

YOUNG SOCIALIST

EDITORIALS ON: Speculation and Consummation; Motivation for the Coalition; Opportunism in Left Leadership; The Throne Speech — Old Order remains; “Socialist” Measures; Class Struggle and Coalition; Phillipino Rebel Leader captured; New Saviour for Congo.

The Constitutional Position of the Governor General

by A. J. WILSON

The Strategy of Betrayal

by WILFRED PEREIRA

Dynamics of the Ceylon Revolution (Part II)

by EDMUND SAMARAKKODY

Do Not Praise the Unpraisable

by ELIAS MANUITT



Beautiful homes need "Welka"

COTTON CARPETS ✦ FURNISHING
FABRICS ✦ CANDLEWICK BEDSPREADS
CANDY - STRIPED SHEETINGS ✦ TOWELS
HOUSEHOLD LINEN ✦ TERYLENES
VOILES ✦ POPLINS ✦ DRILLS ETC.

*Shop in comfort at our
Air-conditioned Salesroom:*

**"CEYLINCO HOUSE" 69
QUEEN STREET, FORT**

*This modern salesroom is designed to offer the
utmost comfort to our Fort shoppers*

WELLAWATTE MILLS LIMITED
ALSO AT 473, GALLE ROAD, COLPETTY



Beautiful homes need "Welka"

COTTON CARPETS ✨ FURNISHING
FABRICS ✨ CANDLEWICK BEDSPREADS
CANDY - STRIPED SHEETINGS ✨ TOWELS
HOUSEHOLD LINEN ✨ TERYLENES
VOILES ✨ POPLINS ✨ DRILLS ETC.

*Shop in comfort at our
Air-conditioned Salesroom:*

**"CEYLINCO HOUSE" 69
QUEEN STREET, FORT**

*This modern salesroom is designed to offer the
utmost comfort to our Fort shoppers*

WELLAWATTE MILLS LIMITED
ALSO AT 473, GALLE ROAD, COLPETTY

YOUNG SOCIALIST

Volume 3 Number 2

Whole Number 12

Editorial Notes

SPECULATION AND CONSUMMATION

THE sudden prorogation of Parliament in early March for as long as four months released a flood of speculation regarding the motivation for such an unprecedented move of the Government. Has the Ides of March come for this country? Was democracy to be subverted, Parliament to be disbanded and was a military Dictatorship to be set up. This was the fear uppermost in the minds of both politicians and politically conscious persons.

But soon the truth emerged. This talk and rumours of a coming Dictatorship or a coup-d'etat served to provide a cover for a different type of game that was going on. When news of secret meetings of Philip Gunawardena and N. M. Perera with Prime Minister Sirima Bandaranaike and Cabinet Ministers was out, it was evident that moves were a foot to give a left coloration to the SLFP Government. But what was the motivation and provocation for such an extraordinary step by the SLFP Government? Has this Party turned revolutionary? Has the SLFP decided to overthrow Capitalism and set up a Socialist State? Those were the questions that called for answers. On the one hand vested interests generally were sounding the alarm at the SLFP having anything to do with marxists, and on the other hand workers, the wage-earners generally and the rural masses, thought that it was good to have the left leaders as Cabinet Ministers.

MOTIVATION FOR COALITION

The Sirimavo Government was by no means reckless. The class needs of the Ceylonese bourgeoisie were uppermost in the minds of the SLFP leaders. The mass situation in the context of increasing urgency of drastic steps to salvage Capitalism had to be seriously considered. For instance severe import restrictions to conserve foreign exchange and also to help the manufacturing National bourgeoisie was creating a constant rise in prices of essential commodities and increasing the misery of the people. The enforcement of the wage freeze since 1957 had resulted in depressing the wage levels of the wage earning population. The resulting situation was a growing opposition to the Government from both the wage earners and the rural masses. Further the two million strong wage earning class was taking meaningful steps towards struggle round their 21 demands against the Capitalist class and the Government. The series of prolonged and determined strikes since July 1960 were unmistakable signs that the coming struggles could be dangerous. The December 1963 and January 1964 Port Employees Strike, led by the Ceylon Mercantile Union and involving 13,000 employees which lasted nearly a month and ended in victory for the strikers, was a serious danger signal. The coming struggle of the wage earners was going to provide for the SLFP Government a serious confrontation with the organised labour movement. In the context of considerable dissatisfaction amongst the rural masses such a confrontation was a real threat both to the SLFP Government and the Capitalist class. And correct strategy for a bourgeois Government and the leaders of the bourgeoisie was to ward off such a confrontation by winning over to their side even some of the leaders of the working class and the masses and thereby weaken, disrupt and disorient the working class. Such an alliance of the Bourgeoisie with leaders of the working class is called a "Coalition".

OPPORTUNISM IN LEFT LEADERSHIP

From the side of the working class and the toiling people their interests must necessarily suffer by any type of class collaboration. And a Coalition Government is the classic and the most complete form of class collaboration that could be achieved by the bourgeoisie. But for the opportunist leaders of the working class who had practised class collaboration and taken the road of Reformism, Coalition was a consummation devoutly to be wished. The leaders of the MEP and the Communist Party had followed class collaboration as a policy and so

they took coalition in their stride. But not so for the LSSP. The LSSP was a Revolutionary Party following a policy of class struggle and pledged to a revolutionary programme. How could the LSSP change suddenly? No, it was not a sudden change. A section of the old leadership including both the rightists and the so called centrists have since 1956 followed more or less openly the road of opportunism. Bandaranaike's philosophy and politics (i.e. bourgeois philosophy & politics) replaced Marxism Leninism as a guide to action for these leaders of the LSSP. By 1960 these leaders had clearly abandoned the road to Revolution. They supported the SLFP Government and were moving towards organisational collaboration—that is towards a Coalition with this bourgeois Government.

YOUNG SOCIALIST

Printed by John James Sarangapany for Sydney Wanasinghe, 51 A, Peterson Lane, Colombo 6, at the Wesley Press, 490, Havelock Road, Colombo 6.

Contents Page

Editorial Notes	41
The Constitutional position of the Governor General by A. J. Wilson, B.A., Ph.D., Lecturer in Political Science, University of Ceylon, Peradeniya	55
The Strategy of Betrayal Wilfred Pereira	61
Dynamics of the Ceylon Revolution by Edmund Samarakkody	69
Do not praise the unpraisable by Elias Manuitt (Chief of staff of the Guerilla Front in the State of Falcon in Venezuela)	73

Volume 3 No: 2 Whole No: 12

Editorial Board: WILFRED PEREIRA
MAY WICKREMASURIYA
SYDNEY WANASINGHE

Subscription rates: Local: Rs. 3/- for 5 issues.
Rs. 6/- for 10 issues
Overseas: Surface Mail—Rs. 10/- for 10 issues.
Air Mail—Rs. 25/- for 10 issues

All correspondence and remittances to:-

SYDNEY WANASINGHE,
51 A, Peterson Lane,
Colombo 6, Ceylon.

But the overwhelming Parliamentary majority of the SLFP in 1960 prevented this coalition they desired. But ever since then the LSSP leadership continued to knock at the doors of the SLFP Government and waited for opportunities to go closer to the Government. During this period these leaders sought to discourage strikes and when strikes did break out they did their utmost to restrain the workers. And when the SLFP Government was too unpopular for them to effect a rapprochement they discretely put on a mask of opposition to the Government. Together with the MEP and CP leaders these LSSP leaders found in the United Left Front an effective cover for their reformism. Showing an oppositional face to the SLFP Government and the Capitalist class through the devise of the ULF these left leaders were taking the road of a link up with the Sirimavo Government. The ULF perspective was a no-contest pact with the SLFP at the General Elections and a Coalition Government thereafter. But unfortunately for the more deceitful of the left leaders who preferred to put on the oppositional mask much longer the situation ripened faster. It was an imperative need for the Sirimavo Government and the Capitalist class to ward off immediately any working class action. This was an unpostponable task for the Ceylonese bourgeoisie. It was left to N. M. Perera to courageously forget all talk of Marxism and Revolution and openly support Coalition with the SLFP "to consolidate the victories under Bandaranaike in 1956 and

to achieve Democratic Socialism". ULF or NO ULF, N. M. Perera was determined to take the road of service to the bourgeoisie. He was right, as the vacillating and weakened elements of the old leaders, the so called centrists soon followed the lead he gave and are now the trusted advisers to the Government. Further despite that bitterness and disappointment of MEP leader and CP (Moscow) leaders on their failure to get portfolios yet they are more or less loyal supporters of the coalition government. Thus class collaboration in the classic form has begun in Ceylon.

THE THRONE SPEECH OLD ORDER REMAINS

The realities of the Coalition Government have emerged through the Throne speech with sufficient clarity to bring out both the class base and the class bias of the new set up. Our country, our Race our Religion form the classic phraseology that provide the framework for bourgeois philosophy for securing and maintaining capitalist class oppression and rule throughout the bourgeois world. The Prime Minister and her "Socialist" advisers Dr. N. M. Perera, Colvin R. de Silva and others have lost no time in assuring the Ceylonese capitalist class and vested interests generally that it is their (bourgeois) philosophy that will remain dominant by reiterating that Buddhism will be given its "rightful" place and that 'Sinhala only' will be the framework of granting any concessions to the oppressed Tamil minority. The decision to continue to enforce the notorious anti-working class and communalist Citizenship Act consistently opposed by the LSSP was a further guarantee to the Ceylonese bourgeoisie that SLFP policies will remain. What is more the pronouncement that Commonwealth ties will be respected is an assurance that British Imperialist assets the Tea and Rubber Estates will be protected. The Prime Minister has gone much further and assured that Estates will not be nationalised. British Imperialism could see that the Export Trade and banks will as before remain mainly in British hands.

SOCIALIST MEASURES

So-called steps in the direction of Socialism cannot have reality without

relief to the pressing needs of the wage earners. The wage-freeze policy of the Government that has helped the capitalist class and the Government to depress the living conditions of nearly two million wage earners will remain. The wage earners must live and work in misery and be satisfied with being advisers to their bureaucrats in Government enterprises and Government Corporations. But for this "Concession" of being in Advisory Committees the wage earners have to submit to being disciplined by their bosses.

For the rural masses, the landless and unemployed there is neither land nor hope of jobs—Their share in the coalition is by way of right to have their representatives in Vigilance Committees and Peoples Committees to fight bureaucracy and inefficiency in Government and semi-Government institutions and to track down black marketeers. It is no surprise that these "gains" have failed to enthuse the rural masses.

The failure of the spokesmen of the Coalition Government to defend the policies outlined in the throne speech is a measure of its so called socialist content. The poor performance and virtual collapse of some of them and the eloquent silence of others cannot be explained except in relation to both the emptiness of the Throne speech in regard to meeting the real needs of the people and further more that the policies are openly capitalist as before. The Throne speech has served to expose these stalwarts of the Sri Lanka Sama Samaja Party as servitors and overseers of the Ceylonese Capitalist class.

