

# YOUNG SOCIALIST

EDITORIALS ON: Expectation and Reality; Alliance with the dark forces; Press Take-over; General Elections; The UNP—led Bourgeois 'National' Government; Throne Speech; The Opposition; The Fight Against the 'National' Government; Vietnam; Dominican Republic.

Coalition—Illusion and Reality

by Wilfred Pereira

Freedom of the Press and Marxism

by V. Karalasingham

From Marxism to Communalism

by Sydney Wanasinghe

An Introduction to the Philosophy of Marxism (Part VI)

by R. S. Baghavan

*From the Arsenal of Marxism*

Trotsky on Popular Frontism

*oooh...*  
*what lovely*  
**TOWELS**



**DURABLE FACE  
& BATH TOWELS  
DESIGNED TO BRING  
YOU LUXURIOUS  
DRYING AT A  
PRACTICAL PRICE!**

*Manufactured by:*

**WELLAWATTE SPINNING & WEAVING MILLS LTD.**  
RETAIL SALES  
473, GALLE ROAD, COLPETTY ● 227, MAIN ST., PETTAH.

---

# YOUNG SOCIALIST

---

Volume 3 Number 3

June 1965

Whole Number 13

---

## *Editorial Notes*

UNFORESEEN and unexpected circumstances have delayed this issue of YOUNG SOCIALIST. Since the first Throne Speech of the Coalition Government events have moved fast. The end of the Budget debate was, for the Government, not the opportunity of coming to grips with the economic problems facing the country. On the contrary, the desire to divert the attention of the people from the burning issues, to channelise their manifest dissatisfaction in safe directions, and the determination to take defensive measures against the inevitable reactions of the toilers caused the Coalition Government to take up the question of Press Control. The impatience of the Government to rush through the anti-democratic legislation resulted in procedural blunders in Parliament necessitating an unexpected prorogation and a second Throne Speech. And what appeared as a dull Throne Speech debate ended in the defeat of the Government on December 3rd leading to a General Election on March 22nd and the defeat of the Coalition Government at the polls and its replacement by a UNP led bourgeois 'National' Government.

### EXPECTATION AND REALITY

The formation of the SLFP-LSSP Coalition Government in June 1964 was only a temporary way out of the crisis of the SLFP Government that reared itself about this time. This Governmental crisis was mainly the reflection of the crisis condition of the Ceylon capitalist economy. To speedily take the economy out of a state of chronic stagnation and to raise the living standards of the people called for nothing less than a complete overturn of the economy in the anti-capitalist direction. Concretely, it called for a clear and ever-growing left

orientation of the SLFP-LSSP Coalition in the context of the mobilisation of the workers, poor peasants and toilers around an anti-Imperialist and anti-capitalist programme.

Such an evolution would have irresistibly led to the polarisation of class forces and the development of an anti-capitalist struggle. But neither the SLFP nor the LSSP (Reformists) were motivated by such perspectives. On the contrary the announced determination of the Coalition to follow the so-called Bandaranaike principles was an assurance that the aim of the Coalition Government was to maintain and protect capitalism. In this context Dr. N. M. Perera's budget did not in the least worry the capitalist class. Despite the proposed control of Banks, tax on big house-owners, and an acreage tax on Tea Estates, the accredited representatives of big business and big capital found it possible to congratulate the Finance Minister for his Budget. As for the working class, the suffering middle classes and the peasantry, their was no hope of any real relief of their pressing problems. And far from any anti-capitalist measures and the necessary left orientation the Coalition Government took refuge in the usual methods of bourgeois Governments in meeting the demands of the people. Sinhala racialism and Buddhist clericalism was the answer of the Government in the situation.

### ALLIANCE WITH THE DARK FORCES

The anti-democratic and anti-working class policies of the Government was concretised in the SIRIMA-SHASTRI PACT. The conspiracy of the Coalition Government with the Government of India to remove forcibly to India five lakhs and a half of Plantation workers and others of Indian origin was announced as a solution to the problem of state-less persons. The reactionary cry of 'Drive the Indian workers

out to make room for the Sinhalese' was to be realised now through the Coalition Government. And in continuation of these same anti-democratic policies the Coalition Government also announced its decision to make Buddhism the state religion. Discrimination against the religious minorities was to be given legal sanction. The Government's intention of maintaining bourgeois class rule in alliance with the darkest forces of reaction became a reality.

### PRESS TAKE-OVER

With no real aim or plan to deal with the pressing economic problems the Coalition Government was aware that mass discontent would manifest itself sooner

## 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	...	83
Coalition—Illusion and Reality <i>Wilfred Pereira</i>	...	91
Freedom of the Press and Marxism <i>by V. Karalasingham</i>	...	106
From Marxism to Communalism <i>by Sydney Wanasinghe</i>	...	113
An Introduction to the Philosophy of Marxism (Part vi) <i>by R. S. Baghavan</i>	...	126
<i>From the Arsenal of Marxism</i>		
Trotsky on Popular Frontism	...	134

Volume 3, No. 3. June 1965 Whole No. 3.

Editorial Board: WILFRED PEREIRA  
SYDNEY WANASINGHE

Subscription rates: Local: Rs. 5/- for 5 issues  
Rs. 10/- for 10 issues.

Overseas: Surface Mail—Rs. 15/- for 10 issues. Air Mail—Rs. 35/- for 10 issues.

All correspondence and remittances to:-

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

rather than later. The omissions and commissions of the Government had received press publicity causing no little embarrassment to the Coalitionists. Criticism of the Government was now emanating from the ranks of the workers and toilers. Corruption in the Government Parliamentary party at Ministerial level was common knowledge and became common talk. It was time for the Government to act. The 'golden brains' of the LSSP (Reformists) pointed out an easy way to deal with the situation. They were quick to realise that the workers and toilers had rightly developed a hatred against the powerful bourgeois press monopolies that was the power behind reaction in the country. The bourgeois press, particularly Lake House and The Times of Ceylon, had never concealed their open support of the capitalist class and the Imperialists. Equally manifest was their opposition to the working class movement and the democratic currents in the country. 'Take over the bourgeois press' and 'Take over Lake House' were slogans frequently heard in demonstrations of workers and toilers in Colombo. Playing on this sentiment of the working people the idea of Press Control was publicised and soon Press Bills were prepared.

The contemplated Press Control through a Press Council was far-reaching legislation seeking to muzzle the entire press including the press of the political parties. There was express provision in the Bill for the Press Council to intervene and prevent any newspaper or periodical criticising and exposing the Government under pain of severe penalties including imprisonment. When the contents of this Bill were known and public resentment was manifest the Government retreated. As a manoeuvre and as a first step they now proposed the take over of Lake House by a Press Corporation. This was only a step in the direction of press control contemplated earlier. And this Press Corporation was only a fig leaf that covered the naked Government control that was intended. And, what is more, with newsprint also under Government control, the ownership of Lake House by the SLFP-LSSP Coalition was a virtual press monopoly by the Government.

Press monopoly by a bourgeois Government linked to the dark forces of com-

munalism and clericalism would have opened the door to the worst forces of bourgeois reaction. The alleged anti-capitalism and anti-imperialism in this press take-over proposal was a myth. On the contrary this move was only the further evolution of the SLFP-LSSP Coalition in their Rightist orientation that had commenced earlier. And when this alliance was defeated in Parliament on December 3rd the working class and the toiling masses had no cause and no right to shed any tears.

### GENERAL ELECTIONS

After dissolution of Parliament on December 17th the election scene in the country was not difficult to understand. What was plain to any observer was the fact that two big electoral combinations were competing to win the voters. The SLFP led combination was the camp of the new manufacturing and industrial bourgeoisie and the UNP led combination was the camp of the older plantation bourgeoisie and older business and trading interests. Each camp sought to show that it was more 'progressive' than the other. But the reality was otherwise. The forces of Sinhala racialism and Buddhist clericalism had apparently agreed on a virtual division of labour between the two camps. These forces were controlling and directing the election campaign on both sides. Except in the Northern and Eastern Provinces the voters were divided between the two bourgeois camps. The independent intervention of the workers and toilers in the election was not in the picture. Political parties of the working class and workers' organisations generally trailed behind these bourgeois camps. The CP (Peking) and the Ceylon Democratic Congress led by Mr. Aziz were in the SLFP led camp, and the Ceylon Workers' Congress led by Mr. Thondaman backed the UNP led combination. The only independent intervention of a working class political party was by the LSSP (Revolutionary).

### THE UNP LED BOURGEOIS 'NATIONAL' GOVERNMENT

In the light of the alignment of Parties and the absence of clear issues dividing the

bourgeois camps there was a possibility that votes would be evenly divided between these two combinations. The election results giving 55 seats for the SLFP led combination and 66 for the UNP created an uncertainty as to which combination would ultimately get Parliamentary power. The possibilities before each combination raised hopes in both, leading to reckless and unprincipled secret bargaining by both sides with other groups. As the Federal Party was obviously the deciding factor in the situation there began frantic moves by both sides to win over this Party.

Both sides were unperturbed by the divergent political aims between the FP and themselves in their desperation to get Parliamentary power. The Sinhala-only policies of the SLFP, UNP, MEP and JVP and their open Sinhala racialism and the part played by each of these Parties in oppressing the Tamil minority did not appear to have caused any of these Parties any embarrassment in seeking to appear overnight as friends of the Tamil people. The leaders of the LSSP (Reformists) who represented the SLFP led combination in the bargaining with the FP were not bothered by their open betrayal of the Tamil minority when they abandoned the championing of the rights of the Tamil minority in exchange for Ministerial positions in the SLFP Cabinet.

And the FP for its part gave up all pretence of any seriousness in their fight for parity of status for the Tamil minority, and displayed readiness to peg their demand to the level of the status of regional language for the Tamils and Regional Councils through which they hoped to participate in regional administration. Thus bourgeois parties and groups with conflicting aims and policies discovered that Parliamentary power or Ministerial portfolios were more precious than 'principles' which they pronounce from the housetops. And the outcome of this unseemly and shockingly unprincipled bargaining was the UNP led bourgeois 'National' Government with the Federalist Party membership in a Cabinet with Philip Gunawardena supported by the representatives of Sinhala racialism.

### THRONE SPEECH

The Throne Speech of the new Government was proof that the policies of a Government led by one capitalist combination is hardly different from another. Sirimavo Bandaranaike and her LSSP allies could have recognised their own election programme clearly reflected through the Speech from the Throne. The pointed reference to the Government's intention to give assistance to the plantation industry to induce capitalists to make increased investments in this field is at the same time an assurance to British imperialists that British and foreign owned plantations will be safeguarded. If foreign capital is to be encouraged it follows that local capitalists will receive their share of support and protection. Whether it be in agriculture or industry the Government means to depend on private capitalists for development.

As for the workers, peasants and toilers, their problems will remain as before. The professed intentions of the Government to take "resolute steps" to solve the acute problem of unemployment and the ever rising cost of living will remain good intentions. Unemployment is not unwelcome to capitalists as it helps to provide cheap labour. The encouragement of private trade and private production through state assistance to the 'National' traders and industrialists will only result in the increased cost of living. The acute and pressing problem of landlessness was not even mentioned. The taking over of private land is the only way out of the problem of landlessness. The promise to abolish the nindagam system of land tenure without touching the vihara and dewala lands will only mean the continuation of the system.

The workers and wage earners have been promised a system of workers participation and sharing in profits. The joint councils introduced by the SLFP, the workers advisory councils proposed by the SLFP-LSSP Coalition or the presence of selected workers in managerial positions cannot change the system of capitalist class rule. These are only attempts to deceive the workers.

The intention of the Government to remove difficulties in the way of implementing the Sirimavo-Shastri Pact only means that

the decision to repatriate 5½ lakhs of plantation workers to India will remain unaltered and the contemplated crime against the plantation workers will be perpetrated.

In the field of foreign policy, despite talk of neutrality and non-alignment, the Government will definitely lean on the side of the imperialists. The Government's tolerance of US imperialist aggression in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic is proof of its true sympathies. Thus the policies of the new coalition have no aim other than that of sustaining and maintaining at any cost capitalism in Ceylon and the protection of imperialist interests in the country. Economic development through capitalism cannot extricate the economy from its chronic stagnation. Accumulation of capital to meet the requirements of investments at a tempo that will help to speedily solve the problems of development will not take place. Foreign aid cannot appreciably alter the situation for capitalism in Ceylon. Thus chronic stagnation will continue. Consequently and inevitably the problems of wage-freeze, unemployment, housing shortage, high cost of living and general misery for the masses will continue. The way out for the people is nothing less than the overthrow of the capitalist system. The fight to overthrow the UNP led Government cannot be realistic except in the context of the *anti-capitalist* struggle on the basis of the united front of working class parties and organisations.

### THE OPPOSITION

The LSSP (Reformists) and CP (Moscow) have accepted the leadership of the SLFP in Parliament. This is only a continuation of their former policies. But the consequences that follow from a joint opposition of the SLFP, LSSP and CP led by Sirima Bandaranaike are inescapable. From the outset this joint opposition to the UNP led Government has been on Sinhala racialist and Buddhist clericalist lines. The charge that the UNP has betrayed the Sinhalese and the Buddhists is the theme of the speeches or pronouncements of not only the SLFP but of the LSSP (Reformist) and CP (Moscow). Contributions of learned LSSP (Reformist) and CP men in Parliament seek to protest that the Tamil minority is to be granted concessions by the Government and also seek to challenge

the Government to dare alter the Sirima-Shastri pact by which over 5 1/2 lakhs of plantation workers and others of Indian origin are to be forcibly repatriated.

An LSSP (Reformist) Senator's attack on the UNP led Government was on the 'charge' that they obtained their votes mainly from the racial and religious minorities. According to this Senator the disqualification of the UNP was that they could not obtain a majority of the Sinhala-Buddhist votes in the Elections! The CP (Moscow) pursues this line of propaganda against the UNP in a more organised and skilful manner. A daily paper which they have contrived to publish since the elections and which they have named ATTHA (Truth or Pravda) is devoted to open Sinhala racialism and Buddhist clericalism as a weapon against the UNP. And it was at the May Day demonstrations of the SLFP-LSSP-CP that this anti-racial and religious minority propaganda reached a high water mark. Unprintable and even obscene slogans against the Tamils and Christians were shouted under the guidance of the leaders of the LSSP (Reformist) and CP (Moscow). Apparently the theory behind this line of attack is that the UNP led Government should be defeated by any means. Thus Sinhala-Tamil racial riots and Buddhist-Christian religious riots must be in the perspective of these degenerate leaders of the LSSP (Reformists) and CP (Moscow) whose state of political bankruptcy is already driving them to politics of desperation.

### BOOKS — PAMPHLETS

by ROSA LUXEMBURG

	Rs. c.
The Mass Strike, the Political Party and the Trade Unions	2 00
Socialism and the Churches	50
Accumulation of Capital	20 00
Reform or Revolution (in press)	2 00

### SURIYA BOOKSHOP

388, Galle Road,  
Wellawatte.

### THE FIGHT AGAINST THE 'NATIONAL' GOVERNMENT

Like the Bourbons of old the LSSP (Ref) and Stalinists of both Communist Parties have learnt nothing and forgotten nothing. The familiar but treacherous slogan of "all anti-UNP forces unite" is being trotted out by these reformists who seek to deceive once again the workers and toilers that it is necessary to form an alliance with a section of the capitalists in order to fight the UNP led capitalist Government. The theory leading to faith in a progressive bourgeoisie had led to repeated betrayals of the working class and toilers during the last half century in numerous backward countries including Ceylon.

The UNP led 'National' Government is a *capitalist* Government and the forces behind this government are the forces of capitalism. The oppression of the workers and toilers through the UNP led Government is *capitalist* oppression and the opposition to a capitalist government requires the mobilisation and unity of the *anti-capitalist* forces. As a party of the bourgeoisie the SLFP cannot participate in or support the anti-capitalist struggle. The working class, poor peasants, the suffering middle classes and the oppressed racial and religious minorities are all part of the anti-capitalist forces. The mobilisation of all oppressed sections of the people under the leadership of the working class is the only correct strategy in the preparation of the fight to overthrow the UNP led capitalist government. Such a mobilisation cannot be achieved without resolutely exterminating all forms of racialism and clericalism which are poisoning and destroying the much needed unity of the anti-capitalist forces. The anti-capitalist struggle in the perspective of developing a confrontation of the workers, toilers and all the oppressed people against the Government and the capitalist class is the only way to destroy forever the UNP led Government and the forces of capitalism.

### VIETNAM

Recent events in Vietnam—the landing of US marines, the series of bombings of N. Vietnam by US planes and the use of

such weapons as napalám and phosphorous bombs by US imperialism—have sparked off world wide protests.

The reality in South Vietnam is that the US is in a hopeless situation. Its policy of waging a "limited war" while trying to maintain Quisling-type puppet regimes is no longer possible. One and a half million dollars of aid per day notwithstanding victory over Vietnamese freedom fighters is virtually impossible. The majority of the South Vietnamese peasantry are in sympathy with the guerrilla fighters, while in the cities there is mounting dissatisfaction and anti-American sentiment. The Vietcong are already in control of three-fourths of the territory of South Vietnam.

