled on behalf of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation to Hanoi, Peking, Moscow, Hiroshima, Phnom Penh, Addis Ababa, Athens, etc. Giving his reason for supporting the Week, Mr. Farley said: "I support The Week because it sets a much-needed example in British political journalism."

Ralph Schoenman is an American living in London and working as Secretary to Bertrand Russell. He has participated in the activities of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and the Committee of 100. Mr. Schoenman gives his reasons for supporting The Week as "the absence of a serious Socialist analysis in Britain has plagued all of us working in the Labour Movement. The value of The Week is that it is incisive and eclectic, not sectarian. All of us need theory - the strategy of the struggle, and the task of working this out has been undertaken by The Week. It needs our encouragement and participation, as well as our gratitude."

Editorial note: The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation has produced some very valuable pamphlets and other literature on vital international topics. It is also engaged on a wide variety of activities which would command the support of our readers. For details of the publications and further information write;

Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation,  
3 & 4, Shavers Place,  
Haymarket,  
London S.W. 1.