CLASS STRUGGLE AND COALITION

Despite the dampening wall of class collaboration the class struggle burst through and the coalition Government was faced with several strikes in both the public and private sectors. At the Werahera C.T.B a go-slow only became a strike proper immediately after coalition and the C.T.B. management locked out with the help of the Police about 1,000 workers. This strike was over. Strikes occurred in the Eastern Paper Mills, Cement Corporation, Velona Textile works, the oil Corporation and the Textile Factory at Veyangoda.

These strikes are proof that the organised working class despite the betrayal of its leaders continues to have faith in its own strength and the need to struggle. They also serve to bring out the fact that coalition took place at a time when the organised working class were girding their loins as it were for big struggles to win their pressing demands. It is in this setting that the betrayal by the LSSP Reformists has to be measured. Their crimes are not over. These ex-leaders of the working class have permitted and are permitting the police of the Bourgeois State to intimidate, assault, arrest and baton charge workers both male and female. The notorious UNP Capitalist exploiter who pays only a wage of Rs. 1/- per day to girls in his factory has been permitted to use the Police and his thugs against the Strikers in his factory. Far from assisting the strikers these trade union leaders have done everything to dissuade the strikers from continuing the strike. Rumour has it that a certain SLSSP Minister has met the employer secretly. The strike continues and the Police harassment remains unabated. SLSSP Ministers and leaders have done nothing to stop Police harassment or to force this Employer to grant the demands of the strikers. The strikers have demanded Nationalisation of this Factory, but there is no response from the Coalition Government.

The role of these "Socialists" in the Coalition Government is very clear. They will defend the capitalist SLFP Government and help them to continue in their pro-capitalist and anti working class policies. But whatever may be the outcome of these strikes, it is certain that the organised working class will learn sooner rather than later that coalition is the word for the betrayal of the working class by their leaders.

FILIPINO REBEL LEADER CAPTURED

Dr. Jesus Lava, top leader of the Huk-balahaps was captured on May 21st and is now awaiting trial in Manila. He had been hunted for 15 years. Lava presumably had left his jungle fastness in the Sierra Madre of central Luzon to seek medical treatment for acute Malaria.

Lava lived and worked in the "underground" with a galaxy of talented rebel leaders who, one by one, were killed or arrested. When Huk Supremo, Luis Taruc, voluntarily surrendered to the government in 1954, Lava succeeded to the position of top political and military leader of the rebel movement.

Although the backbone of the Huk movement was broken militarily, fear that it may revive haunts the dreams of the propertied classes. This is clearly seen from the views expressed by Manila Times on April 24th, which stated that "Today Huks remain a sinister ghost, hiding in the shadows, mocking the law; and like the proverbial dark horse awaiting a climate when they can burst forth to make this entire archipelago a Vietnam."

NEW SAVIOUR FOR THE CONGO

On June 30th The United Nation's Occupation of the Congo came to an end. On that date, too, President Kasavubu's 4 year mandate as head of the Republic of Congo ended and the Congolese Parliament completed its first term.

As the deadline neared, anxiety rose among imperialist circles in the Congo over the possible collapse of the neocolonialist Kasavubu-Mobutu regime. Its main figure-head, "Socialist" Premier Cyrille Adoula, publicly admitted the bankruptcy of his stewardship. Vast areas of the country in various parts have set up new Lumumbist administrations independent of the centre.

Both Belgian and US capitalists who had been looking for a way out decided in this situation to back Moise Tshombe who was responsible for the first internal crisis the new republic faced in 1960. It was the attempt of Tshombe to set up a independent republic in the mineral rich province of Katanga that led to this crisis. The ouster of Patrice Lumumba, and his subsequent foul murder was the work of this sinister stooge, Tshombe. Later when Congo became too hot for him he sought and was given refuge by Franco of Spain.

He did not return to Congo direct from Madrid. He stopped first at Brussels where he had long talks with Paul-Henri Spaak the

(Continued in Page 60)

THE CONSTITUTIONAL POSITION OF THE GOVERNOR - GENERAL

by A. J. WILSON

“UNDER a constitutional monarchy the Prime Minister of a Commonwealth nation is more powerful than he would be in a Republic under a President. If for any reason he wishes the Governor-General to be removed he has only to request the British Sovereign to recall him, and his request must be granted. A President, however, is usually elected for a term of years, and though he may be uncongenial or un-co-operative cannot be removed speedily or without a possible political upheaval.....”

In view of the foregoing it was clear to me that constitutional proprieties required that I should keep out of politics and refrain from any activities which might give rise to the suspicion of political influence.....”

Lord Soulbury in 'Memories of Ceylon' in the Times of Ceylon Annual 1963.

“The Governor-General does not get a letter of appointment for a period. He is appointed Governor-General and can be removed at a moment's notice at any time on the wish of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has only to make representations to the Queen under our Constitution, that he or she wishes the Governor-General to go, and the Governor-General goes.....”

There is no maximum period at all. The Governor-General can continue even for 50 years as long as the Prime Ministers of that whole period want him, or he can be in office only for one day.”

Mr. Dudley Senanayake in Parliamentary Debates (House of Representatives) Vol. 49, No. 4, Col. 590.

The Governor-General is the personal representative in Ceylon of Her Majesty the Queen. His position however is not exactly the same as the Queen. For one thing he holds office during Her Majesty's pleasure. In accordance with Section 4 (2) of our Constitution this would in effect mean that he holds office so long as he is acceptable to a government and a Prime Minister who are in command of a majority in the House of Representatives. This was the position taken up by the Chief Justice of Pakistan in his judgement in the case of *Federation of Pakistan and others versus Moulvi Temizuddin Khan* when he stated among other things that a request for the recall of the Governor-General addressed by the Prime Minister to the Secretary of Her Majesty “would be sufficient” and “Her Majesty the Queen in such matters normally acts on the advice of the Ministry of the Dominion provided that the Ministry represents the people of the Dominion”. Arising from this fact, it would mean therefore that the Governor-General is not in an independent position as the Queen is to Britain. Royalty is almost a permanent institution in Britain. Even if the Queen does something which is not quite correct, she might not be subjected to criticism because governments are generally reluctant to involve monarchy in controversy. The offence will have to be of a serious and unconstitutional nature. The Queen is therefore in a position to be more independent than her representative in a commonwealth country who holds office only as long as he is acceptable to a government which is in command of a majority in the legislature. What therefore the late R. H. Dawson stated of the Governor-General of Canada (whose terms of appointment are similar to those of the Governor-General in Ceylon) is also true of the Ceylon Governor-General, namely that the Governor General (in Canada) is “potentially at least at the mercy of his own Cabinet, a

subordination which makes assertions of independent opinions unlikely and any strong line of conduct impossible and is apt as well to undermine his influence and reputation for impartiality.”

There has however been only one real instance up to date of a Governor-General of a Commonwealth country being dismissed or recalled on the advice of the Government or Prime Minister of the country concerned. This was in the Irish Free State in 1931, when the Governor-General, Mr. James McNeil was recalled. In Australia too there was an instance of a Governor-General being recalled but this was at his own request after he had had a disagreement with the Australian Government over the question of his annual allowances. There was also a reported incident of an attempted dismissal of a Governor-General by a Prime Minister in Pakistan which it might be of interest to mention here. When Pakistan's third Governor-General, Ghulam Mohammad dismissed the Prime Minister Khwaja Nazimuddin, it was said that the latter on hearing of his dismissal attempted to telephone the Queen presumably to request her to dismiss the Governor-General. His telephone however had been disconnected and so he could not make the long distance call.

What, however, makes the position of the Governor-General in Ceylon not exactly similar to that of the Queen is that his powers are confined to a narrower field than those of the Queen herself in her capacity as Queen of Ceylon. Under our Constitution there are certain functions which only the Queen may perform as Queen of Ceylon and these have not been delegated to the Governor-General under any circumstances. Thus the making of treaties, the appointment of diplomatic representatives, the declaration of wars are not delegated to the Governor-General. In these matters the Queen in her capacity as Queen of Ceylon acts on the advice of the Ceylon Government.

There are other functions which either the Queen or the Governor-General may perform. It is not provided that only the Governor-General can perform these functions. Thus Section 7 of our Constitution

states that the Parliament of Ceylon consists of Her Majesty and the two chambers—the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Queen is therefore a part of the legislature of this country, and she need not be, though usually she is represented by the Governor-General. She could for instance if she so desired send another representative to open or dissolve Parliament. The late King George VII sent his brother the Duke of Gloucester for the State Opening of Parliament on February 10, 1948. In all normal circumstances however the Governor-General will represent the Queen as part of the legislature of this country.

There is also Section 45 of the Constitution. This states that “the executive power of the Island shall continue vested in Her Majesty and may be exercised on behalf of her Majesty by the Governor-General in accordance with the provisions of this Order and of any other law for the time being in force.” The executive power which refers to such matters, as for instance the appointment of a Prime Minister or other Ministers or a certain category of public officials like, for example, the Secretary to the Cabinet, the Permanent Secretaries, the Auditor-General or the Commissioner of Elections, thus may be, but need not necessarily be, exercised by the Governor-General. If the Queen visited Ceylon she could perform these acts herself. Further there might be occasions when a Governor-General, might decline to accept the advice of a Prime Minister. In such an event the Prime Minister can if he or she is in command of a majority in the House request the Queen to either remove the Governor-General, or if this is considered too drastic a step, advise the Queen to make the appointment herself. The Queen could then send another representative to the Island and get him to make the appointment on her behalf or she herself could come over to the Island and make the appointment. She may even issue an order to the Governor-General. What is significant is that where Section 45 is concerned the Governor-General cannot act as an independent person. There is always the possibility of his wishes being overridden.

The Governor-General according to the terms of his appointment is also Comman-

der-in-Chief of the Island. This is however a nominal function. It does not imply that the Governor-General should assume active command of the armed forces. Sir Oliver Goonetilleke however took this function seriously when he assumed command of the armed forces (it must be assumed that this was done with the approval of the Prime Minister at that time) during the first two or three weeks of the Emergency of 1958. This was however an extraordinary situation which called for extraordinary measures. In normal times he is only in a nominal sense the Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces.