The lying pretense that American troops are in South Vietnam as military "advisers" has been abandoned. According to "Time" with the recent arrival of 1,400 marines, there are 45,000 American military men in South Vietnam. In addition some 27,000 Navy men are on warships patrolling Vietnamese waters. The US has no moral right to be in Vietnam. Such inhibitions, of course, do not deter US imperialism from pursuing its brutal policy. Its real concern is the protection of economic interests and the prevention of far reaching social reforms in Asia.

What is the policy of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China vis-a-vis the intensification of the war and US aggression against North Vietnam? At the moment they maintain an equivocal attitude. This has been spotlighted at the Youth Conference held in Accra recently, where accusations and counter accusations were made by Soviet and Chinese representatives. The Chinese criticise the Soviet Union for withholding aid while the Soviets accuse the Chinese of obstruction. It is in this context that Fidel Castro has appealed for effective aid. He has declared that the socialist camp must run all the necessary risks to aid North Vietnam. Withholding of aid at the crucial moment is characteristic Stalinist policy. Moscow had always refrained at the vital moment from supporting the Chinese, Spanish and in many ways even the Yugoslav revolutions. One recalls how Stalin "rolled up" the communist

uprising in Greece. The interests of bureaucracy come first. Even revolutions can wait. Such is the cynical attitude at the moment of the Soviet and Chinese bureaucracies in the face of Johnson's "escalation" of the war in Vietnam.

## DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

US armed intervention in the Dominican Republic illustrates the insoluble dilemma facing the Yankee imperialists in their relations with the Latin American countries ever since Castro's democratic revolution against the Battista tyranny took the turn it did. Any attempt to isolate Cuba and its "communist dictatorship" needs the moral support of the Latin American Governments. But so long as the US supports dictatorships in Latin America it cannot get the support of liberal, democratic opinion against Castro. While right-wing dictatorships are useful for preserving the status quo and Yankee interests, they sooner or later give rise to popular revolts which, given the economic and social conditions prevailing in this area, tend to exceed the bounds of bourgeois democracy which are considered safe for imperialist interests.

When it was realised that Castro's revolution had gone beyond the bourgeois democratic point at which the imperialists had hoped it would be stabilised, US Latin American policy underwent a radical change. It attempted to meet the challenge of the Cuban revolution and its attraction for the masses of Latin America by recognising the necessity for social change and assisting the democratic forces trying to bring about those changes. John F. Kennedy (later President) had written in his book *THE STRATEGY OF PEACE*:

"Just as we must recall our own revolutionary past in order to understand the spirit and the significance of the anti-colonial uprisings in Asia and Africa, we should now re-read the life of Simon Bolivar... in order to comprehend the new contagion for liberty and reform now spreading south of our borders."

Noble words, but note the word "contagion"!

"We can still show our concern for liberty and our opposition to the status



quo in our relations with the other Latin American dictators (that is, other than Castro) who now, or in the future, try to suppress their peoples' aspirations. And we can take the long delayed positive measures that are required to *enable the revolutionary wave sweeping Latin America to move through relatively peaceful channels and to be harnessed to the great constructive tasks at hand.*" (emphasis added)

This idea of containing the popular revolutions within safe limits and harnessing them to the tasks of economic construction—in which of course American capital would participate with great profit—were later embodied in the "Alliance for Progress."

### M. R. PUBLICATIONS

	Rs. c.
<b>The Political Economy of Growth—</b> <i>by Paul Baran</i>	26 00
<b>Caste, Class and Race—</b> <i>by Oliver C. Cox</i>	37 50
<b>Alienation of Modern Man—</b> <i>by Fritz Pappenheim</i>	8 75
<b>Marxism in our time—</b> <i>by Gilles Martinet</i>	16 25
<b>The Socialist Register 1964</b>	30 00
<b>The Menace of the Miracle—</b> <i>by Heinz Abosch</i>	25 00
<b>We the People—</b> <i>by Leo Huberman</i>	25 00
<b>The Present as History</b> <i>by Paul M. Sweezy</i>	17 50
<b>In Place of Fear—</b> <i>by Anurin Bevan</i>	22 50
<b>American Radicals—</b> <i>by Harvey Goldberg</i>	7 25
<b>World Crisis in Oil—</b> <i>by Harvey O'Connor</i>	36 00
<b>Man's Worldly Goods—</b> <i>by Leo Huberman</i>	9 00
<b>Notes from China—</b> <i>by Joan Robinson</i>	4 00
<b>Monthly Review Supplement-1965</b>	5 00

### SURIYA BOOKSHOP

388, Galle Road,  
Wellawatte.

The Declaration of Punta del Este of August 16, 1961 stated:

"This Alliance is established on the basic principle that free men working through the institution of representative democracy can best satisfy man's aspirations....

"Therefore the countries signing this declaration in the exercise of their sovereignty have agreed to work toward the following goals....

"To improve and strengthen democratic institutions through application of the principle of self-determination by the people.

"To accelerate economic and social development...." etc. etc.

Those are the words that were used to fool the masses of Latin America and impress liberal opinion throughout the world. The real intentions behind those words have been amply exposed by recent events in the Dominican Republic.

When the Trujillo tyranny ended in May 1961 with his assassination by members of his own group attempting to forestall a popular movement against the regime, his dictator successor Joachim Balaguer was propped up until January 1962 by the US which rendered him every assistance to prevent any democratic movement from precipitating counter moves by the right-wing controlled army. Attempts from both the right and the left to bring about a change ultimately resulted in a coalition arranged by the US embassy between the extreme right-wing National Civic Union of Viriato Fiallo and the centrist Dominican Revolutionary Party of Juan Bosch, which replaced the Balaguer regime.

As was to be expected, the liberal Bosch was completely dominated by Fiallo who was supported by the US. This coalition had now to set up the "institution of representative democracy." Emergency laws were passed permitting the jailing or deporting of all popular and progressive leaders; all political parties except those of Fiallo and Bosch were banned; voting lists were rigged and then Elections were held in December

1962. Bosch and his party received a convincing majority and the US graciously permitted him to form a Government.

Bosch, however, was more honest than Washington had bargained for. He restored civil rights, lifted the ban on the outlawed political parties, refused to persecute Fidelistas and Communists, legalised the trade unions and even started parcelling out one of Trujillo's estates among the peasants. Bosch had thus given tangible proof of his democratic intentions. Here one would have expected, was the opportunity that the US and the OAS had been waiting for—the opportunity to encourage a peaceful democratic social revolution that would steal the thunder from Castroite methods. Bosch may have been acceptable as a good bourgeois democrat, but what was the use of democracy if the Yankee imperialists could not reap their reward for bringing the Dominicans the gift of democracy? And that is just what Bosch was trying to prevent when he refused to turn over the oil business to US capitalists and grant them mining and other concessions they were demanding.

If Bosch were permitted to continue encouraging the popular democratic forces there was no knowing where it would end. Castro's Cuba was a living warning too horrible to contemplate. The democratic process had to be halted. This task was entrusted to Gen. Wessin y Wessin. On September, 25, 1963 the tanks and guns provided by the Yankee defenders of democracy ringed the Presidential Palace. The diplomatic corps in San Domingo prevailed on Bosch to leave the country in order to avoid bloodshed, and once again a military junta took over and appointed a triumvirate headed by Donald Reid Cabral to make the country safe against democracy.

Since then popular resentment against the Cabral regime had inevitably been building up. A movement was afoot to bring back Bosch and restore a "constitutional" regime, while extreme right-wing forces were also preparing to counter it. The "constitutionalists" under Col Francisco Caamano on April 24 in 1965 moved into action against the pro-Cabral top-ranking army personnel in a bid to topple the Government, and fighting broke out between rebel and loyalist

forces. By the 29th US forces were landed at first to evacuate American citizens and then to "keep the peace".

It is not necessary to recapitulate the events thereafter. At the time of writing the rebels have set up a provisional government under Caamano, pending the return of Bosch in order to set up a "constitutional Government", while the extreme right-wing forces have set up a counter government which calls itself the "Government of National Reconstruction" under Col. Pedro Benoit. Neither of these "governments" would like to see the masses intervening. Bosch himself appeals to the "constitutionalists" to lay down their arms and asks them not to oppose the US troops. In the first flush of enthusiasm the Caamano troops had distributed arms to civilians, a step that they are now regretting.

At the present moment an OAS "Peace Mission" is trying to bring about a "Government of Unification" between the representatives of Caamano and Imbert Barreras (who has replaced Benoit). The US has suggested a Coalition government once again (just as after the elimination of Trujillo) to be headed by a former Minister in Bosch's Government. An "Inter-American Peace Force" has just been set up by the O.A.S. under cover of which the Yankee imperialists and their bourgeois Latin American allies hope to intervene not only in the Dominican Republic but in any Latin American country where it becomes necessary to prevent the masses from intervening to solve their own problems.

Under the prevailing social and economic conditions in the countries of Latin America there is no half-way halting place between a fascistic dictatorship for safeguarding the interests of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat which will usher in the socialist revolution that alone can deliver the masses of Latin America from their present misery. US intervention is designed to prevent the latter and it can do so only by propping up new dictatorships in spite of the grandiose declarations of its liberal spokesmen and propagandists.

1st June 1965

# COALITION – ILLUSION AND REALITY

By WILFRED PEREIRA

SHORTLY after the reformist leaders of the LSSP entered the Sirima Bandaranaike Government in June 1964, Dr. N. M. Perera explained in an interview he gave the SUNDAY OBSERVER (24-6-64) why he joined the Government and what he expected to gain by it. He stated that 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*. The main cause for this omission was lack of full concerted support from the masses, particularly the working class. Thus these gains of 1956 could not be consolidated and were, in fact, threatened (by the UNP). But now that the LSSP has joined a coalition government with the SLFP, he was confident that the mobilisation of the masses, particularly the workers, can be achieved and 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*.

When his interviewer asked him what factor in the political situation made him take this decision he said that there were two dangers: the malaise, the *talk of corruption*, the disunity, *the general instability*, all of which was a constant temptation for undemocratic forces to attempt a subversion of democracy; and secondly, *the gradual shift of opinion to the Right*; general dissatisfaction was leading people towards the Right for lack of an alternative. To beat back the Rightist forces there had to be a closing of ranks of all socialist and progressive elements. *There has been a real resurgence of Rightist opinion in the country*. The Right could not be thrown back unless there was a consolidated *struggle of the SLFP and the Left*. *The working class had to be rallied and brought into play*. That is what he had done and that is why he had responded favourably to the invitation of the Government for the support of all progressive and leftist forces. (*Emphasis added*).

N. M. Perera's expectations can be briefly summarised as follows: mobilisation of the working class for a "consolidated struggle" of the SLFP and the Left in order to throw back the resurgence of the UNP resulting from the failure of the SLFP government since 1956 to break the economic power of the capitalist class.

Mrs. Bandaranaike, on the other hand, explained her desire to coalesce with the "working class leaders" much more simply and directly: to get the *co-operation of the working class in order to eliminate disruptions, especially strikes and go-slows* so that the development of the country could proceed according to the middle-path policies of her late husband.

## Sabotage

Although N. M. Perera spoke so glibly about a "consolidated struggle", even before the Coalition came into existence his accomplice Colvin R. de Silva had begun to sabotage the struggle for the 21 Demands. The so-called working-class leaders and their stooges in the trade unions were giving tangible proof of their willingness to help Mrs. Bandaranaike accomplish *her* purpose. The "consolidated struggle" that their tactician in chief had in mind was obviously to be confined to the parliamentary arena with the working class standing on the side-lines and cheering their "leaders".

The 14-point agreement which "consolidated" the SLFP-LSSP alliance soon demonstrated, and the first Throne Speech of the Coalition government confirmed, that the LSSP had abandoned even the parliamentary struggle to break the economic power of the capitalist class. The C. P. de Silva wing of the SLFP which at first opposed coalition with the LSSP was eventually won over when C. P. de Silva was satisfied that the LSSP leaders had "capitulated" by signing the 14-point agreement.

In an analysis of the coalition "tactic" under the title THE STRATEGY OF

BETRAYAL in *Young Socialist No. 12*, the author of the present article wrote:

“Any Marxist knows that the resurgence 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.”

“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 ‘middle-path’ policy... will have just the opposite 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.”

### Paving the Way

The UNP has not carried out its ‘revolutionary’ threat—there has been no necessity to resort to such drastic action. The class conscious leaders of the capitalist class were able to see what large sections of the working class were prevented by their “leaders” from seeing—that the Coalition was paving the way for the return of the UNP to power by what is known as the normal democratic process. They could afford to sit back and allow the “working class leaders” to do their job for them. And now the UNP has brought off a “revolution by ballot”.

The March Elections only confirmed what was manifested by the defection of the C. P. de Silva group and the parliamentary defeat of the Coalition on December 3rd—that the “gradual shift of opinion to the Right” was in full flood and that the capitalist class was now ready to hand over power to its traditional party, the UNP, after its *locum tenens* the SLFP had, with the complicity of the “working class leaders”, accomplished the

task of softening up the resistance of the working class and squandering the good-will of the toiling masses together with the financial resources of the state.

In spite of the fact that the political bankruptcy of the Coalition—notwithstanding the accession of the ‘golden brains’—had brought the country to the verge of financial bankruptcy, the UNP has decided to take over the administration of the Capitalist system. This testifies to the efficiency with which the “working class leaders” have done their job of duping and dividing the working class and disorienting the toiling masses, thus making it easy for the “National” Government to “lead the country to prosperity” by placing even heavier burdens on the backs of the toiling masses. And that is not all. The “working class leaders” have done their best to fool the masses into believing that state aided private enterprise plus a nationalised sector for providing the Government with the necessary funds for assisting the “national traders and industrialists” amounts to “Socialism”. Hence the new “National” Government of the UNP is able to masquerade as a “socialist” government, with just as much justification as the governments of the SLFP, while promising to “accelerate the pace of development in both the Public and the Private sectors”.

### Efficient Job

The “National” Government then appears to have profited by its past mistakes and also to have learned many lessons from its *locum tenens*. At the present moment it appears to be determined to make a more efficient job of the business of administering capitalism in this country. And that can mean only one thing for the working class in particular and the toiling masses in general—more efficient methods of ensuring their exploitation. What opposition to this can we expect from the SLFP, and its allies, apart from opposition to the replacement of SLFP and ‘Leftist’ stooges by stooges of the “National” Government in the Public services?

The first Throne Speech of the “National” Government has completely taken the wind out of the sails of the SLFP and its ‘leftist’ allies. What alternative program can they

offer in order to rally a genuine anti-capitalist opposition? As long as the reformist LSSP and CP leaders keep a large section of the working class tied to the SLFP with the aid of the slogan, Forward to socialism under the leadership of Mrs. Bandaranaike, the strengthening of the National Government is assured. The political bankruptcy of the Left Fakers is manifested in their attempts to embarrass the new Government by rousing communal and religious strife. Unable to resuscitate the class struggle for fear of embarrassing the SLFP, the Left Fakers seek to regain their lost prestige by instigating a "struggle" against the linguistic and religious minorities whose 'reactionary' votes are alleged to have tipped the scales in favour of the UNP. That these attempts have failed for the time being is due to the strong support of the Sinhala-Buddhist masses for the "National" Government.

While the corruption and political bankruptcy of the SLFP and Coalition regimes have enabled the UNP, whose past record is no less infamous, to rehabilitate itself in the eyes of the masses and even give itself a new look, the Left Fakers are unable to offer the masses anything more than the same old formula of the "unity of progressive forces against reaction". The "progressive forces" now include the Stalinists, those past masters in the art of class collaboration, not because of any 'progress' on their part but because the reformist LSSP'ers have now accepted the Moscow Line. But at the same time, the "progressive forces" have been reduced to pro-Coalition Sinhala-Buddhists. The struggle from now on is between Sinhala Socialism (represented by the pro-Coalition forces) and National Socialism, with both brands of socialism conforming to the precepts of Buddhism. A Dhammasamajaya in place of a Samasamajaya appears to be the common objective of both sides, with the struggle confined to the ideological plane of the interpretation of the scriptures which from time immemorial have been invoked to sustain the status quo. All traces of Marxism (which, for the capitalist class and its lackeys is synonymous with class struggle) must now be obliterated from the consciousness of the toiling masses and replaced by *maithri* and *ahimsa*. Under the goad of the capitalist press the Left Fakers have per-

formed their genuflexions with due submission.

### The Noose

The so-called "tactic" of the Coalition was a ruse of the petty bourgeois reformist LSSP leadership to inveigle the working class into the noose that they had prepared in collusion with Mrs. Bandaranaike. Dudley Senanayake has now snatched the rope from her reluctant hand and will proceed to tighten it as and when he likes while he utters soothing words about 'democratic socialism' and the Sangha preaches *ahimsa*.

No amount of slander of the "reactionaries" who toppled the Coalition on December 3rd and voted the UNP back to power on March 22nd will enable us to understand why the Coalition failed to realise the hopes of its supporters—illusions fostered by such utterances as those of Dr. Perera that we have quoted at the beginning of this article. Dr. Perera himself has admitted that the UNP remained a threat to 'the gains of 1956' because its economic power was not broken and that this was due to the lack of full concerted support from the masses and particularly the working class. Then how is it that it was precisely after Dr. Perera had "rallied and brought the working class into play" in support of the SLFP that the UNP was able to recoup its strength and rally the 'reactionary forces' so as to be able to challenge the Coalition? To say that the 'reactionary forces' made an extra special effort because they feared the socialistic threats of the Coalition is only begging the question. It still remains to be explained why the Coalition of 'progressive forces' *with the state power in its hands* and backed by the good-will of the masses and particularly the working class was powerless to "beat back the Rightist forces" as Dr. Perera expected.

Lenin once said: "People always were and always will be the stupid victims of deceit and self-deceit in politics until they learn to discover the *interests of some class* or other behind all moral, religious, political and social phrases, declarations and promises". Let us take Lenin's advice and try to discover the class interests that lurk behind the

socialistic verbiage of both partners of the Coalition who claimed to be leading the "progressive forces" along the road to socialism. Unless we do that we shall be unable to understand the impotence of the "progressive forces" to stem the resurgence of the "reactionary forces", and we shall not be able to go forward to the urgent

task of enlightening and organising for the *anti-capitalist struggle* the only forces which can—and, owing to their social position, *must*—constitute the power capable of sweeping away the reactionaries and clearing the road to socialism—the power of the working class in alliance with the urban and rural proletariat.

## THE CLASS CHARACTER OF THE SLFP

Right up to the time of the 21st March Trade Union Rally at Galle Face for the 21 Demands, the LSSP leadership regarded the SLFP as a capitalist party. But when preparations were afoot for the special Conference of the LSSP of June 1964 the leaders who advocated Coalition with the SLFP suddenly discovered that the SLFP was NOT a capitalist party even though it was admitted that it was functioning within the capitalist framework. (LSSP Conference Resolution) At the mere nod of Mrs. Bandaranaike's head towards the "working class leaders" the SLFP had become a "centrist party". The pro-coalition leaders were trying to convince the rank and file that the SLFP had no particular class bias and therefore coalition would not mean class collaboration. Due more to their prestige in the working class movement than the strength of their arguments they succeeded in duping the great majority of the LSSP membership, promising that the association of the LSSP with the SLFP would "increase the progressive content of the SLFP and make it more definitely a leftward moving government."

It was the socialistic pretensions of the SLFP leadership and its opposition to the UNP that enabled the Left Fakers to deceive large sections of the working class regarding the class character of the SLFP. The socialist minded masses have no doubts about the class content of the UNP's politics. During the period of UNP rule from 1947 to 1956 the masses learned from their own bitter experience, aided by the political education of the LSSP, to recognise the UNP as the party of the capitalist class in Ceylon. But they still have illusions about the class interests that hide behind the anti-UNP-ism of the SLFP.

### Deception

When Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike and his group broke away from the UNP in

1951 and set up the SLFP in opposition to the UNP, the hatred of the masses for the UNP made it quite easy for them to deceive themselves and be deceived about the real class content of the anti-capitalist and socialistic phraseology employed by Mr. Bandaranaike in his denunciations of the UNP. On the basis of his anti-UNP-ism, aided by demagogic appeals to national and religious sentiments awakened after the grant of independence in 1948, he was able to foster illusions in his capacity to lead the anti-capitalist struggle for the overthrow of the UNP, and was thus able to build up a mass following.

The differences within the UNP which led to the split away of Mr. Bandaranaike and his faction could not possibly have been over the question of capitalism versus socialism. Such an issue could never arise within a party of the capitalist class. Besides, the socialist minded elements were already ranged behind the two Marxist-oriented working class parties, the LSSP and CP. Any differences that could arise within the UNP could only be those between *sections of one and the same capitalist class*. The fact that Mr. Bandaranaike chose to set up an independent party instead of joining one of the already existing socialist-oriented parties indicated that he stood somewhere between the extreme right wing of the capitalist class and the working class. But where exactly did he stand? What class interests did he stand for?

### Liberals

The UNP at its inception represented the general interests of the Ceylonese capitalist class. Naturally the interests of its most powerful section predominated. This was the old established comprador and landed bourgeoisie who had grown up under the patronage of the British imperialists. It was to this section that the Imperialists

handed over power in 1948 as friends who could be trusted to look after imperialist interests. This section of the capitalist class tried to preserve the existing colonial pattern of economy on which they had been nurtured.

The endeavours of the big bourgeoisie to monopolise a restricted capitalist milieu for themselves roused the envy and hostility of the junior members of the class and particularly those who had accumulated capital out of war contracts and other services during World War II and now found that their style was being cramped by the policy of their big brothers. These up-and-coming capitalists began clamouring for a change of economic policy under the slogans of 'industrialisation' and 'Ceylonisation,' by means of which they sought to make a place for themselves in the national economy and also to step into the shoes of the foreign capitalists, chiefly British and Indian. These new invaders of the old established preserves found a champion in Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike. Behind them were also the middle class intelligentsia, mostly scions of the more well-to-do strata, seeking avenues of employment for their talents in the higher rungs of the public and mercantile services which were then mostly filled by foreigners. There were also members of the urban and rural lower middle class ever willing to attach themselves to anybody or cause that offered them the hope of escape from their social and economic stagnation.

The SLFP thus represented chiefly the interests of the new entrepreneurial bourgeoisie who were merely seeking to *liberalise* the economy in order to find a place for themselves *within the capitalist system*. By its professed anti-UNP-ism, the SLFP was able to rally the middle strata of the population that felt themselves *hemmed in by the UNP above and the working class below*. The interests of these groups were designated 'progressive' in contradistinction to the 'reactionary' or conservative policy of the UNP. This helped to create illusions in the minds of the backward masses regarding the ability of Mr. Bandaranaike and his party to break the strangle-hold of the UNP on the country's economy and clear the path to an egalitarian social order which they designated 'socialism' in contradistinction to the 'capitalism' of the UNP.

## Rivals

Mr. Bandaranaike, however, found rival claimants to the leadership of the anti-UNP struggle in the already established Marxist-oriented working class parties, the LSSP and the CP. These parties were led by members of the radical petty bourgeoisie who had come under the influence of Marxism in their search for ways and means of breaking the imperialist strangle-hold on the economy. They had readily grasped the value of Marxism as an ideology for mobilising the working class which, in the period between the two world wars, was composed in the main of workers employed in imperialist owned enterprises and the plantations.

However, when the Ceylonese bourgeoisie began to entertain entrepreneurial ambitions of their own, which involved the employment of labour on a large scale, they began to realise the dangers of 'Marxist indoctrination' of the working class. Mr. Bandaranaike was quick to see this. While his anti-UNP-ism was frequently expressed in anti-capitalistic and even socialistic phraseology he made it a point to declare his antipathy for Marxism. For Marxism, to the class conscious bourgeois is synonymous with class struggle. The kind of socialists who were attracted by the SLFP were therefore just petty bourgeois reformists and their lower middle class co-thinkers who were basically *anti-working class* in their outlook rather than anti-capitalist.

The necessity for the SLFP to differentiate itself from the UNP on its right and the Marxist-oriented working class parties on its left, compelled Mr. Bandaranaike to stress the '*middle-path*' nature of his politics. Although he was anti-UNP he would never countenance class struggle methods to defeat it. His opposition to the UNP was purely parliamentary. His attitude to the anti-capitalist mass struggle was shown by his hostility to the Hartal of 1953 before he came to power, and after he came to power by his attitude to strikes—he always refused to negotiate while workers were on strike—and by his tightening up of the Public Security Act which had been placed on the statute book by the UNP.

### Middle-Path

The SLFP represented the interests of a section of the capitalist class which only wanted a liberalising of the capitalist regime in order to find a place for themselves within the capitalist system. The struggle between the two wings of one and the same capitalist class, represented by the UNP and the SLFP, was a struggle for the division of the spoils of exploitation.

The middle-path policy of the SLFP was an attempt to steer a course between the UNP, the extreme right wing of the capitalist class, and the Marxist-oriented Left parties. It was, in essence, the pretence of being pro-working class without being anti-capitalist and of being anti-UNP while being pro-capitalist. Such a policy was admirably suited for confusing and deceiving the masses but

it could never solve the social and economic problems of a backward country in the context of the chronic crisis of capitalism on a world scale.

The class nature of the SLFP as the liberal wing of the Ceylonese capitalist class enabled that class to put forward the SLFP to defend its general interests when its conservative wing, the UNP, found that it could no longer fool the masses into voting it back to power. Thus it was that the SLFP was victorious in the 1956 Elections, with the support of a large section of the capitalist class that had swung over from the UNP. But whenever the capitalist class began to lose confidence in the SLFP a swing back to the UNP would take place and be reflected in Parliament causing crises such as those of March and November when the Prime Minister was compelled to close the doors of parliament.

### THE UNITY OF PROGRESSIVE FORCES

The difficulties experienced by the Left parties in making headway among the backward rural masses against the rival attractions of the SLFP with its Sinhala-Buddhist demagogy, drove the petty bourgeois leaders of the Left parties to a gradual adaptation of their policies to the illusions of those backward masses. This involved the abandoning of a revolutionary perspective and adapting the struggle to the purely parliamentary perspectives of the SLFP, and thereby also surrendering the leadership of the anti-UNP struggle to the SLFP. The working class was insidiously indoctrinated with the idea that it must subordinate itself to the "progressive forces" who were rallying round the SLFP, in order to strengthen those forces vis-a-vis the UNP.

The slogan of the Unity of Progressive Forces to defeat the UNP was used with great success with the support of the Left parties in the 1956 Elections and resulted in the rout of the UNP. The victory of the SLFP (under the name-board of the MEP) was hailed as a "revolution by ballot". But when the change of regime produced no improvement in the living conditions of the masses and the inevitable strike struggles broke out, the state apparatus was seen to be functioning, often quite ruthlessly, in the interests of the capitalist class just as under

the UNP; while the Government tried to explain away its shortcomings by accusing the state bureaucracy of sabotaging its progressive measures. Needless to say, none of these things should have been possible if there had been a revolution.

This slogan was abandoned in the March 1960 Elections and resulted in the return of the UNP which was supposed to have been wiped out in 1956. For all the vaunted "revolution by ballot" the alliance of "progressive forces" had not succeeded in even curbing the UNP. But instead of using this lesson to help the masses overcome their illusions, the Left leaders used it to confirm those illusions in the ability of the "progressive forces" to defeat the UNP. The slogan was restored for the July 1960 Elections which brought the SLFP to power again. The efficacy of the slogan in pursuing a purely parliamentary perspective was thus confirmed, and it could henceforth be trotted out whenever the SLFP found itself in difficulties.

Needless to say, the power and privileges of the propertied classes remained unimpaired under the SLFP regime of Mrs. Bandaranaike, and the social and economic crisis went from bad to worse. The resulting strike struggles expressed the desire



of the working class to solve the economic problems of the proletarian masses by their own extra-parliamentary methods. But the capitalist press—the very same press against which the coalitionists seek to wreak vengeance today—came down firmly *on the side of the SLFP Government* and accused

the Left leaders of trying to embarrass the Government, while an insidious propaganda campaign was mounted to drive a wedge between the working class and the rural masses. The response of the Left leaders was to intensify their efforts to pander to the illusions of the rural masses.

### THE UNITED LEFT FAKERS

Ever since the successes of Mr. Bandaranaike in rallying the liberal bourgeoisie and anti-Marxist petty bourgeoisie and the accession of his party to power, the petty bourgeois leaders of the Left parties had begun to cast longing looks in that direction. Although they found themselves in the milieu of the working class movement, their real spiritual home was with the SLFP. The SLFP was really the kind of party they would have liked to lead, but they found themselves already involved in a Marxist-oriented movement which repelled their petty bourgeois class brothers. They could not openly abandon the Left parties they had founded and join the SLFP. And besides, as long as Mr. Bandaranaike was alive they could not compete with him for leadership of the “progressive forces”. Their only hopes lay in converting the working class movement into a part of the “progressive forces”. But after the assassination of Mr. Bandaranaike the petty bourgeois Left leaders began to ‘get ideas’. Each of them began to imagine himself in the role of a national leader. But the problem still remained for these leaders of how to jettison the working class and, moreover, a working class that refused to subordinate itself completely to the “progressive forces”, and how to rid themselves of the stigma of Marxism and all that it implied in the eyes of the conservative petty bourgeoisie and rural masses.

If these Left leaders dared not leave the working class behind and join the SLFP, the only alternative was to take the working class along with them into the SLFP. But open liquidation of the Left parties too was not possible. The slogan of the “Unity of Progressive Forces” could be used to forge a closer alliance with the SLFP, *but the Left parties and particularly their leaders would first have to be made acceptable to the SLFP.* The leaders of the LSSP, the CP and the MEP got together for this purpose in the United Left Front (ULF). Although they had political differences, and chiefly about which of them should be groomed for the role of national leader, they were all united about the necessity for paralysing the working class movement if they were to be allowed within ‘smelling distance’ of the throne occupied by Mrs. Bandaranaike. The United Left Fakers decided to demonstrate to the capitalist class their abandonment of the class struggle by putting their signatures to a joint programme (for the ULF) which could easily have been accepted even by the UNP. 12th August, 1963, the tenth anniversary of the most heroic class battles of the Ceylonese proletariat, was chosen as the auspicious day for setting the seal on the plans of the Left Fakers for the most heinous betrayal of the working class.

### MARCH CRISIS

The preservation of capitalism under the two Bandaranaike regimes could find no solution to the social and economic problems of a backward country in the epoch of the crisis of capitalism on a world scale. The attempts to control the more embarrassing activities of both the liberal and conservative capitalists by means of ‘controls’ (exchange, import-export, price etc.) only dis-

rupted genuine capitalist business and encouraged the activities of blackmarketeers and racketeers, while the capitalists ‘expropriated’ by the nationalisations merely transferred their interests to other sectors of the economy that are being maintained as the preserves of private enterprise. The maintenance of the wage-freeze in the face of the steeply rising cost of living and the

growth of unemployment by the closing down of capitalist businesses alienated the sympathy of the working class, while the controls which interfered with capitalist business roused the exasperation of the capitalist class including the SLFP's own supporters. It is no wonder that under such conditions the UNP was steadily recouping its forces.

The economic crisis aggravated by the futile middle-path policies of the SLFP Government blew up in a political crisis in March 1964. On the Government's left was the working class, united as never before, mobilising for action on the 21 Demands. On the Government's right was the resurgent UNP which was now beginning to feel itself strong enough to challenge the Government for a show-down in parliament. Rather than risk a parliamentary defeat, Mrs. Bandaranaike prorogued parliament in order to give herself time to appease her party's right wing which was threatening to go over to the UNP.

A genuine anti-capitalist government would have seized the opportunity to smash the threat from the right by unleashing the working class whose 21 Demands were obviously directed against the economic base of the capitalist class; while a genuine working class leadership would not have waited for anybody's permission, and least of all of a capitalist government, before it decided to launch the struggle for the 21 Demands. However, neither the SLFP Government nor the United Left Fakers, its petty bourgeois agents in the working class movement, could countenance such a step. If there was one thing in common between the SLFP leadership and the ULF leadership it was their *fear of the working class*.

### Problem

The problem for the Government now was: how to eliminate the danger on the left which was threatening the very foundations of the precious capitalist system, and how to do so without resorting to extreme measures which would place the SLFP itself in the same reactionary cate-

gory as the hated UNP in the eyes of the working class; and how, at the same time to avert the danger from the right which threatened to oust the SLFP from power and redivide the spoils of exploitation once again in favour of the UNP? Besides, if Mrs. Bandaranaike could succeed in keeping the working class in its place she hoped to be able to appease not only her wavering supporters but her opponents on her right as well and save her government from defeat.

As she herself admitted, there were three courses open to her: a dictatorship, coalition with the UNP, or coalition with the ULF. In accordance with the policy of centrist governments in similar circumstances, she chose the third course. By this means she counted on the Left Fakers to bring out their well-tried formula of the 'Unity of Progressive Forces' to defeat the UNP and help her out of the mess. But not without the prompting of the Left Fakers themselves who had been putting out feelers, going behind the back of the working class, and even behind each other's backs, in their impatience to enter into her Government. Through the mediation of the Left Fakers she counted on getting the working class under her wing and preventing it from being 'led astray' by the Marxist ideas to which it had been exposed in the past. Moreover, the rivalry among the leaders of the ULF offered her the chance of splitting it wide open and causing more confusion in the ranks of the working class.

At the Mass Trade Union Rally at Galle Face on 21st March—for which permission was granted in spite of the prevailing State of Emergency, a significant fact!—the leaders of the ULF raised the scare of a threatened coup from the right. The working class was now alerted for the task of defending the Government under the pretext that the 21 Demands would be jeopardised if the UNP captured power. The formula of the "Unity of Progressive Forces" was again pressed into service. And in order to avoid embarrassing the Government the trade unions were soon after called upon to put their 21 Demands into cold storage. A sure way of protecting them from the UNP !