The Governor-General further enjoys certain personal privileges by virtue of his office. He has official residences for himself, his family and personal suite in Colombo (Queen's House), Kandy (King's Pavilion) and Nuwara Eliya (Queen's Cottage). He receives a salary of £8,000 a year (about Rs. 8,888-77 a month) and this is free of income tax. The Governor-General is also provided with a secretarial and personal staff. He has ADCs and a Secretary, all of them appointed by the Government and paid for from public funds. Amongst these officials, it is the Secretary to the Governor-General who holds the most important and responsible position. He can in certain circumstances be a power behind the throne. Much will however depend on the experience and knowledge of public affairs of the person holding the office of Governor-General. Lord Soulbury would not for instance have required expert advice. Having been one of the principal architects of our Constitution, he would have known how it should work and how to work it. Sir Oliver Goonetilleke too had had long experience as an administrator, negotiator and Minister of State. He would not have had to lean heavily on advisers. Mr. Dudley Senanayake had occasion to state when the question of dissolution was being discussed during the Debate on the Address, in April 1960 that "the person who happens to be Governor-General at the moment (i.e. Sir Oliver Goonetilleke) is well versed in all these constitutional matters." If on the other hand the Governor-General is not one who is experienced in political and constitutional matters, he may have to

depend on his Secretary or even on other unofficial advisers. Despite all their experience, King Edward VII had Lord Esher, King George V had Lord Stamfordham and King George VI had Lord Lascelles.

To safeguard the impartial position of the Governor-General, the Constitution provides that his salary cannot be reduced except by a constitutional amendment. It has not happened so far to any Governor-General who had been in office. More important however than this provision regarding salaries is what is contained in the proviso to Section 4 (2) of the Constitution. Section 4 (2) states that all powers, authorities and functions vested in Her Majesty or the Governor-General shall subject to the provisions of the Constitution and of any other law for the time being in force, be exercised as far as may be in accordance with the constitutional conventions applicable to the exercise of similar powers, authorities and functions in the United Kingdom by Her Majesty. The proviso however is of utmost significance. It states that no act or omission on the part of the Governor-General can be called in question in any court of law or otherwise on the ground that the provisions aforementioned have not been complied with. Thus the Governor-General is not answerable for his actions either to a court of law or to any other person. He need not therefore when he acts, have to think of legal or other consequences. His actions, provided they do not violate the Constitution or any law for the time being in force cannot be questioned by any authority.

There is provision for an acting appointment to be made whenever the office of Governor-General falls vacant or if the Governor-General is absent from the Island or for some other reason is unable to perform his duties. Provision for this acting appointment has been made in paragraph 7 (1) of The Ceylon (Office of Governor-General) Letters Patent, 1947. This states that some person may be appointed to act for the Governor-General but if there is no suitable person available, "the person for the time being lawfully performing the functions of Chief Justice shall, during Her Majesty's pleasure, administer the Government of the Island." The con-

vention, however has developed for the Chief Justice or the Acting Chief Justice to function for the Governor-General, though the provision in the Letters Patent states that the Chief Justice may act only if there is no other suitable person available. Thus when Sir Henry Monck-Mason Moore retired and left the Island, the Chief Justice at the time, Sir Arthur Wijeyewardene acted as Governor-General till Lord Soulbury came. When Lord Soulbury went on leave, the Chief Justice Sir Alan Rose acted for him. On the second occasion when Lord Soulbury went on leave, the Prime Minister at the time, Sir John Kotelawala states in his autobiography that the names of Sir John Tarbat and Sir Ivor Jennings were suggested for the acting post, but that he insisted that the Acting Chief Justice, Mr. C. Nagalingam should act.

The Governor-General by virtue of his office has certain ceremonial functions of a constitutional nature to perform. He is responsible for the ceremonial opening of Parliament at the beginning of each session. He reads the Speech from the Throne which is prepared by the Cabinet at the beginning of each session. It is he who administers the oath of office to Cabinet Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries. He receives Ambassadors of foreign states accredited to Ceylon as soon as they arrive in the Island.

The Governor-General is also expected to carry out functions of a social nature. He is expected to act as the patron of all types of charitable and philanthropic institutions. He also attends functions, visits public places, opens carnivals and addresses school prize-givings. Lord Soulbury for instance took much interest in the national cultures. He was also interested in the problem of slum clearance and in the proper maintenance of government hospitals.

There may be occasions when the Governor-General may have to act in the role of mediator. Sir Oliver Goonetilleke for instance tried to bring about a settlement when a section of Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike's first Cabinet led by Mr. W. Dahanayake refused to attend cabinet meetings until Mr. Philip Gunawardene who was at the time Minister of Agriculture

and Food was dismissed. The same Governor-General also had to listen to a deputation of Ministers in Mr. W. Dahanayake's Cabinet regarding dissatisfaction with the way in which the investigations into the assassination of Mr. Bandaranaike were being carried out. Again Sir Oliver Goonetilleke played the role of mediator during the schools takeover crisis when the Roman Catholics expressed strong opposition to the legislation on assisted schools enacted by the government of Mrs. Bandaranaike. In recent times, the present Governor-General, Mr. William Gopallawa has had representation made to him by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Dudley Senanayake, regarding reports about a threatened coup d'etat.

Very often the Governor-General is expected to act as an advisor to the Prime Minister. Of course it is ultimately the Prime Minister's responsibility to accept or reject such advice and there have been occasions when such advice had not been accepted. Much will depend on the prevailing circumstances. Mr. D. S. Senanayake acknowledged the fact that the first Governor-General, Sir Henry Monck-Mason Moore had given him guidance and advice in regard to the Island's attainment of freedom. Mr. C. Suntheralingam has stated that it was mainly through Lord Soulbury's persuasion that Mr. D. S. Senanayake took Mr. G. G. Ponnambalam into his Cabinet. According to Mr. J. L. Fernando, Lord Soulbury was chiefly instrumental in persuading Mr. Dudley Senanayake to take firm action against Sir John Kotelawala who was at the time Minister of Transport for his alleged publication of the controversial document 'The Premier Stakes'. Lord Soulbury's successor Sir Oliver Goonetilleke was in fact more active in the role of adviser. It was on Sir Oliver's advice that Sir John Kotelawala dissolved Parliament in 1956. Mr. W. Dahanayake on the other hand declined to accept Sir Oliver's advice to prorogue Parliament for a long period when it seemed as if Mr. Dahanayake was losing his majority in the House of Representatives.

Sometimes the Governor-General may in the carrying out of his social or constitutional duties come in conflict with his Minis-

ters. Lord Soulbury's interest in the problem of tuberculosis brought him in conflict with the Minister of Health at the time, Mr. E. A. Nugawela. His concern for the slum dwellers in Colombo caused annoyance to the Minister responsible for slum clearance at the time, Dr. C. W. W. Kannangara. In both cases however Lord Soulbury had the consent of the Prime Minister of the day when he gave expression to his views on these matters. Recently, the present Governor-General, Mr. William Gopallawa had differences with the first Minister of Justice in Mrs. Bandaranaike's Cabinet, Mr. Sam P. C. Fernando over the question of accepting the latter's advice to remit death sentences. When such conflicts develop however, it might be noted that it is the Governor-General who will generally have the weight of authority on his side unless for some other reason, the Prime Minister decides to lend his support to the Minister in question.

Most important however are the constitutional functions of the Governor-General. Some of these are specifically laid down in the Constitution. In regard to the others, his powers and duties are similar to that of the Queen in England, though these are not specifically defined.

With regard to the constitutional functions that are specified, there are a number allocated to the Governor-General under the Constitution. The majority of these, in accordance with Section 4 (2) of the Constitution are exercised on the advice of the Prime Minister. In these matters, the Governor-General has no discretion whatsoever to reject the advice tendered by the Prime Minister. These powers include the summoning and proroguing of Parliament, granting of assent to legislation, the appointment of five Senators every two years and of six members to the House of Representatives after a General Election, appointment of members of the Public Service Commission and the Judicial Service Commission, the appointment of Judges of the Supreme Court, the Secretary to the Cabinet, Permanent Secretaries, the Auditor-General, the Attorney-General, and the Commissioner of Elections and finally the appointment of Ministers of the Cabinet and Parliamentary Secretaries.

There are however two important functions which the Governor-General is expected to perform under the Constitution where he has room for manoeuvre and therefore a certain amount of discretion.

The first is in connection with the selection of a Prime Minister and, related to this right to appoint a Prime Minister, is the right of dismissal. In normal circumstances, there will be no room for the exercise of either of these powers. The leader of the largest single group in the House of Representatives will usually be called to form a government. The leader of the group need not sit in the House. He or she can be a member of the Senate. There are however occasions when the choice of a Prime Minister may have to be made from among one or two individuals. Lord Soulbury for instance had to make a decision between Mr. Dudley Senanayake and Sir John Kotelawala in March 1952. He chose Mr. Dudley Senanayake. Sir Oliver Goonetilleke could have appointed Mr. C. P. de Silva as Prime Minister after Mr. Dudley Senanayake was defeated in Parliament in April 1960. He preferred to accept Mr. Senanayake's advice to dissolve Parliament. On such occasions like the ones mentioned, the Governor-General has a limited choice.

The right of appointment carries with it the right of dismissal. This right is not usually exercised but it may be exercised when a Prime Minister openly violates the Constitution or if he refuses to resign when he has clearly lost the confidence of the House. It has never been exercised up to date. There was however one occasion when Sir Oliver Goonetilleke was called upon to exercise this power. This was when Mr. W. Dahanayake began dismissing the original members of his Cabinet when he functioned as caretaker Prime Minister from December 1959 to March 1960. Since Mr. Dahanayake did not command the confidence of the majority of the House, Mr. C. P. de Silva was deputised by the S.L.F.P. which was the largest group at the time of dissolution to request the Governor-General to dismiss Mr. Dahanayake and to appoint Mr. C. P. de Silva as Prime Minister. The Governor-General however did not heed this request.

The other important power which the Governor-General exercises is with regard to the dissolution of Parliament. Here again in normal circumstances when a Prime Minister commands a majority in the House, the Governor-General will have to act on the Prime Minister's advice. But there may be occasions when the Governor-General can exercise his discretion. This will happen when the party situation in the House is complicated and not very clear. On such occasions if he can find an alternative Prime Minister, he can refuse to dissolve.

In regard to those duties which are not specifically defined, it is clear from what has been stated that the Governor-General need not necessarily accept the advice of the Prime Minister in all circumstances. There may be occasion when he will have to be persuaded by a Prime Minister to accept his advice or his recommendations. There may be occasions when the Governor-General can refuse to accept such advice or to put into effect the recommendations of the Prime Minister. Sir Ivor Jennings one of the chief architects of our Constitution in his book 'The Constitution of Ceylon' states "that a function to be exercised on advice is not formal or automatic. The Queen may have to be persuaded and there may be occasion on which she can refuse to accept the advice of her Prime Minister or of the Cabinet."

Finally the Prime Minister is expected to keep the Governor-General informed about the intentions and decisions of the Cabinet. The Governor-General is entitled to ask for information on certain matters and he is even entitled to ask for documents in order that he might keep himself informed of developments. In such matters, his requests cannot be turned down.