## COALITION

After much haggling which widened the rift within the ULF, Mrs. Bandaranaike chose the LSSP as her coalition partner, but only after she had got Dr. N. M. Perera's agreement to a joint programme which would not infringe on the SLFP's middle-path policy and the Soulbury Constitution, that is to say, *a programme that guaranteed the preservation of capitalism.*

As the working class party with the widest mass base and a past record of anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist struggle, the LSSP would prove an invaluable ally and help to give the tarnished middle-path policy of the SLFP a Left colouration which would attract a good section of the proletarian masses to the policy of class-collaboration under her suzerainty. As for the support of the Communist leaders (both Moscow and Peking) Mrs. Bandaranaike had no doubts whatsoever, even without the inducement of portfolios, of the subservience of those past masters in the art of class-collaboration.

The assistance of the UNP and the capitalist press too was not wanting for this joint manoeuvre to inveigle the working class into the embrace of the SLFP. The outspoken threats of the UNP to resort to "revolution" if parliament was not convoked soon, reinforced the appeals of the Left Fakers for the Unity of Progressive Forces by means of which a large number of unsuspecting workers were induced to put their necks into the class-collaborationist noose.

### Favourite

As the chosen favourite of the Prime Minister, Dr. N. M. Perera became the chief apologist for the Coalition. Although the Left Fakers had already done much to blunt the class consciousness of the working class by dissolving it in the united front of heterogeneous progressive forces there was still a hard core within the LSSP which was suspicious of this Coalition move, as the LSSP had always regarded the SLFP as a capitalist party. Dr. Perera had now the unenviable task of convincing the more politically conscious among the rank and file of his party that Coalition would NOT be class-collaboration. On the eve of

Coalition he discovered that although the SLFP was "functioning within the capitalist framework" it was "not a capitalist party", but a "centrist" party. That is to say, it was a unique type of party never found anywhere else in the capitalist world—a party which had no particular class content. Unless by "centrist" he meant that it had a *middle-class* content. However, in capitalist society the middle-class can never have an independent policy. Its upper strata follow the capitalist class while its lower strata tend towards the working class. If the middle-class forms a separate political party it must remain as an appendage of the capitalist class.

Dr. Perera was trying to convince his party that association with the SLFP would result in filling its supposed political vacuum with a working class content and help to push it leftwards. In the document he submitted to his party's Conference in June 1964 this is what he said: (by choosing to coalesce with the Left, Mrs. Bandaranaike) "decided unmistakably to move leftwards with the progressive forces and find a solution to the problems besetting the country along left policies". And further, "a coalition government between the working class party like the LSSP and the SLFP can still further change its (?) class character. Such an association will increase the progressive content of the SLFP and make it more definitely a leftward moving government."

If anybody had any doubts in June as to whose class character would be changed by the association, a brief space of five months of Coalition government proved that the SLFP'S "centrist" politics had a *capitalist* class content; that whatever "progressive content" the SLFP had, considered quantitatively, was *reduced* by the transformation of the C. P. de Silva group from "progressives" into "reactionaries"; and as we shall see later, that the Coalition had moved definitely even more to the *Right*.

### Lackey Service

The first and most important service rendered by Mrs. Bandaranaike's Left Lackeys not merely to the SLFP but to the *entire capitalist class* was the paralyzing

of the struggle for the 21 Demands, with the assistance of their opportunist and careerist stooges in the trade unions. If Mrs. Bandaranaike had only turned to the left to welcome her loyal agents into the Government, her duly accredited lackeys were hastening to move rightwards as fast as they could on bended knees.

While the abandonment of the anti-capitalist struggle under the Coalition regime prevented the working class from leading the struggle of the proletarian masses to solve their economic problems by their own class methods, the Velona strike showed that the capitalist class still retained the power to solve its problems by its own customary reactionary class methods, and further, that it could rely on the state apparatus of the 'socialist' government of 'united progressive forces' to protect it from the wrath of the anti-capitalist masses.

The inability of the Coalition, even with the aid of the 'golden brains', to resolve the economic crisis continued to produce sporadic strikes. The cost of living and unemployment continued to rise, while the Government was compelled to borrow at the rate of a million a day for its house-keeping expenses. Corruption and nepotism still continued unabated. The class collaboration tactic was not proving as effective as the capitalist class and its sup-

porters expected. Contrary to the expectations of Dr. N. M. Perera the gradual shift of opinion to the Right was gathering speed. The disruption of the struggle for the 21 Demands revived the class confidence of the capitalists, and those who had supported the SLFP since 1956 now began to transfer their allegiance back to the UNP, the traditional party of the capitalist class.

Having paralysed the working class movement the Left Fakers were powerless to bring any effective pressure on the Coalition Government, even if they so desired, to take any steps of a radical nature even within the capitalist framework to restore confidence of the anti-capitalist masses in the Government. The Government had no alternative but to adapt itself to pressure from the Right.

Having betrayed the class struggle and prostrated themselves before Mrs. Bandaranaike, the Left Fakers had to seek other means to restore their prestige among their followers. If not the masters they could at least pretend to be of some consequence by placing their party stooges in places of power and privilege. This could be done only by encroaching on the preserves of the SLFP and it naturally led to dissension within the Government ranks. The capitalist press began to scream about "Marxist infiltration".

## FALL OF THE COALITION

The capitalist class treats coalition with its Left agents in the working class movement as a calculated risk. The correct place for the petty bourgeois agents of the bourgeoisie is within the working class movement where they can control the anti-capitalist struggle and confine it within safe limits. It is only at crucial moments when the working class appears to be likely to get out of hand, out of control by their "leaders", and when any direct attempt to smash it would be too risky, it is only then that the capitalist class resorts to the device of a Coalition government with the parties of the working class. But when the Left Fakers are taken into a Coalition they are placed in the embarrassing position of sharing responsibility for the sins of omission and commission of the Government. Such a situation could lead to discrediting the

Left Fakers in the eyes of the more militant and class conscious sections of the working class. It is therefore necessary to avoid putting too great a strain on the illusions of the working class by unduly prolonging the coalition. But at the same time, under the circumstances of an incurable economic crisis, even the demagogic pretences of the fake Marxist can result in fanning the smouldering class struggle, while the presence of these fakers in the Government could become embarrassing by preventing "stern action" against sporadic strikes.

Now that the Left Fakers had accomplished their task of dividing and is-orienting the working class and paralysing the anti-capitalist struggle, the C. P. de Silva wing of the SLFP (which had originally

opposed coalition) wanted to dispense with their services. The capitalist class was now preparing to cash in on the accelerating shift of opinion to the Right and hand over the administration of the capitalist system once again to the UNP. But before it could do so it was necessary to eradicate the remaining traces of Marxism from the consciousness of the masses. For this purpose the transgressions of the fake Marxists could be used to discredit genuine Marxism.

The attack on the fake Marxists was launched by the Buddhist hierarchy under cover of opposition to N. M. Perera's Toddy Proposal. The Government capitulated and withdrew the proposal. In order to cover up their defeat the Left Fakers launched a campaign for the take over of Lake House. Since they had failed to pressurise the SLFP into any anti-capitalist measures, the nationalisation of Lake House was the last remaining anti-capitalist pretence left to the Coalition.

Due to a procedural lapse on the part of the Government the Press Bill it had tabled was appropriated by the UNP in order to postpone its discussion. In order to retrieve the bill Parliament was prorogued on November 13th.

### Revolt

It now became necessary to present a new press bill at the next sessions. The C. P. de Silva wing opposed any action to muzzle the press and threatened to break away. The issue of the nationalisation of Lake House (which would have strengthened the

prestige of the so-called "Marxists") was only a pretext for the revolt of the C. P. de Silva group which was now preparing to join forces with the UNP. In an attempt to appease this group and adapt itself to the accelerated swing of opinion in the country to the Right, *the Government dropped from its programme for the next session of Parliament all the "progressive" measures proposed earlier and left undone, and confined itself to three proposals:* implementation of the Sirima-Shastri Pact, Buddhism as the state religion and the take over of Lake House. The majority in the Government were prepared to give way on everything else to placate Right opinion but not on the Lake House issue. They could not surrender on this issue without abandoning the Coalition's last surviving pretension to anti-capitalism.

The C. P. de Silva wing could not be appeased. It bided its time until the debate on the Throne Speech and then crossed over, laying itself open to the accusation of the "stab in the back", and helping to topple the Coalition Government.

Petty bourgeois opportunist and careerist supporters of the Coalition may storm and rage at the "reactionaries" who toppled the Coalition. We can quite understand their chagrin at the wrecking of all their hopes of solving their own personal problems without the danger and discomfort of involvement in the class struggle. But the class conscious workers have no tears to shed for a Government that was assisted by its Left lackeys to cripple the anti-capitalist struggle and restore the confidence of the capitalist class and its hangers-on in the UNP.

### ANTI-MARXIST CAMPAIGN

The SLFP had held the fort for the capitalist class when it could no longer govern in the name of the UNP. The capitalist class was quite content to leave the defence of the capitalist system to the SLFP as long as the latter proved capable of deceiving the masses with its socialistic pretensions. But once the pretences of the "middle-path" began to wear thin and the SLFP allied itself with the so-called "Marxists" whose prestige in the eyes of the working class was based on their past record of anti-capitalist struggle, considerable sections of

the capitalist class regarded this as a dangerous playing with fire. True, the Left Fakers had done the capitalist class a great service in paralysing the threatened offensive of the working class. The capitalist class had no doubts about the loyalty of their Left lackeys. But the same could not be said of the working class. Sporadic strikes under the Coalition regime showed that the Left Fakers could not be depended on to keep the working class in check indefinitely. If the country was to be made safe for capitalism it was absolutely neces-

sary to make it impossible for a genuine Marxist leadership to come to the fore.

The decision of the capitalist class to topple the Coalition Government was directed not so much against the SLFP as its "Marxist" allies. Now that the anti-capitalist movement had been paralysed and the SLFP had shown its readiness to move Rightwards, the Capitalist class had decided to hand over the power to the UNP before the SLFP's "middle-path" policy became too badly discredited in the eyes of the working class in particular. If the Left Fakers could be completely isolated and wiped out at the next Elections, whichever of the two main capitalist parties, the SLFP or the UNP, should be returned to power, these two parties would be able to arrange matters amicably between themselves over the bent backs of a prostrate working class, without the embarrassing presence of the Left Fakers.

### Villains

An anti-Marxist campaign was now mounted by the capitalist class and its kept press. The Left Fakers were presented as the arch villains of the Coalition who had corrupted the democratic SLFP with their "Marxism", while the SLFP was criticised for its weakness and gullibility.

The capitalist class and its propagandists knew just as well as we do that the fake "Marxists" had betrayed the anti-capitalist struggle and repudiated their Marxism in practice. The Left Fakers had provided the Left cover for the concessions that the Coalition had made in order to appease the resurgent Right. They made loud noises about the take over of Lake House and helped to distract attention from the Government's capitulation to the Sangha by the withdrawal of the Toddy Proposal which incidentally played into the hands of the Kassippu Kings; they hailed the Sirima-Shastri horse-deal between the heads of two bourgeois states as the acme of statesmanship, and sought to cover up the betrayal of the interests of the largest section of the Ceylon working class; they gave their support to the proposal to make Buddhism the state religion so that the Sangha could be incorporated in the state apparatus for the more efficient spiritual disciplining of the

predominantly Buddhist masses. All these concessions had helped to strengthen the most reactionary sections of the capitalist class and hastened the shift of opinion to the Right.

### Prostration

The capitalist class now set out to utilise the Left Fakers' repudiation of Marxism in order to discredit genuine Marxism. The only hope for these traitors to the working class was to do their damndest to continue in Mrs. Bandaranaike's service by adapting themselves to reactionary pressure and pandering to the illusions of the most backward and conservative strata of the masses. To assure a return of the Coalition at the next Elections by hook or by crook was their sole purpose. The more loudly the capitalist press shouted about "Marxist subversion" of the language, religion and culture of the Sinhala race, the more abjectly the Left lackeys demonstrated their loyalty to Mrs. Bandaranaike and their devotion to the "middle-path policy" of her late lamented husband. Mrs. Bandaranaike herself defended them by declaring, "I did not secure the co-operation of Marxists either to spread Marxism or to destroy Buddhism".

The prodigal sons who have returned to their true spiritual home after their sojourn in an alien milieu must now manifest their complete break with an embarrassing past. They hail Mrs. Bandaranaike as "Mother Lanka".

Colvin R. de Silva who played the leading role in paralysing the struggle for the 21 Demands uses all his demagogic powers to make the people believe that Mrs. Bandaranaike can emulate Fidel Castro, while N. M. Perera invites the masses to go "forward to socialism under the leadership of Mrs. Bandaranaike". Fidel Castro destroyed the reactionary Battista regime by unleashing an armed struggle whereas Mrs. Bandaranaike took the Left Fakers into her service to *hold back* and paralyse the anti-capitalist struggle as she herself admitted in different words. Yet Mrs. Bandaranaike who castigated her Left lackeys for daring to call a One Day Token Strike on 10th December in defence of her Government is invited to "lead" the country

a la Castro! The Left Fakers have, of course, abandoned even their pretences at 'pushing' the SLFP Leftward. Having placed their 'golden brains' at Mrs. Bandaranaike's feet they are in no posture to do any pushing.

### Repudiation

When the capitalist press reports Dr. N. M. Perera as having said that Marxism will be established before he dies, the loyal lackey hastens to correct the wrong impression and Radio Ceylon is placed at his service. He tells the country that the word he used was "not Marxism but Socialism". We knew all along that his brand of socialism had nothing to do with Marxism—particularly when he made provision for his old age (he *will* get old before he dies, we hope) by investing in a rice mill. However, it is not us but his bourgeois masters that he was seeking to assure of his bona fides.

Bernard Soysa is more subtle; he does not repudiate Marxism directly. He equates it with Buddhism and converts it into the opium of the masses. His approach to Marxism is through the Buddhist precept, Let all things be happy. So Bernard is happy, the peace-loving petty bourgeois pandankarayas of the Coalition are happier, but the happiest are the class-struggle hating anti-Marxist capitalists and their hangers-on.

Last, but not least, the "Samasamajaya" which in the days gone by was the voice of the proletarian vanguard, gives place to the "Janamathaya" which panders to the illusions of the most backward and conservative strata and rouses their basest communal passions.

### WHAT NEXT ?

March 22nd only confirmed what December 3rd had presaged—that the attempt of the Left Fakers to "throw back the resurgent Right" by an alliance of the working class with the SLFP (which was holding the fort for the capitalist class) had accelerated the resurgence of the reactionary forces; that this "tactic" of class collaboration had only helped to deceive the masses and paralyse the working class, making it easy for the

### Psychological Atmosphere

But there is no let up in the anti-Marxist barrage. The Left Fakers have done their best to smoothe the path for their bourgeois masters but the latter are not yet satisfied. A sizeable section of the working class has refused to put its head into the class-collaborationist noose. The trade unions still remain intact though weakened. Sporadic strikes during the Coalition regime showed that the working class was being restrained with great difficulty by Mrs. Bandaranaike's Left lackeys and their stooges in the trade unions. In the event of a new outbreak of strikes under existing economic conditions which the capitalist class knows it cannot remedy, the workers must be taught to regard Marxism as synonymous with betrayal lest they find their way to the resumption of the organised anti-capitalist struggle under a genuine Marxist leadership.

In preparation for the difficult days ahead for the capitalist class, the psychological atmosphere must be created in advance for inciting a counter-revolutionary mass movement against any possible attempt by a genuine Marxist leadership to coordinate and lead the inevitable strike struggles toward the overthrow of capitalist rule which will involve both the UNP and the SLFP. That is the meaning of the virulent press campaign against Marxism and its perverters. It is prompted NOT by fear of the fake "Marxists" but by *fear of the working class and the proletarian masses*. As for the Left lackeys, they respond by disowning Marxism and repudiating everything it stands for. They fawn at the feet of "Mother Lanka" imploring her to keep them in her service, where they hope to find refuge from the vengeance of the masses.

capitalist class to regroup its forces; that the failure of the 'golden brains' to make even the slightest impression on a corrupt and incompetent regime had compelled the capitalist class to revoke the power of attorney it had delegated to the SLFP.

The coalition "tactic" of the Left Fakers was cast in the same mould as the notorious Popular Front tactic of the Stalinists

which helped to betray the German, the Austrian, the Chinese and the Spanish revolutions. The Ceylonese working class has now had first hand experience of the Popular Front in action in the name of the Unity of Progressive Forces against Reaction. Trotsky had pointed out over and over again that *"a successful fight against bourgeois reaction can be waged only with the forces and methods of the proletarian revolution"*. But our fake Trotskyists tried to make out that Ceylon was an exceptional case where 'Marxist dogma' was inapplicable, because, you see, Marxism is incompatible with the genius and culture of the predominantly Buddhist proletarian masses. This is supposed to have been proved by the fact that instead of the working class leading the socialist revolution according to 'Marxist dogma', we accomplished the unique feat of a "revolution by ballot" through the instrumentality of the "united front of progressive forces". However the SLFP Government that was elected to power by the votes of the "progressives" proved to be "inefficient and incompetent". It therefore became necessary for our "Trotskyists" to offer the services of their 'golden brains' and collaborate in the business of government and, provided the working class banished from its mind all that it had been taught about class struggle, revolution and all the rest of that foreign and romantic rubbish, their "leaders" promised to take them forward to real socialism.