It will thus be seen that the Governor-General is neither a nodding automation nor can he be an extreme autocrat. He has certain powers partly defined partly implied which he can exercise in a justifiable manner. Much will depend on his personality. The basis of all his power is the fact that he must appear to be impartial. It is only on this condition that he can afford to function as the Head of the State. If he gives however the impression that he is being partial, then confidence in him will

be undermined and he will run the danger of being removed. There is no other way in which he can function—for ultimately under our Constitution he depends on the Prime Minister and the Cabinet for continuance in office.

REVOLUTION

and

COUNTER - REVOLUTION

in

SPAIN

by *Felix Morrow*

Soft cover Rs. 10-00

Hard cover Rs. 15-00



SURIYA BOOKSHOP,
51 a, Peterson Lane,
Colombo 6.

(Continued from Page 54)

Foreign Minister and the US Ambassador Douglas MacArthur III. These briefings show clearly that he has returned to Congo with the blessings of both Belgium and USA. His stop at Bamako, the capital of Mali was to get the approval of African states as to his legitimacy. But he soon received a severe rebuff when Algeria and Morocco objected to his participation in the 2nd conference of the Organization of African Unity, and he was forced to cancel his plans.

THE STRATEGY OF BETRAYAL

(FROM PERMANENT REVOLUTION TO PERMANENT COALITION)

by WILFRED PEREIRA

SRI LANKA can now claim another 'first': "a Trotskyist party" has accepted office in a bourgeois government and has thereby accepted responsibility for the stability of that government and for maintaining the capitalist system in Ceylon and protecting imperialist interests under the Soulbury Constitution.

Marxists condemn this action of the 'leaders' of the LSSP as a defection to the camp of the class enemy and a despicable betrayal of the toiling masses these professed Trotskyists claimed to lead towards the overthrow of capitalism.

To this charge, N. M. Perera and his lieutenants—among whom two are fellow Ministers, two Senators, two Parliamentary Secretaries and at least two others behind-the-scenes advisers to their Ministerial comrades—claim that they have not abandoned either Marxism or their party programme, but that, on the contrary, entry into the SLFP government is only a "tactic" whose ultimate objective still remains the establishment of socialism.

TACTICS

If the coalition is a tactic it must not do violence to the fundamental principles on which the general strategy of the party—which is laid down in its programme—is based. Even though a tactic may deviate from the general line of the campaign, involving sometimes even a retreat, it does not abandon the means of winning the campaign which is to come to grips with the enemy and destroy its forces.

For Marxists, the means of reaching their objective of socialism is determined by the nature of capitalist society which manifests itself in the class struggle between the two polar classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Marxists seek to intervene in that

class struggle on the side of the proletariat, to lead it in that struggle and imbue it with a scientific understanding of the nature of that struggle which is forced on the proletariat by the nature of its role in the capitalist economy.

Moreover the general strategy of the Marxist party is laid down in its **revolutionary** programme. Revolutionary, because Marxists seek to develop the class struggle to its logical conclusion in the overthrow of the power of the capitalist class by the working class. The tactics employed by a Marxist party, therefore, must always have the perspective of developing the class struggle and at the same time, the fighting forces of the working class must understand the implications of any tactic in which they are involved.

THE COMMON WEAL

Let us now take a close look at this "tactic". In a war neither side enjoys a monopoly of tactics. It is now clear that both the LSSP and the S.L.F.P. were using coalition as a tactic. But in such a case one would expect the aims of the two opponents to be completely antagonistic. If they were found to be not so, then we can only conclude that the two sides are engaged in a sham fight, or that one side has capitulated wholesale to the other. You can take your choice.

First, what were the aims of the SLFP, what did it hope to get out of a coalition? The Prime Minister made her intentions very clear when she spoke to the Executive Committee of her Party on May 10, 1964 and she explained why she thought it necessary to "initiate talks with the working class leaders" to form a coalition:

"However much progressive work we do we cannot expect any results unless

we get the co-operation of the working class.... Disruptions, especially strikes and go-slows must be eliminated and the development of the country must proceed It is only by travelling on this path [the middle-path defined by S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike].... that we can achieve our purpose."

She went on to state that Philip Gunawardena and N. M. Perera had informed her that "they could form a [coalition] Government on the basis of a common programme.... They were of opinion that it was a Government like this which could work for the common weal." (our emphasis)

N. M. Perera, then, appears to have agreed that a coalition could work for the common weal of the bourgeoisie represented by the SLFP and of the toiling masses, and particularly the working class, which the LSSP claims to lead. That is to say that a coalition could reconcile the SLFP policy of the "middle-path" — socialism without shattering the capitalist framework — and the LSSP policy of socialism only by the destruction of the capitalist system. But any sane person can see that such a reconciliation can be effected only by the complete abandonment of its policy by one of the parties to the agreement; there is absolutely no room for compromise between two completely antagonistic policies. If N. M. Perera has led his Party into the coalition it can only be by completely abandoning its Marxist revolutionary programme.

The "tactics" of N. M. Perera and his lieutenants appears to be at first sight a peculiar one which plays into the hands of the class enemy. But here our astute tacticians will declare that the SLFP does not represent the class enemy; the real enemy is the UNP. They say that the prime task is to crush the UNP and prevent its come-back; that the SLFP does contain a "reactionary" right wing, but that its "progressive" wing contains "leftward-moving forces" which can be won over to the socialist cause. Let us see then how this tactic is going to help in winning these battles on the way to the final defeat of the class enemy.

(1) **To prevent the come-back of the UNP.** Any Marxist knows that the resur-

gence of the UNP after its defeat in 1960 is due entirely to the inability of the SLFP government to shatter the capitalist economic base of the UNP's power. However much the SLFP may denounce the UNP in words it is incapable of smashing the UNP once and for all, because the SLFP itself is as firmly bound to that capitalist economic base as the UNP.

The quarrel between these two parties is like that of two gangs of robbers over the division of the booty. To take the side of one gang calling it more "progressive" will not help to put down robbery, but will only make us its accomplices. In the same way any socialist policy which does not have the perspective of shattering the capitalist framework against the resistance of the SLFP itself and not only the UNP, is a sham and a deception of the toiling masses.

If the aim of the coalition is to prevent a dictatorship of the "Right" surrendering to the tactic of the SLFP and helping to stabilise its "middlepath policy" ('socialism' within the framework of capitalism!) will have just the contrary result. The abandonment of class struggle and revolutionary perspectives in order to avoid embarrassing the coalition government, in plain words a policy of class collaboration, will find the working class completely disarmed and disoriented if the UNP resorts to what it has now begun to call "revolutionary" methods to dislodge the SLFP-LSSP parliamentary combination.

(2) **To win over the "leftward-moving forces" in the SLFP** and incidentally to convert the Left minority in parliament into a majority.

Whatever forces of this nature there are will not be converted by speeches in parliament. It is an axiom of Marxist strategy that they will move only when they are pushed by the masses engaged in active struggle against capitalist exploitation and oppression. But the LSSP policy of class collaboration will leave the toiling masses defenceless when the SLFP, the senior partner in the coalition, begins to unload on their backs the burdens of its futile middle-path policies.

It will then be too late for the LSSP to think of organising the masses for resistance, for it would already have begun to lose the confidence of the masses. In the absence of an alternative revolutionary leadership capable of rallying the toiling masses and taking them forward, fascist damagogues will have a clear road.

Besides, this belated attempt by the LSSP to speak the truth to the masses will be construed by the senior partner of the coalition as disruption and a breach of faith; to be followed by ignominious expulsion from the government at a moment most unfavourable to the LSSP. This will certainly not help to raise the LSSP's prestige in the eyes of either the "leftward-moving" elements in the SLFP or of the masses who still have illusions in the SLFP.

(3) To "bring pressure" on the SLFP to take more "leftward steps" within the capitalist framework, in the hope that it will be possible to inveigle the SLFP into socialism before it realises where it is being taken by the LSSP tacticians.

This is the typical reformist illusion that a series of reforms will one day result in socialism under the nose of the capitalist class and behind the back of the working class.

Marxist revolutionaries include the struggle for reforms in their general revolutionary strategy; but they have learned from past experience that the more uncompromisingly they pursue the class struggle the more decisive will be the nature of the reforms; decisive for the transition to socialism. They also know that the ruling bourgeoisie is too astute and class conscious to be fooled by the "tactics" of petty-bourgeois reformists into surrendering its power. The bourgeoisie knows, just as well as the Marxists, that such petty-bourgeois tactics only succeed in duping the working class. Hence the hatred of the bourgeoisie for the Marxists who expose the fraudulence of such tactics.

MARXIST STRATEGY

If the LSSP tacticians are Marxists as they claim to be, their aim must be to carry

the anti-capitalist struggle forward and help the working class particularly to overcome its illusions in the SLFP's middle-path policy and in bourgeois parliamentary democracy. In order to mobilise the toiling masses for struggle they must be told the truth about the nature of the SLFP and the coalition and the nature of the struggle they will have to wage to break out of the bonds of capitalism.

It should be duty of the LSSP to warn the toiling masses whom it professes to lead that whatever the promises of the SLFP, the only "progressive" measures it will **implement** are those that are advantageous, or at least not harmful, to the bourgeois interests that the SLFP represents; that anything more than this **CANNOT** be achieved without the conscious and active extra-parliamentary struggle of the toiling masses that will back up the efforts of their representatives in parliament. The masses must be forewarned, pointing to their past experience of SLFP rule, that progressive measures within the capitalist framework will only bring about further disruption of the economy, and that it will be the masses who will be called upon to bear the burden and make sacrifices while the capitalists make their profits.

But the aims of the LSSP tacticians are based on a purely parliamentary perspective which leaves no place whatsoever for the class struggle. On the contrary, class struggle (involving strikes, go-slows etc) becomes embarrassing to prospective parliamentarians scrounging for votes by appearing to be all things to all men. In such a situation parliamentary combinations, coalitions, no-contest pacts — parliamentary arithmetic is substituted for revolutionary dynamics as a solution for political crises.

PERMANENT COALITION ?

If the ultimate aim of the LSSP tacticians is socialism—that is, socialism as Marxists understand it and **NOT** as the SLFP is **determined** to have it, within the framework of capitalism—their tactic of coalition must be in consonance with the perspective of breaking out of the capitalist framework **against the determined opposition of the SLFP.**

Let us for the moment grant N. M. Perera, the chief of the tacticians, his un-Marxist view that socialism can be achieved by parliamentary means. If that is his plan, the LSSP must eventually defeat the SLFP in an electoral contest in which the country will be asked to choose between Marxist socialism and the SLFP's brand of socialism. That is the constitutional parliamentary democratic method. But—we find that N. M. Perera, with the complicity of his lieutenants, has committed the LSSP not only to a coalition, but also to a **NO-CONTEST PACT** with the SLFP **in which he has surrendered the sole power to determine the allocation of 'seats' to the leader of the SLFP.**

Once again we see the tactic ending in surrender. Not only has the LSSP surrendered its independence and its revolutionary programme, abandoning therewith the method of class struggle which is fundamental to Marxist strategy, but N. M. Perera has abandoned even his own **parliamentary** means of defeating the SLFP on the road to socialism.

This wonderful tactic of coalition appears to be specially devised for surrender all along the line even up to the surrender of the final objective. It is a tactic for "consolidating" (to use a favourite word of N. M. Perera's when speaking about the coalition) the joint rule of the SLFP-LSSP combination in the interests of the capitalist class. Our 'Trotskyist tacticians' have come a long way from the Theory of the Permanent Revolution which they have now repudiated in favour of the Permanent Coalition. Thus does the substitution of parliamentary for revolutionary means to prevent a dictatorship of the UNP lead to a **constitutional dictatorship of the SLFP in the interests of the bourgeoisie with the LSSP functioning as its political police.** The stage is now set for a merger of these two Parties, and from there, with the aid of the Public Security Act, it could lead to a 'One-Party State'. But the working class will disperse these socialist fakers before that.

THE MAJOR-DOMO SPEAKS

Do we need more proof? When N. M. Perera was pleading with the Prime Minister

for the inclusion of the entire ULF in the coalition, the argument he urged was, "the SLFP needs the co-operation of the **entire** working class to consolidate its policy". His argument was based NOT on the needs of the working class but on the **urgent necessity of the SLFP!** But perhaps this was a ruse of the astute Doctor? We shall see.

Let us then listen to the new Finance Minister of Her Britannic Majesty's Government in Ceylon. In an interview he gave the SUNDAY OBSERVER (24-6-64) explaining why he joined the Government, N. M. Perera states:

"I am confident that this mobilisation of the masses, particularly the workers, can be achieved and that the country can move leftwards more rapidly, can **consolidate the victories of 1956** and complete other tasks needed for the construction of a Socialist society." (our emphasis)

Note how he already speaks the language of the SLFP. **Whose** victory in 1956 is he confident of consolidating? After the experiences of the masses, and particularly the workers, under the SLFP regime does he still dare to say that **they** won a victory in 1956? Surely then he must be referring to the "victories" of that section of the national bourgeoisie that the SLFP represents, together with their petty-bourgeois hangers-on and the blackmarketeers and racketeers who flourish under SLFP rule.

As he saw it,

"a revolutionary process was started in 1956, not through violence but through the ballot. The political power of the capitalist class was attacked, and in many ways broken. But something was left undone...the economic power of this class was not broken."

He explains why,

"**the main cause was lack of full concerted support from the masses, particularly the working class.** Thus those gains of 1956 could not be consolidated and were, in fact, **threatened.**" (our emphasis).

But now that he has joined the Government, he is confident that the masses, parti-

cularly the working class, can be mobilised to do what was left undone up to June 1964.

MALIGNING THE WORKERS

What can we gather from this very frank avowal of his plans by N. M. Perera? First, he wants to inspire confidence in the SLFP; to make us believe that it is really interested in breaking the economic power of the capitalist class. Second, he maligns the working class when he accuses it of withholding its support for breaking the economic power of the capitalist class. Third, he seeks a vote of confidence from the bourgeoisie for himself by reaffirming his undertaking to mobilise the working class in order to "consolidate" the SLFP's gains of 1956 by eliminating the threat of strikes and go-slows.

But N. M. Perera was, if you will remember, the leader of the LSSP that had been mobilising the working class for 25 years for the task of breaking the economic power of the capitalist class. Was it, perhaps, the still lingering revolutionary traditions that had been dinned into the working class by the LSSP that made it withhold its "full concerted support" from the SLFP that N. M. Perera now complains about? He and his tactician comrades have not cared to consult the working class, or they would know the answer.

Surely these LSSP tacticians who still claim to be Marxists and Trotskyists must know that the failure of the SLFP to break the power of the 'reactionary' capitalists was due entirely to the refusal of the 'progressive' capitalists of the SLFP to shatter the common capitalist economic base of both the 'reactionary' as well as the 'progressive' capitalists. **They must also know that if the working class refused its support for "consolidating" the SLFP victory of 1956 it was because it correctly refused to distinguish between 'progressive' and 'reactionary' capitalists;** all it was able to recognise was the fact of its exploitation, and it reacted in the only way that a self-respecting working class will react to exploitation. And we can guarantee that it will continue to do so notwithstanding the "full concerted" efforts of Mrs. Bandaranaike and Dr. N. M. Perera to hoodwink and discipline the workers.

REVOLUTION BY BALLOT

When N. M. Perera, with the connivance of his lieutenants, attributes the failure to break the economic power of the capitalist class to the lack of support from the working class he is **echoing the accusations of Mrs. Bandaranaike and slandering the class he claims to lead.** The working class did its best, under a confused and half-hearted leadership, to complete the "revolution of 1956" for its purpose. **But it was precisely the SLFP with its "middle-path" policy that stood in its way.** And it is precisely because **the "SLFP's gains of 1956" were once again being "threatened" by a united working class with its 21 DEMANDS** that Mrs. Bandaranaike summoned N. M. Perera to her assistance. And while his accomplice, Colvin R. de Silva, was engaged in the JCTUO asking for "another date", N. M. Perera has obliged the Prime Minister and offered his services for "consolidating" the chief obstacle in the way of the 21 Demands.

'Revolution by ballot' was the ideological sign-board put up by the petty bourgeois pandankarayas and propagandists of the SLFP after Bandaranaike's electoral victory over the UNP in 1956, in order to fool the masses into believing that socialism was round the corner and all they had to do was wait with folded hands until the SLFP delivered the goods. N. M. Perera and his lieutenants have taken over this slogan and round it they have devised a "tactic" whose purpose is still the same—to stave off the threat to the SLFP's gains of 1956 from Marxist revolutionary action by the working class.

We heartily agree that "something was left undone" after the defeat of the UNP in 1956. But we know what N. M. Perera and his lieutenants have conveniently forgotten, that it is **only the working class that can complete the task** that the revolutionary national bourgeoisie may initiate but can never consummate, the revolutionary socialist task of solving the social and economic problems of a backward semi-colonial country. But unlike N. M. Perera and his accomplices we are confident that **the working class WILL accomplish its historic task and will do so only over the corpse of the Coalition which the "tacticians" are trying to make permanent.**

The confidence of genuine Trotskyists in the revolutionary potential of the Ceylonese working class flows from the theory of the Permanent Revolution. The tactic of the Permanent Coalition is based on a petty bourgeois distrust of the working class and, in the last analysis, on the dread of the socialist revolution. Fearing the revolution more than the UNP, the "progressives" have got together and devised a joint tactic to shackle the working class. By means of that tactic it is the working class that will be "undone"—so they hope.

WORKERS' COUNCILS

But the petty-bourgeois pandankarayas and propagandists for the coalition will remind us of the Workers' Councils and Vigilance Committees which are to be brought into "**active participation in the process of Government... and will have positive and creative functions to perform (and) will be in an organised manner ranged against their class enemy with the necessary authority and power of the state machinery to back them in their struggle**". (LSSP Conference Resolution, June, 1964). Will not these organisations give a new stimulus to the class struggle, they will ask.

N. M. Perera's grandiose promise has already been whittled down to **Advisory Committees** which will help the government and the employers "to obtain the best results" from their labour. This is quite in keeping with his chief task as watch-dog of the country's finances—'cutting down' on everything he can lay his hands on, excepting the toil and sweat of the working class.

The Finance Minister, speaking to trade unions of the Inland Revenue Department on July 7, 1964 said

"Trade unions will be given a special role with the formation of Advisory Committees in Departments. However they could go a step further and do their best to assist the Government in **other capacities as well**.

"Trade unions should sustain this Government by performing the role assigned to them in the near future.

"Trade unions would be made **partners** [of the Government] by law." (our emphasis)

Here is the tactician-in-chief deploying his forces! The role he "**assigns**" to the working class in the new dispensation could not have been expressed more clearly and more economically, and that is "to sustain this Government"—this Government formed by the alliance with the SLFP of the reformist LSSP leaders who have not been "assigned" but have **voluntarily assumed** the role of taming and disciplining the working class by leading it into the close and intimate embrace of the "authority and power of the (**bourgeois**) state machinery".

GUNS AT THEIR BACKS

Are there any class conscious workers who believe that workers' councils and vigilance committees will be able to function as organs of class struggle—to fight not only the UNP capitalists but the SLFP capitalists as well? These sub-governmental organisations set up under the aegis of the coalition will of necessity have to be organs for assisting in the efficient functioning of the regime, for "eliminating strikes and go-slows" to please the Prime Minister, to "sustain this government" to please Dr. N. M. Perera, and "consolidate the victory of the SLFP" to please the capitalist class. The common weal!

We can be sure that the capitalist state machinery will be paralysed in trying to distinguish between 'progressive' and 'reactionary' enemies of the working class. But if at any time class conscious workers seek to use these organisations to develop the class struggle, they will find the "authority and power of the (**bourgeois**) state machinery" **at their backs** to remind them of the role that N. M. Perera and his accomplices have "assigned" to them. They will be forcefully reminded that **strict discipline** is needed to carry out this manoeuvre successfully.

The "other capacities" in which the Finance Minister expects the Advisory Committees to function, will be left to the initiative of the petty-bourgeois pandankarayas whose services will be at a premium, and will consist chiefly in spying

and tale-bearing in the name of vigilance against genuine class conscious workers, to frame them as agents-provocateurs, saboteurs and enemies of the Government. N. M. Perera and his chief accomplice in the trade union field, Colvin R. de Silva, have already displayed their qualities of leadership in this direction. They have eliminated known revolutionaries from the offices they held in the trade unions controlled by the LSSP, and that too without laying any charges against them besides that of "political differences".

STATE PATRONAGE OF TRADE UNIONS

It was pointed out long ago by Trotsky that there is "one common feature in the . . . degeneration of modern trade union organisations . . . it is their drawing closely to and growing together with the state power." He gave the reason for this "state patronage" in the case of colonial and semi-colonial countries in the following manner:

"The governments of backward, i.e. colonial and semi-colonial countries, by and large, assume a Bonapartist or semi-Bonapartist character; and differ from one another in this, that some try to orient in a democratic direction, seeking support from workers and peasants, while others install a form close to military-police dictatorship. This likewise determines the fate of the trade unions. They either stand under the special patronage of the state or they are subjected to cruel persecution. Patronage on the part of the state is dictated by two tasks which confront it: first, to draw the working class closer thus gaining a support for resistance against excessive pretensions on the part of imperialism, and at the same time, to discipline the workers themselves by placing them under the control of a bureaucracy."