But, again as Trotsky pointed out, *"to renounce the conquest of power (by the working class) is voluntarily to leave power in the hands of those who wield it, i.e. the exploiters"*, and *"the renunciation of the conquest of power inevitably throws every workers' organisation into the swamp of reformism and turns it into a plaything of the bourgeoisie; it cannot be otherwise in view of the class structure of society"*.

### Capitalist Regroupment

The capitalist class has regrouped its forces round the banner of the UNP and that party has been returned to power with the aid of the votes of the masses who have been disillusioned and have turned their backs on the coalition parties. The capitalist class has decided to consolidate its forces and present a united front irrespec-

tive of communal differences. That is the significance of the label "National" that it has applied to its government. This does not mean, however, that it will be unwilling to exploit communal dissension among the proletarian masses. But the job of causing communal dissension among the masses can be safely left to the petty-bourgeois agents of the bourgeoisie. The Left Fakers and their stooges have already given proof of their abilities in this direction.

The first Throne Speech of the new National Government indicates that it has profited from its past mistakes and has also taken some lessons from the SLFP and even filched the latter's programme, in order to make a more efficient job of administering the capitalist system. This only means that it will try to replenish the empty state coffers and provide the capitalist class with all the guarantees and incentives that it needs by heaping more and heavier burdens on the backs of the masses and particularly the working class whose power of resistance has been undermined by the Left Fakers.

### Tail—Twisting

What resistance to the National Government's policy can the opposition parties offer? After their reformist programme has been taken over by the National Government all that they can do is to 'twist the tail' of the Government and urge it on. They are incapable of offering an alternative programme that can mobilise the proletarian masses for an effective struggle against the new onslaught that is being prepared against them. The complete political bankruptcy of the opposition parties, and particularly of the reformist LSSP and CP, is manifested in their attempts to embarrass the Government by rousing communal and religious strife under the guise of "driving a wedge between the UNP and the FP".

The UNP has come back to power at a time when the working class has been disarmed and disoriented thanks to the treachery of the Left Fakers. In order to resist the fresh onslaught that is being prepared on the living standards of the masses it is the immediate and urgent task of the working class to regroup its own forces under the



banner of Marxism so as to be able to take over the leadership of the anti-capitalist struggle. The chief obstacles to the mobilising of this struggle are the opportunist leaders of the LSSP and CP who are determined to keep the working class, or at least its Sinhala-Buddhist sections, tied up with the SLFP even after the debacle of the coalition "tactic". The Left Fakers are completely incapable of playing any role in the working class movement hereafter, except the one that they are currently engaged in—keeping the working class divided on communal and religious lines.

### Mobilising the Working Class

Any attempt to regroup the forces of the working class must take into account the

## LATIN AMERICA

<b>Inside the Cuban Revolution</b>	<i>Rs. c.</i>
by <i>Adolfo Gilly</i>	4-00
<b>The Ordeal of British Guiana</b>	<i>Rs.</i>
by <i>Philip Reno</i>	4-00
<b>Cuba—Anatomy of a Revolution</b>	
by <i>Huberman &amp; Sweezy</i>	9-00
<b>The Second Revolution in Cuba</b>	
by <i>J. Morray</i>	16-25
<b>The US, Cuba and Castro</b>	
by <i>W. A. Williams</i>	16 25
<b>Whither Latin America</b>	
by <i>Paul Johnson</i>	7-50
<b>Arms and Politics in Latin America</b>	
by <i>Edwin Lieuwen</i>	12-50
<b>North from Mexico</b>	
by <i>Carey McWilliams</i>	24-00
<b>Man at the Door with the Gun</b>	
by <i>Belfrage</i>	21-75
<b>The Shark and the Sardines</b>	
by <i>Juan Jose Arevalo</i>	20-00
<b>Guerilla Warfare</b>	
by <i>Che Guevara</i>	17-50

## SURIYA BOOKSHOP

388, Galle Road,  
WELLAWATTE

fact that the leaders of the LSSP and CP have traded on their prestige and sold out the working class movement. These traitors are following in the wake of their former comrade Philip Gunawardena. "The Father of the Revolution" has always been a jump ahead of his present rivals for the patronage of the bourgeoisie. He showed them the way to the camp of the SLFP. But by the time they got there he had already taken off and has now touched down in the camp of the UNP. Will his comrades follow him there? When the inability of the "National" Government to resolve the economic crisis gives rise to another parliamentary crisis, and when today's 'progressives' become 'reactionaries' and today's 'reactionaries' become 'progressives' in order to effect another regroupment of the forces of the bourgeoisie and their hangers-on, we can be sure to find the Left Fakers in one of the camps of the bourgeoisie, loyally performing their lackey service of hoodwinking the proletarian masses and diverting them from their revolutionary course. The Left Fakers must henceforth be treated as the chief obstacle to the mobilisation of the anti-capitalist forces and as enemies of the socialist revolution.

N. M. Perera's plan to "rally the working class and bring it into play" in order to "beat back the Rightist forces" as he put it, has only resulted in throwing every workers' organisation into the swamp of reformism and turning it into the plaything of the bourgeoisie, as Trotsky put it.

It is now the urgent task of the working class to extricate its organisations from the swamp of reformism and *regain its independence and freedom of action*, its freedom to pursue the *anti-capitalist struggle*, by breaking out of the stifling embrace of the petty-bourgeois "progressive forces" which have proved in practice over the past nine years that they are neither progressive nor a force in the face of bourgeois reaction.

Only a *United Front of the Working Class Organisations on a clear-cut anti-capitalist programme* can mobilise the working class for a new offensive which will be able to inspire and rally the proletarian masses in order to sweep away the reactionaries and clear the way to the socialist transformation of society.

# FREEDOM OF THE PRESS & MARXISM

By V. KARALASINGHAM

(This article was written at the time of the Press Bill controversy)

OVER the last few weeks a sustained campaign is afoot to identify the current moves to control the press with Marxism. All sections of the capitalist press as well as leading spokesmen for the UNP have not hesitated to see in both the now abortive press Bills and the new draft legislation a Marxist conspiracy. The capitalist newspapers while directing their fire against the LSSP as being the real authors of the bid to regulate the press have deliberately sought to shield the SLFP. In doing so they seek to achieve two purposes: Firstly to show that the second *capitalist* party, the SLFP, is not really interested in muzzling the press—thereby its image as a democratic party is kept untarnished before the public; secondly, to strike a blow at their real enemy, revolutionary Marxism, by making out that the offensive against the press is in fact inspired by the LSSP ministers. The Marxist past of the LSSP ministers gives a plausible appearance to the propaganda of the capitalist newspapers that Marxism necessarily means a state monopoly of the press. It is therefore necessary to state the correct Marxist attitude on this matter.

When the bourgeoisie was a rising revolutionary class within feudal society it conducted its historically progressive struggle against feudal absolutism under the banners of freedom, equality and fraternity. But once the bourgeoisie came to power the class character of this freedom became manifest. In place of the innumerable restrictions and interference of the old feudal state against trade, manufacture, industry, the bourgeoisie set up its right to free trade and property and created a free labour market where the capitalist with money had the freedom to buy the labour power of the 'free' worker and the latter without the means of subsistence had the freedom to sell or withhold his labour power. It was clearly an unequal freedom and the political freedoms of the bourgeoisie, which accompanied the freedom to trade, the right

to free speech, press and assembly partook of the same character. That is to say these freedoms while on paper they appeared equal to all classes, in real life, was anything but equal. The freedom of speech, assembly etc., available to the working class and the oppressed masses were severely curtailed because they did not possess the economic power to avail to the full the freedom which the law formally pledged to all citizens. This becomes clear even in respect of the most elementary of democratic rights—the right of free speech.

This basic problem is of course magnified a hundred times over when it comes to the question of the freedom of the press and it is the advantages of the capitalist which are greatly enhanced. On the other hand it is the worker who is placed in a even more disadvantageous position, in his competition with the capitalist. The capitalist class has no difficulty in organising not merely one newspaper but a chain of newspapers—and it is not one capitalist who launches on this but several of them and whatever the differences among them, all the capitalist owners of the newspapers are united when it comes to the basic issues touching the class as a whole. It is in the sphere of the freedom of the press that the utter hollowness of the bourgeois claim of equality is most starkly revealed.

But however unequal may be the opportunities for the capitalist and working class in the exercise of the different democratic rights—and included in these is the freedom of the press—the revolutionary movement has a direct and immediate interest not only in the defence of the existing rights, however limited these may be, but also in the fight for their extension. This position, namely that the party of the working class stands for the defence and extension of the existing right of the freedom of the press is inherent in its very character as a socialist party. The latter is distinguished from all

bourgeois parties, including the most liberal and democratic among them, by the fact that it is the most consistent defender of democratic rights.

The immediate aim of revolutionary Marxists is the organisation of the working class for the accomplishment of its historic tasks viz, the seizure of state power and the expropriation of the capitalist class. The first step in the political organisation of the working class is the awakening of its socialist consciousness. This means that the party must engage in propaganda and agitation and inevitably the greater part of the life of a working class party is occupied in this work. Whatever the political regime whether a capitalist democracy with all the known democratic rights or a totalitarian fascist regime where these rights are completely suppressed and brutally denied, the party of the working class must carry out this work. What is the most favourable arena for the performance of this work which is so essential for the future of the working class? Clearly that regime which assures the known democratic rights and permits the widest freedom. This is not looked at in the narrow party sense, although this is not a factor to be minimised.

In fascist and authoritarian conditions, the party working under circumstances of illegality or semi-legality pays a heavy price in men and resources to maintain its illegal press and organisation. In regimes where the rights of free speech, assembly, press etc. are curtailed in any degree, the development of the working class too is hampered and the growth of its class consciousness considerably retarded. For all the political corruption inevitable in a bourgeois democracy, the position of the working class, particularly, its independence and class consciousness is maintained, although serious attempts are made by the bourgeois to undermine them. It is the existence of the democratic rights of free speech and press which enables the working class as a whole to resist these attempts since the working class organised in the revolutionary vanguard by the exercise of these rights helps the class to maintain its revolutionary class socialist outlook. Even if the bourgeoisie temporarily succeeds in its attempts, the existence of the freedom of the press enables the advanced sections immediately

to minimize the damage and rapidly to regroup and revitalize the forces of the working class. In fascist or semi-military rule the working class tends to be *atomised*, broken up into diverse units both in terms of class organisation and class consciousness. In the absence of the freedom of the press, the revolutionary party of the working class has no effective means (that is even the limited means available to it in a capitalist democracy) of reaching the advanced elements of the working class and thereby influencing the class itself. While the press of the working class is so suppressed, the press of the capitalist class maintained by its state carries on open capitalist propaganda hostile to the working class and trade union movement. An attack on the freedom of the press soon becomes directly an attack on the working class, even though one section of the capitalist press itself may suffer thereby.

Within capitalist society the revolutionary party cannot permit even the smallest attack on the freedom of the press, however much this attack may be camouflaged. It cannot permit, not merely an attack on this right, but even on any of the other democratic rights, like those of assembly and speech, however limited these rights are under capitalism. The reason for this is that the real victims of all laws are the working class and oppressed masses. Once the capitalist state is empowered to intervene through a press council or tribunal even against the *Lake House* and *Times*, this little opening is sufficient for the capitalist state to break into the revolutionary press of the working class. The laws themselves are administered by capitalist officials and a law apparently intended against Fascists has invariably been used against the working class. That is why never in history has the revolutionary party within capitalist society called for laws against even Fascists' the sworn enemies of the working class and socialism and we have not made this demand of liberal democratic governments who too are opposed in their own way to Fascism. This is because the working class does not trust the capitalist state to do this job and because of its firm conviction that these laws would be used against the working class itself.

We do not give a single additional power of control to the capitalist state in respect

of the various democratic rights; if anything, the party of the working class stands for the repeal of all existing repressive laws. In this demand, universal in its application within capitalist society, is expressed the deep distrust of the working class of the bourgeois state as the custodian of democratic rights.

Rosa Luxemburg who lived in the period of the flowering of capitalist democracy in Germany but had no illusions in bourgeois democracy and parliamentarism neatly expressed the Marxist position on the question of the socialist movement and democracy; "If democracy has become superfluous or annoying to the bourgeoisie it is on the contrary necessary and indispensable to the working class. It is necessary to the working class because it creates the political forms (autonomous administration, electoral rights etc.) which will serve the proletariat as fulcrums in its task of transforming bourgeois society. Democracy is indispensable to the working class, because only through the exercise of its democratic rights, in the struggle for democracy, can the proletariat become aware of its class interests and its historic task. In a word democracy is indispensable not because it renders superfluous the conquest of political power by the proletariat, but because it renders this conquest both *necessary* and *possible*". (1)

An important element in bourgeois democracy is the functioning of the press free of Government control or ownership or even of medieval licensing laws i.e. freedom of the press. That is why we cannot entrust to the capitalist state the powers of controlling the press, even though it is the *Lake House* and the *Times* or the *Davasa* which they claim is their purpose. Once the bourgeois state is allowed to begin here, it must end with the Press of the working class.

But the reader will ask, is not the press in Ceylon—the *Lake House*, *Davasa* and *Virakesari*—a prostituted press, a naked and shameless instrument of the capitalist class? Undoubtedly this is so, and we can add that no adjective is too strong to describe the newspapers of Ceylon. But to describe them as the "worst in the world" is by implication at least to rate higher, if

not to approve the capitalist newspapers of other countries. This is what the Sri Lanka Sama Samajists are doing now. It is necessary for them to so describe the capitalist newspapers—to distinguish the Ceylon newspapers from the run of capitalist newspapers in the U.K. or America, India or France by its greater servility to the capitalist class, by its cold disregard of the truth, by its ready resort to fabrication etc. in order to "justify" their attempts to control the press in Ceylon. But the truth is that the description of the Ceylon press as "the worst in the world" is not at all accurate. The press in the oldest democracy, the U.K. is as bad as the press in Ceylon. The *Daily Express*, the *Daily Mail*, the *Evening Standard*—all newspapers in England are in fact indistinguishable from the Ceylon newspapers in their political role as well as in the calculatedly deceptive manner of news reporting. In fact what one can say is the Ceylon press is as bad as the worst capitalist newspapers published in *any* bourgeois democratic country.

And the role of the press as a whole in the so-called democratic countries was long ago characterised in a fundamental Communist document, viz. in the Manifesto issued in 1920, by the 2nd World Congress of the Communist International over the signatures of Lenin and Trotsky. "*The bourgeois press has openly engraved the stamp of bribery like a trade mark, on its forehead. The leading newspapers of the world bourgeoisie are monstrous factories of falsehood, libel and spiritual poison.*" (2) And even of the few authoritative and well informed newspapers in the advanced capitalist countries like *The Times* which even though bourgeois nevertheless maintain skillfully their mask of "independence" and "impartiality", Leon Trotsky had this to say; "The yellow press lies as a matter of course without hesitating or looking back Newspapers like *The Times* or *Le Temps* speak the truth on all unimportant and inconsequential occasions, so that they can deceive the public with all the requisite authority when necessary." (3) But despite these sweeping denunciations of the world capitalist press—denunciations which are no less applicable in Ceylon—at no time did revolutionary working class parties call for the control of these newspapers by the capitalist state.

The demand for the control of the press originated not with the left but with the S.L.F.P. It is true that the party had demanded and in fact now demands the "seizure of the capitalist printing press" but this slogan has nothing in common with the current demand to control the press. The former expressed the general working class demand of developing the class struggle in every work place from the elementary stage of economic, trade union struggle to the stage of factory committees of workers which would challenge capitalist proprietary rights in a work place and then to the final stage of the actual seizure of work places and their running under the control of these committees. This slogan, that is, the slogan of the seizure of the printing press by the workers themselves through their elected committees fully retains its validity even today. The actual timing of the slogan, however, is dependent on the pace of the development of the class struggle.

But when the S.L.F.P. of Mrs. Bandaranaike in 1960 advanced the demand for the control of the press in the Throne Speech of that year, it had something entirely different. What it sought, was the transference of the control of the daily press from those presently exercising control who were without exception supporters of the U.N.P. to persons whose direct allegiance was to the S.L.F.P. This could be done by nationalisation, that is by vesting ownership in a state corporation and giving control to a Board of Directors appointed by the SLFP government. By this means the government directly controls the entire press through its nominees and as these nominees are defenders of capitalism and opposed to the working class, the press as a government monopoly would inevitably be a terrible instrument of oppression. What Mrs. Bandaranaike sought was the plunder of one section of the capitalist owners in the interest of the other section which supported her.