He cited the particular case of Mexico where the railways and oil fields had been nationalised, and the trade unions had been given a legal status in their management, ending in their complete subjection to the bourgeois state. In this connection he had this to say :

"The nationalisation of railways and oil fields in Mexico has of course nothing

in common with socialism. It is a measure of state capitalism in a backward country which in this way seeks to defend itself on the one hand against foreign imperialism and on the other hand against its own proletariat. The management of railways, oil fields, etc., through labour organisations, has nothing in common with workers control over industry, for in the essence of the matter the management is effected through the labour bureaucracy which is independent of the workers, but in return completely dependent on the bourgeois state.

"This measure on the part of the ruling class pursues the aim of disciplining the working class, making it more industrious in the service of the common interests of the state, which appear on the surface to merge with the interests of the working class itself. As a matter of fact, the whole task of the bourgeoisie consists in liquidating the trade unions as the organs of the class struggle and substituting in their place the trade union bureaucracy as the organ of the leadership over the workers by the bourgeois state."

He warned against the dangers of permitting the trade unions to be stifled in the embrace of the bourgeois state:

"The statisation of the trade unions was, according to the conception of the legislators, introduced in the interests of the workers in order to assure them an influence upon the governmental and economic life. But insofar as foreign imperialist capitalism dominates the national state and insofar as it is able, with the assistance of internal reactionary forces, to overthrow the unstable democracy and replace it with outright fascist dictatorship, to that extent the legislation relating to the trade unions can easily become a weapon in the hands of imperialist dictatorship." (our emphasis)

("Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay"—Leon

Trotsky)

But the 'Trotskyist' tacticians of the LSSP have, in addition to everything else, abandoned even their memories in order to assume the voluntary role of the SLFP's

political police who will have the full backing of the capitalist state machinery in carrying out their despicable task. Their tactic of entry into the SLFP government is clearly exposed as a perfidious trick to dupe the working class and deliver it gagged and bound into the power of the capitalist class.

HOMeward BOUND

Their admiration for the "revolution of 1956" and yearning to "consolidate its gains" are a confirmation of the objective role these renegades have been playing in the proletarian revolutionary movement. The truth of the matter is that these **bourgeois and petty-bourgeois revolutionaries** have had enough of their self-imposed exile in an alien milieu. We readily grant that during their sojourn with the proletariat they faced not only ostracism but prison and bullets, and made a lasting contribution to the proletarian revolutionary movement. But for them the time has come to consolidate the gains and reap the fruits of the bourgeois nationalist revolution for which they have made great sacrifices, and they have now decided to return home. **The unpardonable crime is their attempt to drag the toiling masses behind them and turn them into their servile retainers.**

If there is a lesson for the working class in this cynical desertion of a leadership, it is that of the necessity for a rigorous surveillance over its leaders, and particularly those who come from another class with their incorrigible predilection for having the best of both worlds.

However, we can assure these strategists in betrayal that the working class will not allow itself to be duped. The revolutionary propensities of the proletariat will continue to develop the more their betrayers try to "consolidate" the capitalist order; and with Marxist revolutionaries to guide them they will soon be on the move pressing forward to complete what was left undone and can never be done by the revolutionary national bourgeoisie—the des-

truction of the capitalist economic base of the **entire class** of exploiters.

CAMOUFLAGE

The Prime Minister, on behalf of the 'progressive' bourgeoisie, has accepted the penitent wanderers into her fold. But, in spite of the criticism she has had to face about allying herself with "Marxists", she has wisely refrained from demanding that they publicly and categorically repudiate their Marxism, whatever else she may have got them to surrender. She knows her onions and her prodigal sons as well. Their protestations of adherence to Marxism, Trotskyism, revolutionism far from being embarrassing, provide her with just the 'Left' cover she needs to camouflage her plans to subdue the working class, at least until she can "consolidate" her victory and the profits of the class she serves.

But we can confidently predict that these renegades who are now eating out of her hand, will before long be compelled to eat their words. And for dessert the working class will ram their filthy lies down the throats of these traitors.

The renegade 'leaders' of the LSSP have held the stage for a quarter of a century and have earned a reputation in the working class movement which extends beyond the confines of our little island. But as Trotsky remarked concerning Karl Radek who was one of the leaders of the Russian Revolution, "opportunism in politics is all the more dangerous the more camouflaged it is and the greater the personal reputation that covers it". We cannot permit the personal reputations of the renegades to stand in the way of our criticism or, what is of primary importance, in the way of the working class.

The socialist revolution does not stand (or fall) on the personal reputations or sacrifices of 'leaders', but on "the class consciousness of the workers, their trust in their own forces and their readiness for self-sacrifice in the struggle."

DYNAMICS OF THE CEYLON REVOLUTION - Part II.

by EDMUND SAMARAKKODY

A PROGNOSIS into the probable course and the unfolding of the Ceylon Revolution, the role of classes and the strategy and tactics in the struggle and the form and content of the new state power brings into issue the fundamental question of the nature or character of the coming revolution. However, an ab initio investigation into this question has been obviated by the previous analysis of the Ceylon economy, the existing relations of production and the existing forms of property. If the conclusion has already been drawn that the forces of feudalism and feudal relations of production have long ago been destroyed, whilst only negligible traces of old non-capitalist relations of production still remain in some remote parts of rural Ceylon, it follows that the fundamental task of the bourgeois Democratic Revolution has already been accomplished in Ceylon. At the same time however, the unaccomplished task of this same Democratic Revolution is writ large on the face of the socio-economic structure. British ownership of the Tea and Rubber Plantations and their dominance in the export trade has given British Imperialism a continuing dominance in the whole economy. The struggle to overthrow imperialism is a reality. Similarly in the field of social relations democratic tasks remain. The Tamil linguistic minority forming nearly one million persons suffer serious discrimination and for another one million persons of Indian origin in the plantations discrimination has come in a more severe form—they are without citizenship rights and consequently in a state of semi-slavery. And there also remain in a real way caste discrimination and caste oppression.

But the overriding question in the Ceylon scene is speedy economic development and the achievement of a growth rate to catch up with the back-log of underdevelopment and outstrip the population growth of 2.8%

per year. It is the Capitalist shell that is confining and blocking the productive forces from expansion and development. The outworn capitalist relations of production must be torn asunder to release these forces of production. Thus the break up of the capitalist framework of the Ceylon economy is the fundamental task of the Ceylon Revolution. And it is in this context that the struggle for the remaining democratic tasks have to be evaluated. The struggle for the accomplishment of the democratic tasks is inevitably linked to the wider struggle to break finally and shatter the capitalist shell, and accordingly the democratic struggle will flow into the main current of the major conflict between Capital and Labour. Thus the coming Ceylon Revolution though propelled and strongly reinforced by a deep rooted and broad based democratic movement, remains Socialist in content. More precisely Ceylon faces a proletarian revolution.

Forces in Revolution :

In the context of the character of the coming Ceylon Revolution the forces in this revolution are broadly the forces supporting, sustaining and conserving capitalism—the pro-capitalist and pro-imperialist and the anti-Imperialist anti-capitalist and socialist forces promoting the break up of imperialist economic power and capitalism itself and which are objectively moving towards the realisation of the new Social Order—the forces of Revolution.

Pro-Capitalist and Pro-Imperialist Forces—Bourgeois.

For nearly half a century the British Imperialists used the semi-feudal aristocratic landlords particularly of the low-country to suppress and oppress the people. Using to advantage their virtual monopoly of an English education and openly embracing Christianity, 'the religion of the

conquer, these aristocratic families led by the Obeysekeras and Bandaranayakes obtained the plums of Government Service, and being the elite of the land were also the wealthiest among the Ceylonese. In the Tamil areas the Imperialists established similar relations with the well-to-do Vellala families.

The non-aristocratic coconut land-owners and merchants of the low-country—the new bourgeois class emerged much later. It was after the first decade of the 20th Century (about 1910) that this new class reared itself. A majority of them, coconut and rubber estate owners and toddy and arrack renters blocked by the pre-eminent position of the feudo-aristocratic land-owning families, but not yet sufficiently class conscious and fearful of the future, this new class was incapable of openly marching like their predecessors of the 18th Century under the banners of “Liberty and Equality”. Instead they concealed their aims under a so-called Temperance Movement and Buddhist Revival. In Angharika Dharmapala, D. B. Jayatilleke, Senenayake Brothers (D. S., F. R. and D. C.) the younger Bourgeois class found leaders of ability. However even a limited fight against privilege and the vested interests of the aristocratic families protected by the imperialist Power could not remain altogether a peaceful affair. But fearful of organising any opposition to the Imperialist Government the new National Bourgeois Movement found it convenient to deal with the prosperous but powerless Muslim Merchant Community. Hence the Sinhalese-Muslim riots of 1915. Sensing an anti-government current in these riots the imperialist Government did not hesitate to use savage repression. This resulted in shooting of Sinhalese Bourgeois leaders (Hewavitharane) and the temporary detention of the new Bourgeois leaders (D. B. Jayatilleke, F. R. Senenayake, D. S. Senanayake) who were made patriots despite their protests of unshakable loyalty to Imperialism. And it is outside controversy that this new Ceylonese Bourgeois class was not in any way anti-imperialist. Their courage, determination, their patriotism and nationalism was a damp squib, and only led them to a violent clash against politically and socially powerless Muslim

merchants and traders. And this same level and degree of patriotism and nationalism of the Ceylon Bourgeois was to show itself to advantage in their “neo-liberation” Movement under cover of religion and language led by Bandaranaike, which was to leave untouched the real economic power of imperialism in Ceylon but through which they have succeeded in eliminating to some extent the Indian Capitalist and also the much weaker Ceylon Tamil Bourgeoisie. The anti-imperialist or progressive bourgeoisie was and is non-existent in Ceylon.

The Ceylon Bourgeoisie till very recent times fell into two groups—the land-owning bourgeoisie and the Compradore Bourgeoisie. The deformities of Capitalist development and its continued state of stagnation and backwardness has created a bourgeoisie in that same image. The ruling Imperialist Power had its two wings of support—the Planters who were the owners or controllers of the Tea and Rubber Plantations organised in the Planters Association of the Tea and Rubber Plantations, and the wing of Agency Houses who were handling the import-export business—the business community represented by the European Chamber of Commerce. Having grown in the shadow of their Imperialist Masters the Ceylonese Bourgeoisie followed in their footsteps. The Ceylonese coconut land-owners soon replaced a number of European owners of Tea and Rubber estates and became the “black” Planters themselves—i.e. the land-owning bourgeoisie. The other section (minority and less important) of the bourgeoisie entered the business world. At first, confined to the Ceylon Muslims this community now embraces the Sinhalese merchants and traders as the bigger and more powerful group. This Ceylonese Compradore bourgeoisie is the counter-part of the European businessman of the Agency Houses.

Both these Ceylonese bourgeois groups (Landowners or Planters and the Compradores) grew as junior planters in the Firm of British Imperialism & Co. Linked to the Imperialist set up both groups remained pro-imperialist and looked consciously to Imperialism for their sustenance and growth. Despite the serious obstacles to their advancement due to the Imperialist vested

interests the Ceylonese Bourgeoisie has never turned anti-Imperialist. In the situation the Ceylonese Compradores found it safer and more convenient to fight their Indian competitor. Next to the European Agency Houses it was the Indian Bourgeoisie that played the leading role in Trade and Business. Through Indian Banks operating in Ceylon the Indian Business Bourgeoisie had the lion's share in business that was not in the hands of the British Agency Houses. The Ceylonese Compradores found themselves hedged in numerous ways by the Indian vested interests. By 1935 the Ceylonese Compradores that wanted now to come into business in a big way were clashing with Indian Big Business and were soon encouraging and sustaining an anti-Indian movement. In fact whilst the Ceylonese Planters were not anti-Indian as they favoured further immigration of Indian workers for their estates, the Ceylonese Compradores were violently anti-Indian.

When the state power came into the hands of the land-owning bourgeoisie led by D. S. Senanayake and his Party in 1948 the land-owning section got the lion's share of the unexpected inheritance from Imperialism. The Ceylonese Planters were assisted through Government Credit Corporations like the State Mortgage Bank, Bank of Ceylon and the Agricultural Credit Corporation to purchase European owned estates. Considerable state subsidies were made for replanting Rubber, coconut and Tea. An irresponsible encouragement to the land-owners was the case of speculation in estates and breaking up such estates. The land-owning bourgeoisie led by D. S. Senanayake failed to give a due share of the good things to the Compradore bourgeoisie. They were left to their own resources. In fact good relations existed between the Indian business interests in Ceylon and the U.N.P. Generous contributions to U.N.P. Election Funds was no secret and many Indian Businessmen were rewarded by grant of Distinguished Citizenship and temporary residence permits were extended and rewards were made at Ministerial level. The vested interests of the Indian Bourgeoisie remained undisturbed and representations and pressure moves of the Ceylonese Compradores had no effect with the Senanayake Government.

The transfer of parliamentary power from the U.N.P. of Senanayake to the S.L.F.P. of Bandaranaike was not unwelcome to sections of Ceylonese business sections. The Compradores who found themselves blocked by the Indian Merchants and Traders saw hope in the pro-Sinhalese and anti-Tamil Movement. The larger section of the Ceylonese businessmen being Sinhalese, the anti-Tamil Movement could help to protect them from new comers from the Ceylon-Tamils and also help them to direct the movement to oust their powerful Indian rivals from positions of economic power. It was not without reason that many Sinhalese businessmen played a silent but effective role in the communal riots of 1958. These lesser Ceylonese capitalists struggling for survival in the mercantile and business world found their ideology now had a habitation and a name—The S.L.F.P. In Bandaranaike they found a leader whose guiding star was his aim to drive every Indian from Ceylon. With the new Government of Bandaranaike the Ceylonese Compradores came in full support of the new set up and pressed their claims—with a cry of “Ceylonisation” the compradores obtained the support of Bandaranaike to gradually push out their Indian rivals. Through the system of import licences the import business began to change hands and definite progress was registered for the compradores under the first Bandaranaike Government. This process was only interrupted by the government crisis during his time and in 1959 by his assassination. The implementing of the demands of the Ceylonese Compradores was accelerated by the second Bandaranaike Government. The T.R.P. extensions are over and Distinguished Citizenship for Indian Businessmen has not been heard of. The Indian businessman is fast disappearing. The Compradore bourgeoisie has recognised the S.L.F.P. as its own Party.

A hitherto insignificant section of the bourgeoisie which failed to create any impression in the economic field has since 1956 grown numerically and in importance—that is the manufacturing bourgeoisie or the embryo entrepreneur. The owners and share-holders of private enterprises in a large number of light consumer industries have since 1956 asserted themselves and have found a place in the economic set up.

With the foreign exchange problem of the government and the need to make drastic cuts in imports of consumer goods the Sirima Bandaranaike Government has called upon the private entrepreneur to launch into production of consumer goods. By effective control of finance, by the nationalisation of the Bank of Ceylon and seriously curtailing the activities of Foreign Banks, the Government is granting considerable assistance financial and otherwise to the infant entrepreneur class—free technical know-how and even blue prints of factories are granted. With Tax holidays, and reduction of import duties for the importation of machinery for new factories, and with a bold wage-freeze policy despite the menacing movement of the working class, the Sirima Bandaranaike Government can now be recognised as representing the interest of the comprador-cum-entrepreneur bourgeoisie of Ceylon, and the S.L.F.P. is their bourgeois party.

But the Ceylonese bourgeoisie of all three sectors are in a common plight. Having arisen belatedly and having come into consciousness of their class needs, and seriously handicapped by the back-log of underdevelopment of the economy, this bourgeoisie already shudders before the enormity of their own tasks. The existence of a strong organised working class, trained in class action and growing menacingly make it impossible for this bourgeoisie to assert itself in relation to Imperialism—fearful of the working class the bourgeoisie cannot support the taking over of Imperialist and other foreign assets in Ceylon. Furthermore, lacking in economic resources and already recognising their hopeless failure in attempts at development the Ceylon Bourgeoisie cannot conceive of their survival without massive foreign aid. In the situation they are compelled to lean heavily on world imperialism (U.S. and U.K.) for sustenance and support.

for

BUILDING
DRAINAGE
WATER SERVICE
DECORATION
ALTERATION

TUDAWE BROS., LIMITED.

505/2, Narahenpitiya Road,
C O L O M B O 5.

Telephone: 84494

DO NOT PRAISE THE UNPRAISABLE

by ELIAS MANUITT

(COMANDANTE ELIAS MANUIT is a member of the General Military Command of the Armed Forces of National Liberation (FALN) and Chief of Staff of the Guerilla Front in the state of Falcon in Venezuela. He addressed this letter to Bohan Lewandowsky, Ambassador of the Republic of Poland to the UN, in reply to certain statements made by him in a Venezuelan Daily, praising the dictatorial regime in Venezuela.

He was not the only person from the Socialist countries, to support the Venezuelan Government in recent times. It was the Yugoslav delegation that pressed most vigorously, for the invitation to the Venezuelan Government to the 2nd Conference of Nonaligned nations. Cuba voiced the sentiments of the people of Latin America in particular, when she condemned this action in no uncertain terms.)

*Sierra of Falcon in Arms,
March 9, 1964.*

Mr. Bohan Lewandowsky,
Ambassador of the Republic of Poland,
in UN.

The writer of this letter is just another combatant against the "exemplary democracy" that you so warmly praise and admire so emotionally, blatantly identifying it was worthy of being supported by all Venezuelans and imitated by the rest of the oppressed peoples of the world, according to your own statements, appearing today in EL NACIONAL, the daily newspaper with the largest circulation in the country.

Mr. Ambassador, the writer of this letter has not yet had the immense honour of inscribing his name as a member of the glorious and combative Communist Party of Venezuela. He has not suffered personally the least torture which the "exemplary democracy" has inflicted in the most criminal and savage manner on the thousands of Venezuelans who have had the

bad luck of falling into his clutches. He has not passed a micro-second in the filthy jails and concentration camps of this "exemplary democracy" now filled with worthy and valient revolutionists of both sexes.

Until barely two years ago he lacked the least concept of the fine and incomparable Marxist-Leninist doctrines. None of his relatives have been massacred with criminal fervour by the repressive armed forces and police of this admired and "exemplary democracy", stained with proletarian blood. None of the Communist, Mirista (MIR), Urredista (URD) parliamentarians elected by the people in the free elections of 1958 or in the fraud of December 1st 1963, and today jailed by this admired and "exemplary democracy" are party companions or relatives of his.

The author of this letter has never been an editor, writer or commentator on the various organs of the press and radio, today closed down by this admirable and "exemplary democracy". He has never felt the immense hunger and unemployment that creeps like a filthy monster among the humble sons of this people today governed by this admired and "exemplary democracy". He has never lived in those flimsy cardboard houses that you can see, like a horrible clawing belt of anguish along the hills that surround the architectural jewel of Latin America's first petroleum capital, from the cushioned and luxurious vehicle that this admired and "exemplary democracy" will provide for you. I will not continue enumerating these things because I confidently assume that as soon as you enter your country's embassy, you will be informed of everything.

Mr. Ambassador, the undersigned could not feel on his own body all the atrocities I have pointed out, since he lived the comfortable and privileged life of the officers of the army of the country of Simon Bolivar.

By the way, when you were a Communist and struggled for the liberation of your people—if you struggled—did you ever read anything about the life of this man? If not, then I recommend that you read the authentic history of Venezuela, not the distorted history that often circulates under the auspices of the North American imperialism.

Anguished by so much disgrace, oppression, persecution, aggression, exploitation and robbery of our nation's riches, and inspired by patriotism, solidarity and fraternity, the whole series of concepts that beautify and enrich the sacred principles of proletarian internationalism, already beat within me although I had not read them in the texts of Marxism-Leninism which you must know by heart, and the hammer and sickle was deeply engraved in my mind as a living symbol of the most beautiful, realistic, just and ardent philosophical concept of the world, for which you today are doing absolutely nothing.

Mr. Pseudo-Ambassador of the heroic and admired people of Poland, I threw all the privileges and comforts of the army into that pit of corruption where I had been asphyxiated for 15 years, and where they had tried, without succeeding, to deform my conscience as an authentic Venezuelan and my sentiments of solidarity towards the suffering of others. And with the weapons that the people had given me, I came to these mountains to fight to the death shoulder to shoulder with your heroic comrades and with many men and women belonging to no parties against the admired and "exemplary democracy" which you, delegate of a worthy and combative people, praise so emotionally.

Mr. Lewandowsky, we do not ask or need solidarity of any kind from you for the resolution which we initiated and which we will continue to the end, whatever the

cost may be, but what I do insist on energetically from you is that if there is anything left in you of the sacred principles you keep in the drawer of your desk at the United Nations, when you sit in the comfortable sofas of the Tamanaco Hotel, Macuto Sheraton, Miraflores (Presidential Palace), Salon Eliptico, etc., do not praise the unpraisable. I ask it of you in the absolute certainty that I speak in the name of more than 1,500 political prisoners, of the one million unemployed out of a population of seven million, of the millions of hungry Venezuelans, of the thousands of tortured citizens, of the widows, the mothers, the sons of the unburied but immortal dead murdered by this regime, in the name of my country, subjugated and suffering, and in the name of the people of Poland and the rest of the free nations of the world.

Mr. Lewandowsky, you have spoken as a representative of the state department of Yankee imperialism. When you return to Washington, stay there, and don't ever return to your country, because I am sure that the people will slap you down; they will throw your infamy, your servility your viciousness and your desertion from the ranks of proletarian internationalism in your face.