It was under this pressure of the S.L.F.P. that the L.S.S.P. in 1960 already well on the way to its own final degeneration gave for the first time qualified support to measures of press control. The "golden brains" of the L.S.S.P. were not wanting in ingenuity and deceptive skill to mask Mrs. B's crude

attempts to monopolise the press in the interest of that section of the capitalist class supporting her. The hirelings of the L.S.S.P. leadership provided the formula.—Let us broad base the ownership by bringing in the trade unions and co-operatives and let control be vested in a board in which are included trade union and cooperative society representatives. Even this formula, of course has now been abandoned.

It is an absolute falsehood to say that the "broad basing" of ownership can democratize anything. The biggest monopolies in the world—Shell, Imperial Chemical Industries etc. are all broad based, and ironically, even trade unions are share holders. What matters is who *controls* the company? In any case "broad basing" of Lake House, *Times* and *Davasa* can be accomplished by the simple device of amending the Companies Ordinance.

The participation of trade unions whether as owners in the capacity of shareholders or as the persons in control, through their nominees even as directors whether exclusively or together with others will not convert capitalist newspapers into working class newspapers. Trade Unions are institutions within capitalist society and except for a small minority in the Trade Union movement who are revolutionary Marxists the overwhelming mass of trade union officialdom is at least thoroughly petty bourgeois and therefore capitalist in outlook. In the final analysis they will prove as dogged defenders of capitalism as the present owners of big newspapers, but the former being the nominees of the government can but carry out the orders of the government, just as the Director General of Broadcasting does it in Radio Ceylon.

But the existence of a nominally free and independent press outside government control and ownership at least enables the working class (a) to utilise the differences and antagonisms between the various newspapers owners to present its views in one or the other papers (b) to exploit the conflict that arises between the daily press and the government in order to present the view point of the working class and what is most important (c) it is the existence of this bourgeois democratic right—the freedom of the press—which ensures to the working

class in capitalist society its freedom to have its free and independent press. No wonder Leon Trotsky in the following forthright words warned the young Chinese Communist Party in 1928 not to confuse

the monopoly of the press under Soviet power with state monopoly under the Kuo Min Tang bureaucracy. "If the Chinese proletariat is obliged to live a few more years (even if it were only another year) under the regime of the Kuo Min Tang, would the Chinese Communist Party abandon the struggle for the extension of legal possibilities of all sorts, for the freedom of the press, of assembly, of organisation, of strike etc? Were it to abandon its struggle, it would transform itself into a lifeless sect. But that is a struggle on the democratic plane. The Soviet Power signifies the monopoly of the press, of assembly etc., in the hands of the proletariat. Perhaps the Chinese Communist Party will put forward these slogans precisely at this time? In the situation under consideration, it would be an admixture of childishness and madness. The Communist Party is fighting at present not for power, but to maintain, to consolidate and to develop its contact with the masses for the sake of the struggle for power in the future." (4)

Professional opponents of Marxism in which no doubt are included the hacks of the capitalist newspapers have of course spread the myth that the seizure of power by the revolutionary party of the working class necessarily means the suppression of dissident opinion, including of course, the suppression of the right of free expression. It is made out that in doing so the revolutionary party is carrying out an integral part of its socialist programme, namely the suppression of other newspapers. Nothing can be further from the truth than this vile slander.

Leon Trotsky's answers to questions put by the Commission of Inquiry in 1938 are worth recalling both to show Marxism's basic approach to this question as also to understand the measures carried out by the Bolsheviks after the seizure of power in November, 1917.

*Dewey*: . . . . Under what conditions would you forbid the propagation of capitalist propaganda?

*Trotsky*: Where, in the Soviet Union?

*Dewey*: In any Socialist state

*Trotsky*: I don't forbid at all. We have now the Soviet Union. If we had two or three states more with the prole-

## BIOGRAPHY

	Rs.	c.
Prophet Unarmed—by <i>Isaac Deutscher</i>	31	40
Prophet Outcast—by <i>Deutscher</i>	37	00
Stalin—by <i>Deutscher</i>	10	00
Sergei M. Eisenstein—by <i>Marie Seton</i>	22	00
Karl Marx—by <i>Mehring</i>	21	00

## WORLD AFFAIRS

The Sino-Soviet Conflict—by <i>Zagoria</i>	42	00
The Defense of Western Europe— by <i>Middleton</i>	8	00
Dynamite in the Middle East—by <i>Totah</i>	15	00
Revolt on the Nile—by <i>El Sadat</i>	12	00

## HISTORY

Revolutions of 1848—by <i>Robertson</i>	16	00
Revisionism—by <i>Labedz</i>	34	60
Witnesses to the Russian Revolution (edited)—	34	60
Brest Litovsk—by <i>Wheeler-Bennet</i>	33	00
Ten Days that shook the World—by <i>Reed</i>	14	40
Long View of History—by <i>Warde</i>	2	50

## PHILOSOPHY

Science of Logic—by <i>Hegel</i> in 2 vols. each vol.	25	00
Encyclopaedia of Philosophy—by <i>Hegel</i>	20	00
Hegel Highlights—An annotated Selection edited by <i>Orynski</i>	18	00
Introduction to the Logic of Marxism— by <i>Warde</i>	5	00

## LITERATURE

The Historical Novel—by <i>Lukacs</i>	17	00
Studies in European Realism—by <i>Lukacs</i>	12	50
Naturalism in 19th century English Literature—by <i>Brandes</i>	10	50
Selected Poems—by <i>Brecht</i>	14	00

## CEYLON

Ceylon a Nation Divided—by <i>Farmer</i>	6	40
Politics of Coalition—by <i>Karalasingham</i>	2	00
The Way Forward for the Tamil Speaking People—by <i>Karalasingham</i>	1	00

## SURIYA BOOKSHOP

388, Galle Road,  
WELLAWATTE

tarian state, then the danger of capitalist restoration would disappear totally, and it would not be necessary to prohibit capitalist propaganda. We would perhaps create a museum in every paper. It would be—in this sense—it would be a museum for the remainders of all the old culture.

*Finerty:* You take in their right—you recognize the government right of a capitalist state to prevent socialist—

*Trotsky:* I am not an adviser of capitalist government, but I can only remark

*Finerty:* In other words, if you had the government you would permit advocating criticism of the government, freedom of speech?

*Trotsky:* What state, what time, and under what conditions? It depends. I work not with abstractions, only with realities.” (5)—

A little while before this questioning Trotsky was asked “were you the head of a socialist state, would you permit open capitalist propaganda?”, and he replied, “It depends on the concrete situation, upon the strength of the state. If it is a rich state with a civilized population, which became a socialist state, capitalist propaganda would be so ridiculous that it would be ten times more ridiculous to forbid it. It would not be necessary to have a one party dictatorship. It would permit everybody to create a party to advocate the return back to feudalism, capitalism and even to can—

*Lafayette:* Canibalism?

*Trotsky:* Canibalism. In this sense I would give the advice to be totally liberal in a civilized country....”(6)

From Trotsky's answers it is clear that it is no part of the principles of Marxism to deny democratic rights, once the working class is in power. A cynic may interpret Trotsky's answers as a concession to the liberalism of the Commission which was headed by the late Professor Dewey, the foremost liberal of his time. But this is completely misplaced, as any intelligent reader will realise. The expropriation of the capitalist class, in industry, banks, transport, insurance etc., gives a death blow to the real power behind the capitalist press and without this support (advertis-

ment revenue, social connections, political influence etc.) the press barons are reduced to mortal proportions. The maintenance therefore of an independent press by them in the circumstances of virtual penury would be the work of the purest idealism, as in fact it is in the revolutionary Left today. Not even the most enthusiastic underling of the capitalist press today would work for a bankrupt press to champion the cause of.....capitalism! Trotsky's answers are also in accord with the theoretical conclusions of Marxism. Even as Marxists are opposed to bourgeois democracy, they are nonetheless the most consistent democrats. But this is qualified by the real fact that they function in a class society torn by social antagonism and that is why Trotsky repeatedly introduced the qualification, “What state, what time, and what conditions? I work not with abstractions, only with realities.”

The question whether democratic rights are permitted for other classes and parties is determined entirely by the attitude of these other classes and parties to the proletarian power, the degree of development of the international socialist revolution, the condition of the class struggle, the level of culture of the people etc. If there are conditions of open civil war, it would be absolutely idle to expect the working class out of respect for democracy to permit the open class enemies of the new state power to exercise democratic rights. As part of its elementary duty to the class which brought it to power, the revolutionary party would be compelled to take stern measures against these enemies, including the denial of all democratic rights. In the words of Trotsky, “The demand to stop all repression at the time of civil war amounts to a demand that we stop the civil war .. Our adversaries have not proposed peace to us... In conditions of civil war it is legitimate to ban hostile papers.” (7) In the conditions of civil war what is supreme is the defence of the revolution against its enemies, and like in all conditions of war, the latter must be denied their right to wage war against the workers' state. This is in fact what happened soon after the Bolsheviks seized power in 1917.

The Russian bourgeoisie revolted against the new power and the capitalist newspapers

openly incited the people to revolt against the proletarian state. It became necessary to confiscate immediately the capitalist printing presses and newsprint supplies. Soon these were nationalised by the workers' state. But in doing so the Bolsheviks formulated an important principle: There was no question of the government—even a workers' government—setting up its own press monopoly. How then were these conflicting positions—a nationalised printing industry and absence of a government monopoly of the press—reconciled? Very simply as indeed are all Marxist solutions, by allocating to all parties and groups printing facilities and paper according to their numerical strength. In the words of Lenin, "These essentials (printing presses, ink and paper) must become the property of the Soviet government, and be apportioned, first of all to the socialist parties in strict proportion to their voting strength" (8).

But the socialists of Russia—the Mensheviks and SRs—beginning with the first coalition with the "progressive" capitalists in May 1917 and through 5 coalition governments up to 7th November 1917 when the Bolsheviks overthrew the last of the hybrid formations, had irretrievably tied themselves to the Russian bourgeoisie that they could not even avail of the freedom of the press under the first dictatorship of the proletariat. So deadly was that embrace of the class enemy that even after the working class had overthrown capitalist society, the coalition "socialists" could not free themselves from the enemy's clutches. Such is the inexorable logic of coalition with the bourgeoisie. "Step by step, down and down," to quote Lenin's dire prophecy. And like the operation of a law of nature, we see once again, this time before our very eyes, Lenin's words being fulfilled. Who

would have believed before 11th June, 1964 that these men—N. M. Perera, Colvin R. de Silva, Doric de Souza, Bernard Soysa—would be the principal agents of the "liberal" capitalists in the ranks of the working class? The capitalist class hired them to carry out just this function and the whole question of the Press Bill epitomizes the real relationship between the bourgeoisie and its servitors, the leaders of the LSSP. For 4 years since 1960 Mrs. Bandaranaike attempted to muzzle the press and on 12 occasions she was thwarted by, among others, the organised labour movement at whose head stood these very men. But no sooner was the coalition formed than Mrs. Bandaranaike boldly ventured to bring forth in the Senate the first definitive draft. And such is her superb finesse that she herself d'd not attend the debate, let alone speak on the Bill! She entrusted the cool work to her hirelings, in particular Doric de Souza. No doubt when the Bill comes up in the House of Representatives she would hire professionally more competent men to do battle on her behalf. But there is something more in all this than a few deserters crossing over to the enemy and firing on the proletarian army. A few deserters, it is true, in terms of numbers, but these few constituted the *leadership*. The significance of this fact for the present at any rate is that the ranks of the working class are so confused and disoriented as to be incapable of offering immediate resistance to a Press Bill which is aimed also at the working class. Such is the confusion today large sections support the Bill! An inevitable result in any country because the consciousness of the working class lags behind and only a new experience and a new regrouping will awaken the working class to the real role of the coalition government. Then nothing will save the "leaders" whom the working class now trusts.

1. Rosa Luxemburg: **Reform and Revolution**
2. Manifesto of the 2nd World Congress of the Communist International. Full text in Leon Trotsky's **First Five Years of the Comintern** Vol. 1.
3. Leon Trotsky: **My Life**
4. Leon Trotsky: **Problems of the Chinese Revolution**
5. **The Case of Leon Trotsky**
6. **Ibid**
7. Quoted by Isaac Deutscher in **Prophet Armed**
8. John Reed: **Ten Days that Shook the World.**

---

(The section dealing with transitional measures has been omitted. This was published in English in **World Outlook** and in Sinhala in **Samasamajaya** and later in a Sinhala pamphlet by International Publishers, 22 1/1, Chatham Street, Colombo 1. V.K.)



# FROM MARXISM TO COMMUNALISM

By

SYDNEY WANASINGHE

THE General Elections of March 22nd did not give an absolute majority to any party. As in March 1960 the electorate had failed to return a single party to power, and the post-election negotiations had to decide the formation of the new government. The attention of everyone was centred on the Federal Party, as it was they who could decide the nature of the capitalist combination that would govern the country. The F.P. had joined hands with the SLFP, LSSP and CP in April 1960 to vote the UNP out of power. But having been treated shabbily by the SLFP after they were returned to power they decided to throw in their lot with the UNP this time and joined hands with them to form the new government.

The reaction of the coalitionists to this new Government took the entire country by surprise. For two days they clung on to office claiming that they had a majority in Parliament. When they were forced to abandon this claim and resign from office they engaged themselves in a virulent campaign against the minorities. This campaign which was at first directed against the plantation workers, was expanded to include the Tamil speaking people of the North when their representatives pledged support to the UNP and eventually also the Catholics and the Christians as various appointments were being made by the new government.

This campaign had every appearance of being the implementation of a joint decision of the three coalition parties— SLFP, LSSP and CP. They acted in complete unison. The Sinhala newspapers of the three parties spoke with one voice against the plantation workers, the Tamil speaking people and the Christians; used the same epithets and phraseology that one begins to wonder whether this campaign was conducted from one centre. In their English weeklies, Forward and Tribune, the campaign was soft pedalled. It was com-

munalism in the raw in the Sinhala papers while it took a veiled and subtle form in their English counterparts.

With the communalism of the SLFP we are not concerned in this article. That a capitalist party unable to campaign on economic issues because they have absolutely no solution to them, should resort to communalism to divert the attention of the people from their misery, is no cause for surprise. The record of communalism of both the UNP and the SLFP is still fresh in our memory. Both these parties have to share responsibility for the communal disturbances of 1955, 1956, 1958 and 1962. But communalism of the CP and the LSSP cannot be treated in the same manner. This was the first open manifestation of communal politics in the LSSP. The CP had shown symptoms earlier. It had wobbled on the question of minority rights. Nevertheless communalism of both these parties is a phenomenon worthy of special attention.

## THE PAST

The LSSP had championed the cause of the minorities—caste, racial, linguistic and religious—right from its inception. It stood for social justice and equality. The translation of the word “socialist” as SAMA SAMAJA in Sinhalese is symbolic. It is an indication that our pioneer socialists stood for equality in a multi-racial caste ridden society.

The touchstone of principled politics in Ceylon is the attitude to the minority problem. The basic foundation document of the LSSP issued in 1935 entitled Fundamental Objectives provided for equality of status for Sinhala and Tamil. Thus at its very birth the LSSP had accepted that the rights of the Tamil speaking people were as inviolate as those of their Sinhalese speaking brethren.

Besides the workers, the socially oppressed were the first to be attracted to the LSSP. They looked up to the party for leadership and the party never failed them. The resulting popularity or unpopularity of a particular line of action was not taken into consideration. If it was just and correct and was in the best interests of the working class that was all that mattered.

It was in that spirit that the LSSP and the BLPI opposed the Citizenship Act introduced in Parliament by Mr. D. S. Senanayake in 1948. The UNP was able to interpret this opposition as unpatriotic and characteristic of a party that placed the interests of "Indians" before that of the people of this country. But these attacks failed to force these two parties to alter their position. The same with the LSSP stand on the language question. Three days after the bloody Sunday (1) when the LSSP rally in support of its language stand was attacked by the communalists, Dr. N. M. Perera moved in Parliament on behalf of the LSSP:—"That in the opinion of this House the Ceylon (Constitution) Order in Council should be amended forthwith to provide for the Sinhalese and Tamil Languages to be state languages of Ceylon with parity of status throughout the island."

It is worth recalling extracts from the bold speech he made in support of this motion. "It would have been easy for me and the members of my party to have sponsored the very popular idea, Sinhalese only, and we would have been acclaimed as heroes as a good many others have been.

"But our party has taken up a consistent position. Ever since our party was launched we have never faltered or wavered from that position because we felt that was the correct line to take. That position we still adhere to. However unpopular that line of action might be, I am convinced myself of the correctness of that attitude. It might mean going into the political wilderness for some time, but still we the members of the LSSP are prepared to face that. Let there be no mistake about this.

"For a just cause, for correct principles, for a correct political line, I think, it is fully

worth it. The membership of the House is not the be-all and end-all of a political party. But when a political party has been built on careerism then, I think, the Right Hon. Gentleman is quite correct when he says that it will have to go into the wilderness. That would mean the political death of people like that. But we have built up a movement and that movement will carry on whether we live or not."

That was on 19th October 1955. Ten years have passed. I am sure Dr. N. M. Perera would now like to erase from his memory these words he uttered in the heyday of his political career as a spokesman of a Trotskyist party.

The CP was not very enthusiastic in the support of these political positions of the LSSP but yet they did not dare to take a contrary stand. Though their heart was not in them they tailed behind the LSSP afraid of losing their base among the minorities if they acted contrary.

These political positions were however not acceptable to the majority Sinhala Buddhist electorate. At the same time the very positions which the LSSP had won by their principled stand on these minority issues were having their effects on party life. The attention of the LSSP began to shift gradually from the working class and its class organisations the trade unions to the electorate and its organisations the youth leagues. The election into office in a number of important local bodies including the Colombo Municipality gave rise to the slogan—"Today Mayor—Tomorrow Premier". This perspective of power through parliament gained ground and after the defeat of the UNP in 1956 began to take firm root. Certain elements in the LSSP felt that they had been robbed of a victory that was theirs. They felt that Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike and his party the SLFP had reaped the benefits of their toil and labour. They found that their positions on the minority questions were an impediment in the way of achieving their objective—power through the ballot. They forgot that it was these very same positions that were the source of the party's strength. Talk of 25 years of labour was gaudied about freely. Mr. Bandaranaike

(1) Town Hall rally on Sunday 16th October, 1955.

had used religion and language and had succeeded. Mr. Philip Gunawardena had gone along with him and was now a Minister. To do something in their own lifetime, to put their "golden brains" to fruitful use, the LSSP leaders now thought that they must follow in Philip's footsteps. First soft pedal their stands on these minority issues and later abandon them altogether was the strategy they planned.

Mr. Philip Gunawardena has always been one step ahead of the reformist LSSP leaders. He abandoned revolutionary Marxism in 1950 when he formed a united front with the CP. Messrs. N. M. Perera, Colvin R. de Silva, Leslie Goonewardena and others followed him when they signed the ULF agreement on 12th August 1963. Mr. Philip Gunawardena entered a popular front government in April 1956. Dr. N. M. Perera and his colleagues did so on June 10th 1964. They also emulated the example set by Philip when they extended political patronage to their faithfuls. Mr. Philip Gunawardena resorted to communalism and must share responsibility for the communal disturbances during the MEP period. Now Messrs. N. M. Perera, Colvin R. de Silva and others have followed his example. Mr. Philip Gunawardena has joined the UNP. This is the next logical step for his followers to take.

### THE PRESENT

The elections were held on the 22nd. The counting started the same evening. From the very first result—Mihintale where the majority over the UNP was halved it was clear that there was a swing away from the coalition. By morning it was abundantly clear that the coalition had lost. Of course the UNP had not received an absolute majority. They were short of a majority of elected members by 10. But they had the support of 5 SLFSP, 3 TC and one JVP which still left them short by one. The correct thing for Mrs. Bandaranaike under these circumstances, according to her own parliamentary politics was to have resigned. But instead at the instigation of her colleagues she tried to hold on to office as long as possible hoping to find a way to outwit the UNP. The trade unions were sounded regarding a

possible general strike in support of the coalition. Rumours were spread about unaccounted for ballot boxes in Borella and Beruwala, to incite crowds. Leading coalitionists tried this tactic in Borella and opposite Queen's House and assured their supporters that the Federal Party and Mr. Philip Gunawardena had pledged them support. In the meantime frantic overtures were made on bended knees to the Federal Party to support the SLFP and its allies. But when the FP and the MEP decided to back the UNP the coalitionists decided on a virulent communal campaign.

It was a campaign directed against the plantation workers, Tamil speaking people and the Christians. A tar brush crusade was carried out effectively in Borella and Dehiwala-Galkissa where the LSSP sitting members had lost. They explained the defeat of the coalition as being the result of the minorities supporting the UNP. Their plan was to create disturbances, give an excuse to Mrs. Bandaranaike to clamp down emergency rule and enable her to continue in power. When she handed over her resignation much against the advice of her allies the communal campaign took another turn. It was used to drive a wedge between the parties that formed the new coalition. It is not necessary to quote from the capitalist press. A perusal of the three Sinhalese newspapers of the coalitionists—the JANASATHIYA, JANA-MATHAYA and the ATTHA is quite sufficient to show how they carried out this campaign.

The JANAMATHAYA is published by the LSSP with the same editorial board as the former SAMA SAMAJAYA which they have now abandoned. It commenced publication on 4th January as a daily. Its publisher is the same as that of the SAMA SAMAJAYA and it is printed at Star Press, Driberg's Avenue, Maradana, the printing press of the LSSP. The JANASATHIYA is published by the Sathiya Publishing Co. It is printed at the Colombo Co-operative Press, 56 Rutnam Road, Colombo 2 which is run by Mr. S.P. Amerasingham, the editor of the Tribune. Its General Manager is Mr. A. G. Wickremnayake, a member of the LSSP and husband of Mrs. Soma Wickremnayake, ex-MP for Dehiowita. In its first issue it

carried a list of correspondents, the majority of whom are members of the LSSP. Its leading lights are Messrs. Hector Abhayawardena, Chandra Gunasekera and Nimal Horana, who is the editor of the LSSP daily JANAMATHAYA. The ATTHA is a daily published by Mr. M. G. Arnolis Appuhamy, the publisher of the Communist Party's weekly, MAWBIMA. It is printed at Lanka Press, Cotta Road, Borella the printing press of the Communist Party. Mr. H. G. S. Ratnaweera, Communist MMC in Colombo is the Editor of the paper. Thus it is very clear that even though these newspapers do not claim to be party newspapers they are in fact the organs of these two parties. JANAMATHAYA and ATTHA are publications of the LSSP and CP respectively while JANASATHIYA is a weekly controlled by the LSSP.

#### COMMUNAL CAMPAIGN OF THE "PROGRESSIVE PRESS"

The leader article of the JANASATHIYA of 28th March carried the headline:—**"Dudley yields to Federal demands—Tamil also made an official language"**. It reads:—

**"A so-called national government has been formed by Mr. Dudley Senanayake after betraying the rights enjoyed by the nation to the Federalists.**

**"The JANASATHIYA is informed that the pact which was agreed upon to enlist the support of the 14 Federal MPs led by Mr. Chelvanayagam contained 14 points.**

**"The foremost among these is the granting of official status to Tamil in the Northern and Eastern provinces. This will enable Tamil rulers to carry on the administration of these two provinces exclusively in Tamil. It will amount to a division of the Country.**

**"The second point is to give more powers to the proposed Regional Councils. In addition to local government the UNP has agreed to give land alienation to these regional councils. Although this demand was made during the time of Mr. Bandaranaike it was not agreed upon as the only land available for alienation is in these two provinces.**

**"Mr. Senanayake has also agreed not to set up Sinhalese colonies in these two provinces in areas which are considered to be traditionally Tamil. Even though this demand was also made of Mr. Bandaranaike he did not agree to it as it was tantamount to a division of the country.**

**"Another point is the registration of Indian voters. According to the Sirimavo-Shastri pact they were to be included in a separate electoral register. But the UNP has agreed to include them in the same register. As a result the election of MPs in several electorates in the Up Country is handed over to the Indians. A separate register for the Indians was contemplated to avoid this situation.**

**"The UNP has agreed to take over the Estate schools. But the medium of instruction in these schools will be Tamil.**

**"The Federal Party hopes to replace the existing unitary constitution with a federal constitution; to obtain parity of status for Tamil and Sinhalese and to safeguard the traditionally Tamil areas.**

**"Most of these hopes have been realised by this pact with the UNP"**.

This is an assessment of the outcome of the tie-up between the UNP and the FP from a communal angle. It does not attempt to go into details. It merely states in a nutshell the effects of the 14 point agreement which is supposed to exist. The editorial of this same issue goes a little further. It makes the following analysis of the defeat.

**"On one side was the united front of the SLFP, LSSP and CP. Only the Sinhala Buddhists supported them. Who supported the UNP? Local and foreign capitalists, Indians led by Thondaman, Tamils led by Poanambalam, the Catholic Church, Muslims who were against the trade policy of the coalition government, thuppahi elements who do not support our national culture, capitalist newspapers—all of them backed the UNP. The UNP was able to get a majority of seats because in addition they received the support of Sinhala Buddhists who do not have a clear understanding of Buddhist Philosophy.**

**"Thus the coalition received the unsullied votes of the people of this country. The**

UNP received the votes of the minorities and a small section of the majority community. It is clearly seen that a number of up-country seats went to the UNP because of the Indian votes and that the coastal seats from Chilaw to Colombo North and Borella were won by them because of Catholic support. Thus the minorities have got together and defeated the majority community."

This editorial sets the tone for the communal tirade that appears in the next issue of the JANASATHIYA. The word thuppahi was first used by Mr. Philip Gunawardena against the LSSP. Now it has entered the LSSP vocabulary. It was sheer bad luck that a small section of the Buddhists did not possess a clear understanding of Buddhist Philosophy. This could be easily remedied. The LSSP has sufficient talent amongst its membership to attend to this task. Since the building up of a Marxist cadre has long since been abandoned their erstwhile Marxist theoreticians could be released to assist in this work. It is indeed a pity that this weakness was not discovered in time.

Emphasis is made of the Catholic support that tipped the balance against the Coalition in the coastal belt. But how is it that this very same coastal belt went against the UNP in 1956? The UNP was defeated in Chilaw, Nattandiya, Negombo (which is referred to as the little Rome), and Colombo North in 1956. Is it the delimitation that favoured the UNP this time? If so the coalitionists have only themselves to blame for it. Or was there a change in the religious proportion of the electorate due to natural increase? Similarly, it was not the increase in plantation votes that returned the UNP. The truth lies elsewhere. Large sections of the minorities who had voted against the UNP earlier on a class basis were harassed at every turn by the MEP SLFP and the coalition in their endeavours to woo the Sinhala Buddhists. This was their reaction to that maltreatment.

The next issue of the JANASATHIYA dated 4th April goes much further. It links together the Federalists and the DMK. The headline of the leader article reads "Madras Tamils rejoice over new Government". It is thereby sought to give the

impression that the UNP victory is not only a victory of the Tamil speaking people, and the plantation workers as implied in the earlier issue of the paper but a victory for South India as well. The JANASATHIYA also sees the sinister hand of Catholic action in the election of the Speaker, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees. According to JANASATHIYA only Sinhala Buddhists are eligible for high office in Buddhist Ceylon. Perhaps according to its way of thinking not only caste, race and language but religion too go to decide whether a person is a "pariah" in society.

The same issue of the JANASATHIYA carries a news item entitled "Tamil Ex-public servants ask for their jobs". It says:—

"The FP has asked the new government to re-employ all public servants who had to leave government service for not acquiring proficiency in Sinhala, the official language. The new Finance Minister has informed them that a decision on this matter will be taken shortly."

This opposition to any concessions on the language issue comes from the LSSP, a party that championed the cause of the minorities and fought for parity of status for Sinhala and Tamil. Incidentally non-penalisation of public servants in the implementation of the Language Act was one of the 21 demands endorsed by the LSSP and CP up to 21st March 1964.

Another news item gives prominence to the campaign of ridiculing the minorities, started by CTB employees. This news item entitled "Tamil in the CTB" reads as follows:—

"CTB employees in Panadura, Bandaramulla, Moratuwa and Dehiwela have switched over to Tamil in their conversations with one another.

"'Shari' (right), 'Podun' (enough), 'Nippatunga' (stop) are being used by the bus conductors, while they address the passengers as 'aiyya' and 'Samy'.

"The CTB employees say that while Sinhala was given its proper place during the

**Bandaranaike period, the new government has formed a coalition of seven parties to pay more attention to Tamil than to Sinhala and as such the Sinhalese must be prepared for the day when they will be asked to speak in Tamil."**

Note the areas where this campaign is carried on. All of them are areas where the reformist LSSP has a base. These are also essentially Sinhalese speaking areas, with isolated pockets of Tamil speaking people. In Dehiwala, Moratuwa and Bandaragama the coalitionists were defeated. Panadura has a very strong Buddhist tradition and has, in keeping with the analysis of the JANASATHIYA that only those Buddhists who did not have a proper understanding of Buddhist Philosophy voted against the SLFP led coalition, made the correct decision to return the coalitionist, Mr. Leslie Goonewardena. It is worth remembering that it was in Panadura that, in those dark days of June 1958, a Hindu Priest was dragged out of hiding and burnt alive, petrol having been poured on his body. The purpose of this campaign of the CTB employees was to spread anti-Tamil feeling amongst the Sinhalese people of these areas and initiate another pogrom on the lines of June, 1958. The purpose of the publicity given in JANASATHIYA was to attempt to widen the area of its operation.

Mr. R. G. Senanayake also finds a place in this issue of the JANASATHIYA. Nearly half a page is devoted to extracts from his article published under the caption "Are you sending back the Indians or not?" Alongside is a cartoon depicting an illicit immigrant complete with turban devouring Ceylon, with his teeth on Trincomalee. On the same page other short articles deal with the political influence of the plantation workers and the threat to the Island's security from the 'Indians.'

Mr. R. G. Senanayake has subsequently appeared on the same platform with the coalitionists. He even addressed the SLFP-LSSP-CP May Day meeting at Independence Square. As late as 1964 Mr. Bernard Soysa of the LSSP had this to say of Mr. Senanayake in the House of Representatives:

**"It comes ill from the Hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake) who,**

**today, in the alleged interest of saving the Sinhalese people, finds himself in association with men like C. S. Marikkar on the same platform."**

The issue of the JANASATHIYA dated 4th April is devoted almost entirely to the virulent communal campaign. The editorial deals with the same theme and demands of the Government that it reveal the terms of the secret pact with the FP. The ATTHA of April 1st makes the same demand in banner headlined leader articles, and repeats it again on 16th April. Mr. Bernard Soysa makes this an issue in his speech in Parliament on the Throne Speech debate. The 4th page of this issue deals with the famous motorcade from Temple Trees to Horagolla. This home coming after 9 years of political power was made an opportunity to beat the communal drum along the 26 mile stretch. This news item is worth reproducing in full.

**"The people who accompanied Mrs. Bandaranaike in procession from Colombo to Horagolla shouted a large number of slogans.**

**"The hostility of the people towards the UNP-FP Government was clearly depicted in these slogans.**

**"Haro Hara Govinda—Saiver Anduwa Apata Apa—Ape Amma apata Ona." were heard from all sides.**

**"People did not greet this procession and those who participated in it with the customary "ayubowan". Instead they used the Tamil form of greeting "Wanakkam".**

**"The rest of the slogans were as follows:—**

**"Atha Sinhala—Aliya Demala"**

**"Sirima pataw—Sinha Pataw"**

**"Dudley Pataw—Thonda Pataw"**

**"Ape kade—Kavum Kade"**

**"Dudley Kawe—Masala wade"**

**"Mokada Dudley Ganda—Talathel Ganda"**

**"Mokada Dudley Ganda—Kallathoni Ganda"**

These slogans clearly depict the contempt and hatred the coalitionists have towards the Tamil speaking people and the plantation workers.

There is a similarity between these slogans shouted by the coalitionists and those shouted by the MEPers against the LSSP from 1956 to 1959.

Instead of the present slogan "Atha Sinhala—Aliya Demala" it was then "Atha Sinhala—Yathura Demala". Instead of "Sirima Pataw—Sinha Pataw: Dudley Pataw—Thonda Pataw" it was then "Philip Pataw—Sinha Pataw: N. M. Pataw—Kochchi Pataw."

The SLFP led coalition has been replaced by a UNP led coalition. But the only slogan the coalitionists could think of in their march to the political wilderness are these nauseating communal slogans.

The JANASATHIYA of 11th April deals with the franchise rights of the plantation workers. The article entitled—"Up Country seats handed over to the Indians—A proposal to set up multi-member constituencies" reads as follows.

"The UNP-FP Government has given an undertaking to the Tamils to implement a scheme whereby the Indians are given the right to represent the parliamentary constituencies in the up-country which up to the last century formed a part of the Sinhalese Kingdom.

"According to this scheme about 10 constituencies in the up-country will be made multi-member constituencies. When that is done there is a possibility for a Tamil and a Sinhalese to be returned from each of these seats.

"This proposal to carve out multi-member seats is in order to implement the promise made by Premier Dudley Senanayake to Mr. Thondaman to include the names of the Indians who will be registered in the same electoral register.

"Mrs. Bandaranaike pointed out earlier that the names of Indians cannot be included in the same list according to the Sirimavo-Shastri pact. Instead she agreed to set apart four seats to the Indians.

"As a result of this privilege extended by the UNP-FP Government to the Tamils not only will the number of seats given to

them be increased to ten but they will also have the power to influence the election of 10 more members. Ten Tamil members will be elected from the multi-member constituencies while 10 other seats will be won by the party that gets their support.

"According to the policy of the new government it will not be necessary to appoint Indian Tamils like Mr. Thondaman to Parliament. More than ten of them will be elected by the voters.

"The Indian Tamil leaders led by Mr. Thondaman are trying to expedite the implementation of this scheme. Mr. Thondaman has asked Mr. Shastri to take back the Indians as soon as possible, when he met him last time.

"The Indians who will receive citizenship will be registered according to the number of Indians who are repatriated. Therefore it is in the interest of the Indian Tamil leaders here to expedite this. If this is done within three years they hope to increase the number of Tamil MPs at the next elections."