Mr. Lewandowsky, to barter with the crafty bosses of this despotic dictatorship it was not necessary to barter also with the sacred principles of the revolution of all the oppressed peoples anxious for liberation. Such lowness was not necessary. I hope, Mr. Lewandowsky, that your statements to the press have been distorted, so that for that reason, and for that reason only, I will some day have to retract all that I have said.

Sincerely,

Comandante Elias Manuitt

Book Review

Jack London's "Iron Heel"

A Commentary by Leon Trotsky

The following commentary on Jack London's *Iron Heel* was written by Leon Trotsky in 1937 and originally included in the biography "Jack London and His Times" written by the novelists' daughter Joan London. With her permission it was published in the *New Internationalist* of April, 1945.

The opening paragraph is not included.

....The book produced upon me—I speak without exaggeration—a deep impression. Not because of its artistic qualities: the form of the novel here represents only an armour for social analysis and prognosis. The author is intentionally sparing in his use of artistic means. He is himself interested not so much in the individual fate of his heroes as in the fate of mankind. By this, however, I don't want at all to belittle the artistic value of the work, especially in its last chapters beginning with the Chicago commune. The pictures of civil war develop in powerful frescoes. Nevertheless, this is not the main feature. The book surprised me with the audacity and independence of its historical foresight.

The world workers' movement at the end of the last and the beginning of the present century stood under the sign of reformism. The perspective of peaceful and uninterrupted world progress, of the prosperity of democracy and social reforms, seemed to be assured once and for all. The first Russian Revolution, it is true, revived the radical flank of the German social-democracy and gave for a certain time dynamic force to anarcho-syndicalism in France. "The Iron Heel" bears the undoubted imprint of the year 1905. But at the time when this remarkable book appeared, the domination of counter-revolution was already consolidating itself in Russia. In the world arena the defeat of the Russian proletariat gave to reformism the possibility not only

of regaining its temporarily lost positions but also of subjecting to itself completely the organized workers' movement. It is sufficient to recall that precisely in the following seven years (1907-1914) the international social-democracy ripened definitely for its base and shameful role during the World war.

Jack London not only absorbed creatively the impetus given by the first Russian Revolution but also courageously thought over again in its light the fate of capitalist society as a whole. Precisely those problems which the official socialism of this time considered to be definitely buried: the growth of wealth and power at one pole, of misery and destitution at the other pole; the accumulation of social bitterness and hatred; the unalterable preparation of bloody cataclysms—all those questions Jack London felt with an intrepidity which forces one to ask himself again and again with astonishment: when was this written? Really before the war?

One must accentuate especially the role which Jack London attributes to the labour bureaucracy and to the labour aristocracy in the further fate of mankind. Thanks to their support, the American plutocracy not only succeeds in defeating the workers' insurrection but also in keeping its iron dictatorship during the following three centuries. We will not dispute with the poet the delay which can but seem to us too long. However, it is not a question of Jack London's pessimism, but of his passionate effort to shake those who are lulled by routine, to force them to open their eyes and to see what is and what approaches. The artist is audaciously utilizing the methods of hyperbole. He is bringing the tendencies rooted in capitalism: of oppression, cruelty, bestiality, betrayal, to their extreme expression. He is operating with centuries in order to measure the tyrannical will of the exploiters and the treacherous role of the labour bureaucracy. But his most "romantic" hyperboles are finally much more realistic than the book-keeper-like calculations of the so-called "sober politicians".

Powerful Intuition

It is easy to imagine with what a condescending perplexity the official socialist thinking of that time met Jack London's menacing prophecies. If one took the trouble to look over the reviews of "The

Ceylon's greatest natural resource is what you can guess—Water. Can you doubt that our Island's future depends so largely on its utilisation? Rain-fall on our plains has to be caught and stored against dry months. The water that runs waste from our central highlands to the sea has to be channeled to wider areas and tapped for its large potential of electricity. There are our towns and emerging cities that have to be assured their supply of treated water. Nor must we forget the immeasurable wealth of the sea that lies still virgin crying out insistently for fishing harbours. Tanks, Bunds, Hydro-Electricity, Water-Filtration Plants and Harbours demand the highest priority in development engineering in our country.

CEYLON DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING CO. LTD.

50, FOSTER LANE

COLOMBO 10.

Iron Heel" at that time in the German "Neue Zeit" and "Vorwärts", in the Austrian "Kampf" and "Arbeiterzeitung", as well as in the other socialist publications of Europe and America, he could easily convince himself that the thirty-year-old "romanticist" saw incomparably more clearly than all the social-democratic leaders of that time taken together. But Jack London bears comparison in this domain not only with the reformists. One can say with assurance that in 1907 not one of the revolutionary Marxists, not excluding Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg, imagined so fully the ominous perspective of the alliance between finance capital and labour aristocracy. This suffices in itself to determine the specific weight of the novel.

The chapter, "The Roaring Abysmal Beast", undoubtedly constitutes the focus of the book. At the time when the novel appeared this apocalyptic chapter must have seemed to be the boundary of hyperbolism. However, the consequent happenings have almost surpassed it. And the last word of class struggle has not yet been said by far! The "Abysmal Beast" is to the extreme degree oppressed, humiliated, and degenerated people. Who would now dare to speak for this reason about the artist's

pessimism? No. London is an optimist, only a penetrating and farsighted one. "Look into what kind of abyss the bourgeoisie will hurl you down, if you don't finish with them!" This is his thought. Today it sounds incomparably more real and sharp than thirty years ago. But still more astonishing is the genuinely prophetic vision of the methods by which the Iron Heel will sustain its domination over crushed mankind. London manifests remarkable freedom from reformistic pacifist illusions. In this picture of the future there remains not a trace of democracy and peaceful progress. Over the mass of the deprived rise the castes of labour aristocracy, of praetorian army, of an all-penetrating police, with the financial oligarchy at the top. In reading it, one does not believe his own eyes: it is precisely the picture of fascism, of its economy, of its governmental technique, its political psychology! The fact is incontestable: in 1907 Jack London already foresaw and described the fascist regime as the inevitable result of the defeat of the proletarian revolution. Whatever may be the single "errors" of the novel—and they exist—we cannot help inclining before the powerful intuition of the revolutionary artist.

KOSANGAS

THE MODERN FUEL FOR THE MODERN KITCHEN

▨ NO MAINS OR PIPES

▨ SIMPLE

▨ SAFE

▨ PORTABLE

▨ NO SOOT

▨ NO SMOKE

KOSANGAS (Ceylon) LIMITED
51-53, QUEEN STREET, COLOMBO 1

TELEPHONE 4381

Films



THE MAN WHO SHOT LIBERTY VALANCE

This film now being screened at the *Liberty Cinema* is yet another production of Director John Ford who was responsible for a number of film classics—"Stagecoach", "The Informer" and "Grapes of Wrath". It is based on the short story written by Dorothy M. Johnson. Casting two leading personalities as James Stewart and John Wayne in one picture attests to its importance. The story deals with real people who lived in that time in American history when lawlessness was the order of the day and statehood was fought for with blood, sweat and tears.

Stewart is seen in the role of Ranse Stoddard, city bred Lawyer, who, though opposed to and not equipped for violence, has to buck Liberty Valance, the most vicious killer in the western territory where he chooses to hang up his shingle. Wayne plays Tom Doniphon, quiet, respected rancher, who not only comes to Ranse's aid but pushes him ahead to accomplish the seemingly unaccomplishable.

HELLIONS

"The Hellions" an Irving Allen—Jamie Uys production is based on a story by Harold Swanton. It is to be screened shortly at the *REGAL THEATRE*.

One of the most popular of all screen plot situations is the "shootout", that moment of drama in which hero and villain or villains blaze away at each other. In *HELLIONS* the shootout moves from the familiar frontier of the southwest to the completely new, spectacular and exciting frontier of Old South Africa.

The South African lawmen, it would seem, had much the same problems with range-riding renegades as did the sheriffs and marshals of USA. "The Hellions" offers a considerable number of other similarities between the "west" of USA and South Africa—an ingrained hatred for the barbed wire which is spoiling the range and



endangering the lives of horses and humans, citizenry reluctant to help out their local lawmen whenever they have to go up against outlaw, guns, and gunmen who kill, intimidate or torture for fun.

Richard Todd plays the role of the police sergeant in the South African frontier town. when Lionel Jeffries rides into town accompanied by his four sons with his deep hatred for the civilization that is growing round him, Todd finds himself alone in his opposition. The closing scenes of "The Hellions" are truly bullet-blasting.

Lanka

ENVELOPES

100% NATIONAL DEMAND SATISFIED

100% CEYLONESE CAPITAL

100% CEYLONESE SKILL

HELP NATIONAL INDUSTRY . . .

BUY LOCALLY

MANUFACTURED PRODUCTS



ANTON WICKREMASINGHE LTD.

GAFFOOR BUILDING, COLOMBO 1.

Lanka

ENVELOPES

100% NATIONAL DEMAND SATISFIED

100% CEYLONESE CAPITAL

100% CEYLONESE SKILL

HELP NATIONAL INDUSTRY . . .

BUY LOCALLY

MANUFACTURED PRODUCTS



ANTON WICKREMASINGHE LTD.

GAFFOOR BUILDING, COLOMBO 1.

MILK is the surest source of **ENERGY**

CHILDREN DON'T WALK THEY RUN.
WHATEVER THEY DO—CLIMBING TREES,
PLAYING HOP-SCOTCH, WORKING AT SCHOOL
OR PLAYING AT HOME—THEY SQUANDER
THEIR ENERGY WITHOUT A CARE. IT FOLLOWS
THAT A CHILD'S DIET MUST BE FOUNDED ON MILK
WHICH IS THE SOURCE AND SUBSTANCE OF ALL
ENERGY. MILK IS GOOD, SOLID NOURISHMENT—
THAT IS WHY IT IS KNOWN AS NATURE'S FINEST FOOD.

Give your CHILDREN

MILK BOARD MILK

EVERY DAY

DON'T SETTLE FOR A SUBSTITUTE

Drink **MILK BOARD**  **MILK**



NATIONAL MILK BOARD

MILK

is the

surest source of

ENERGY

CHILDREN DON'T WALK THEY RUN.
WHATEVER THEY DO—CLIMBING TREES,
PLAYING HOP-SCOTCH, WORKING AT SCHOOL
OR PLAYING AT HOME—THEY SQUANDER
THEIR ENERGY WITHOUT A CARE. IT FOLLOWS
THAT A CHILD'S DIET MUST BE FOUNDED ON MILK
WHICH IS THE SOURCE AND SUBSTANCE OF ALL
ENERGY. MILK IS GOOD, SOLID NOURISHMENT—
THAT IS WHY IT IS KNOWN AS NATURE'S FINEST FOOD.

Give your CHILDREN

MILK BOARD MILK

EVERY DAY

DON'T SETTLE FOR A SUBSTITUTE

Drink MILK BOARD



MILK



NATIONAL MILK BOARD