Obviously the Editor of the Janasathiya has very conveniently forgotten that it was the Nayakkar kings from South India who ruled in Kandy from 1739.

The Plantation workers were disenfranchised by the Ceylon Citizenship Act of 1948 introduced in Parliament by the UNP led by Mr. D. S. Senanayake. Commenting on this in an article entitled "Employment of Ceylonese in the estates bill" (2) Dr. Colvin R. de Silva said:—

"In its political and franchise aspect, the "Indian" question was to Mr. D. S. Senanayake and his colleagues a class question. The enfranchised Indian was in the main an enfranchised worker who, at least in the trade union field was in daily conflict with the employer. Both his vote and his representative were therefore potentially anti-capitalist. This was demonstrated to the full when the Ceylon Indian Congress MPs aligned themselves with the Left in the first Parliament.

"Mr. D. S. Senanayake had another grouse. Despite all claims to the contrary, Mr. D. S. Senanayake was basically a racialist. That is to say a Sinhalese politician

who was concerned with the political dominance of the Sinhalese race in Ceylon. He saw in the position of the "Indians" within Ceylon's electoral system a threat to this dominance. He awaited his opportunity to remove this threat—and took it with both hands when it came."

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva refused to call these plantation workers Indians. Hence the use of the word within inverted commas. That was in 1962 when his party championed the cause of plantation workers. Now he is the spokesman for Sinhala Buddhist chauvinism and hence the different tune.

The LSSP now advocates a separate electoral register and four seats in parliament—Apartheid in practice. In 1947 these plantation workers elected 8 representatives of their own organisation and helped to elect a number of left MPs in other electorates. Dr. Colvin R. de Silva himself admits in his article that this was one of the reasons that influenced Mr. D. S. Senanayake to disenfranchise them. Now when a section of them are to be re-enfranchised after repatriating the rest, the opposition to a common electoral register and the demand for a separate register on a racial basis comes from none other than the LSSP itself. For the LSSP franchise to the plantation workers has now become a class question. Having crossed the class lines on June 10th 1964 and become survivors of the capitalist SLFP, and thereafter betrayed the workers on the 21 demands which included a wage increase for plantation workers, having become a party that not only endorsed but actively campaigned for the full implementation of the Sirimavo-Shastri pact and what is more which now insists along with Mr. Felix Dias Bandaranaike on the forcible repatriation of 5½ lakhs of these workers, the LSSP cannot expect support from these workers and it is no cause for surprise that they should now oppose arming them even with the miserable right to vote.

In the same issue of April 11th Mr. R. G. Senanayake writes an article under the caption "Are the Indians loyal to this country? The issue also reports a meeting of the Tamil speaking MPs and paints a picture of an organised attempt on the part of the

Tamil speaking people to subjugate the Sinhalese.

This theme is developed in the next issue of the JANASATHIYA dated 18th April. Under the headline—"Federalists ask for more ministries" it reports in a leader article the deliberations of a FP working committee which is supposed to have been held in Jaffna. Under the caption—"Catholic influence spreads" the same issue says:—"Catholic influence has begun to spread after the formation of the UNP-FP government. It was after the formation of the new government that a bishopric was created for Galle for the first time in history.

"In addition to appointing two Catholics and one Christian to three of the highest posts in parliament they have appointed Catholics for the posts of Mayor and Deputy Mayor in Colombo.

"Even though the last government had restricted foreign aid to Catholic organisations all these restrictions have now been removed."

The sinister hand of Catholic action is seen only when the UNP elects a Catholic for Mayor and not when the Left elected Mr. C. T. Grero. During the language debate on 19th October 1955 Dr. N. M. Perera said in reply to Mr. G. G. Ponnambalam—"It means that the best man will be appointed. The question is not whether a man is a Sinhalese or a Tamil. If he is the best man he will be appointed." But now the opposition to Mr. Vincent Perera comes because he is a Roman Catholic. Obviously the JANASATHIYA editor is not well acquainted with the subject he had to deal with. There has been a Catholic Bishop in Galle even during the time of the British.

The JANAMATHAYA, the LSSP Daily started its campaign against the minorities much earlier. In its very first issue on 4th January it attacks the Catholic church for distributing the paper "Watchtower" in Kollonnawa area. Evidently the editor of the JANAMATHAYA did not know that the "Watchtower" is published by an organisation openly hostile to the Catholic Church. On 8th January it carried a news item of a contemplated move by someone to print the "SAMASAMAJAYA", the paper they had abandoned, in a Catholic press in Bambalapitiya. The only printing



press in Bambalapitiya is the one that printed the FIGHT and the SATANA of the Bolshevik Sama Samaja Party and is owned by an Anglican. The same issue carries a newsreport of a meeting addressed by Mr. G. G. Ponnambalam under the caption "Enna Ponna". On the 18th a report of a speech made by Mr. R. G. Senanayake appeared on the front page with the headline, "All those who oppose the solution of the Indian problem are traitors". Reporting Mr. R. G. Senanayake on the "Indian" question is indeed significant.

On 5th March the following news item appears under the caption—"Trouble over the pact to repatriate Indians."

"According to the pact entered into between the UNP and the FP it is intended to sabotage the Sirimavo-Shastri agreement. Everything possible is being done to achieve this end.

"On January 15th, Mr. Thondaman went to South India. This visit is politically suspicious. The question is asked whether he discussed this agreement with DMK officials.."

Here the LSSP goes on record in their own newspaper as being resolutely behind the full implementation of the Sirimavo-Shastri pact which stands for the forcible repatriation of 5½ lakhs of plantation workers, granting of citizenship rights to 3 lakhs, considering the balance 2½ lakhs as stateless people, registering those 3 lakhs in a separate electoral register so that they may elect 4 members to represent themselves in parliament. This is what the LSSP stands for now in its attitude to this "Indian" question. Compare this with the following:

"On this question the LSSP has a position which, in addition to being in accordance to its socialist principle of uniting all sections of the oppressed regardless of differences of race, caste or creed, is the only solution to the problem from the point of view of the interests of the Ceylonese nation as a whole. While recognising the need to have a proper enforcement of the ban on immigration, on the other hand the LSSP stands for the granting of citizenship and voting rights to all residents of Indian origin who have resided

in Ceylon for a minimum number of years and desire to make Ceylon their permanent home. It is only by action along these lines that the so-called Indian problem is capable of solution, that these permanent residents of Ceylon who along with their children are going to continue to be permanent residents of this country can be welded into the Ceylonese nation with a proper consciousness of their rights and obligations and that the efforts of the capitalists to perpetuate their rule through the division and weakening of the working class movement can be defeated."

Above is an extract from the booklet "What we stand for" written by Mr. Leslie Goonawardena, Secretary of the LSSP, in February 1959. Six years later the LSSP and its secretary, Mr. Leslie Goonawardena stand for just the opposite on this question.

On March 6th a headline in the JANAMATHAYA reads—"A Portfolio for Ponna" The coalitionists never seem to get these names straight. It is always "Ponna" for Mr. G. G. Ponnambalam and "Thonda" for Mr. Thondaman. What is held out against the appointment of Mr. G. G. Ponnambalam as a Minister is the fact that he is a Tamil. What a contrast this attitude is from a party that sponsored Dr. Kumaran Ratnam and Mr. T. Rudra for the Mayorality in Colombo and Mr. P. Nagalingam for the Senate. Of course they rectified their mistake soon after, for they never sponsored Mr. Nagalingam or any other Tamil speaking person for Senatorship again. It was perhaps in keeping with the present trend towards Sinhala Buddhist supremacy that they chose Mr. Chandra Gunasekera.

On the eve of the elections, on 21st March, the JANAMATHAYA had a leader article under the following headline—"Treaty which betrays the country in the hands of Oliver Goonetilleke—a secret treaty which was brought to Dudley from Bombay". This was the final appeal to Sinhala Buddhist sentiment on the eve of the elections in order to rally the people against the UNP which had obtained the backing of the Tamil Congress and the CWC.

The JANAMATHAYA did not appear after 22nd March till 9th April, and when it did appear continued the tirade against the minorities with renewed vigour.

**“Nation grieves at Sinhalese New Year”.**

... How can we celebrate Sinhalese New Year at a time when the nation has been betrayed by an alliance of the UNP, the Catholic Church, Singleton Salmon, Thondaman, and Federalists?

**“The Sinhalese nation will weep during this Sinhalese New Year. The people who love the nation, the motherland and language will lament.”**

When we read these lines we were reminded of the celebrated words attributed to King Dutu Gemunu when asked by his mother why he could not stretch himself and sleep.

**“Catholic for Mayor”**

**“The UNP has become Santa Claus for the Catholics. They have now decided to elect a Catholic as Mayor of Colombo.”**

**“Who betrayed the people’s victory”.**

“... The forward march of 1956 has stopped. The fight against Fifty-fifty, against Federalism, against the Catholics who were up against the culture and education of the people has come to a halt.

**“The Sirimavo-Shastri pact which stood for repatriation of Indians who reside in Ceylon at present will not be implemented.**

**“The UNP-FP government has appointed two MPs instead of one to represent the Indians.**

**“The Government is not making any announcement on its attitude to religion and culture.**

**“As the Federalist Mr. Tiruchelvam has been appointed as the Minister of Local Government we repeat that the Sinhala Language Act will not be implemented.**

**“Those who shouted about saving the nation are now silent. For whom did they save the nation? Indians who have no right to be in this country. The Federalists who want to divide the country occupy an important position in Dudley Senanayake’s Government.**

**“The Indian pact is in danger. The nation is in danger. Language is in danger. The Indians have been given a place. Can anyone forget this great betrayal.”**

This appeared in the 1st issue of the JANAMATHAYA after the elections, on 9th April. The words, the language, the sentiments expressed suffice to show the level of degeneration the LSSP has reached. Now the LSSP stands for Sinhala Only with no concessions. It is relevant to recall here what Mr. Leslie Goonawardena also wrote in the booklet “What we stand for” on the language question.

**“Any effort to resolve this problem without the recognition of both Sinhalese and Tamil as official or state languages can only lead to disunity and perhaps ultimately even to division of the country. The Sinhala Only Act passed by the votes of the governing MEP and of the UNP has already ruptured the unity of the Ceylonese people. The fact that the Government has today been compelled to retreat from the position of “Sinhala Only” only provides further proof that the policy of “Sinhala Only” is not only unjust but also impracticable and that no solution can be found on these lines.**

**“As in the case of the Indian question, so also in this case, the language question is a convenient instrument for parties wedded to the system of capitalism to distract the masses from the real problems and to gain their support by rousing racial antagonisms. Our own bitter experience has shown that this path is fraught with dangers of widespread racial disturbances, division of the country and ultimate national disintegration.”**

Thus Mr. Leslie Gunawardena tacitly admits that he is now happily wedded to the capitalist class after his recently obtained divorce from the working class. How else can one explain the present attitude of the LSSP on the Language question.

An article in the JANAMATHAYA of 23rd April signed by Mr. Leslie Goonawardena under the heading “differences between words and deeds” says:—“The UNP does not seem to be keen on solving an important national problem by implementing the Sirimavo-Shastri Pact. Instead the

Throne Speech refers to proposed negotiations with the Indian Government with a view to resolving the difficulties that have arisen regarding the Indo-Ceylon pact of 1964. What are these difficulties? We do not know of any such difficulties. We can only conclude that the purpose of these negotiations is to refrain from implementing the above mentioned pact."

Mr. Leslie Goonawardena is quite clear in his attitude to this question. He does not want any modifications of the Sirimavo-Shastri pact. The LSSP paper says that the Indians have no right to be in this country, and Mr. Leslie Goonawardena of the LSSP alias Comrade K. Tilak of the Bolshevik Leninist Party of India, nods his assent.

The ATTHA continued publication as a daily without interruption after the elections. On 26th March its leader article was under the banner headline—"Dudley becomes Premier with Federal help". It had another news report under the caption "Ponnaiyalata hari pongalai". On the following day the leader story was under the headline, "Four Federal demands granted". They continued to plug this line day after day. On 30th March it headlined that—"The Language of the Saiver Government is Tamil". On 3rd April the main headline said that "a foreign language rules again". This reference was to Tamil. On 7th April the ATTHA declared that parity of status has now been given to Tamil. On the 8th it carried the news of a meeting of Tamil speaking MPs and alleged that a conspiracy against the Sinhalese was afoot. The same issue had another news item under the caption "A recent pact with 50-50 champion." On 20th April they carried a leader story under the heading "Federalists start their campaign to divide the country." By this campaign they wanted to show that the UNP had promised substantial concessions to the minorities, that the Sinhala Only bill was in danger, and that the advantages the majority community received during the period 1956—1965 at the expense of the minorities were no more. That was the level of the appeal to communalism.

On the question of the plantation workers they went much further. On March 29th reporting the Motorcade to Horagolla, the

ATTHA carried the headline—"It was Thondaman who won". They attributed the statement—"Before Meenachchi could be sent Sirimavo was chased out"—to Mr. Thondaman and put that across in a banner headline, in the front page itself on March 30th. This is a particularly vicious headline when it appears in Sinhala. To counterpose Meenachchi to Sirimavo is a direct appeal to Sinhala Buddhist sentiment. The same page carried another news item under the headline "Thondaman leaves for India like a Chola king who has conquered Ceylon." This attempts to paint the defeat of the coalition as a complete surrender of the country to the South Indians. On April 3rd the ATTHA had a leader story under the caption "Sirimavo-Shastri pact destroyed".

The ATTHA of 15th April reproduced the infamous map used by the UNP in its July 1960 election campaign. It had the same caption then used by the UNP—"National disaster". The JANASATHIYA published this same map with the statement that this division has now taken place under UNP rule.

The ATTHA of 19th April published an article by one T. Jayasiri de Silva bearing the headline—"Where are the Language heroes"? This article strikes a pathetic note. It is almost the last ditch stand of the campaign. It records with a heavy heart the failure of the communalists to sink their differences and rise to the occasion when the minorities got together and stole a march on them.

It is too much to expect from the ATTHA that it leave the Christians alone. On 6th April it carries the leader story on the new appointments in the House of Representatives with the following headlines:—"Speaker from Nattandiya, Deputy Speaker, from Chilaw, Chairman of Committees from Negombo. The editorial of the same issue is under the caption "no place for Buddhists". The ATTHA of 12th April headlines the election of a Catholic as Mayor of Colombo. On 23rd April the ATTHA carries an article under the headline "Crusade of the Church" On 8th April it deals with the coup judgement under the banner headline—"How did the Christians become conspirators." Photographs of all the Coup convicts appear above the

headline with crosses superimposed. Dr. Colvin R. de Silva in an article entitled "Political lessons from the judgement in the Coup case" published in the May Day issue of the JANAMATHAYA the organ of the LSSP makes this same point—that none of the coup suspects is a Buddhist and that all of them are Christians. No wonder the tar brush crusade was carried out successfully particularly in Dehiwala-Galkissa inspired by this newspaper campaign.

### THEN AND NOW

In a Declaration of the LSSP (October, 1955) on THE STATE LANGUAGE QUESTION we find the following:

**"The only meaning that we can attribute to their (the Sinhalese-as-the-state-language protagonists) actions is that they really stand, not for a Ceylonese nation, but for a Sinhalese nation.**

**"We would like to remind these gentlemen, if this indeed is their aim, that they are a few hundred years too late... the formation of a Sinhalese nation-state is a chimera. The very concept today is reactionary. The only way in which the Sinhalese can go forward in Ceylon today is together with the other permanent inhabitants of various races, as Ceylonese.**

**"The LSSP, which stands for the emancipation of all the toilers in Ceylon regardless of race, caste or creed, stands also for the building of a Ceylonese nation. It will continue to oppose communalism whether it be of the minority or majority. It points out that the growth of communalism in Ceylon, seven years after the transfer of power by the imperialists, is proof of the inability of the capitalist class to build a Ceylonese nation, and is testimony to the bankruptcy of capitalist leadership. This task, namely, that of building a Ceylonese nation, along with the other social and political tasks posed before the people of Ceylon, will only be solved under the leadership of the working class and its party the Lanka Sama Samaja Party."**

But today, the LSSP which at one time "stood for the emancipation (from the rule of the capitalist class) of all the toilers of

Ceylon, regardless of race, caste or creed" stands for the emancipation of the Sinhala-Buddhists, regardless of class (and moreover, not all of them but only those who have a correct understanding of Buddhist philosophy), from the "rule of the minority communities". The LSSP, which at one time pointed out that the "growth of communalism was testimony to the bankruptcy of capitalist leadership" today assumes the leadership of a resurgent communalism.

The LSSP, which at one time stood for the building of a Ceylonese nation-state now stands for "the reactionary concept of a Sinhalese nation-state". The LSSP, which at one time claimed to be the party of the working class has today become the party of the Sinhala communalists regardless of class. Today "the task of building a Ceylonese nation under the leadership of the Working class and its party, the LSSP", as part of the task of solving the social and political problems posed before the people of Ceylon, has been completely abandoned.

A few months ago the toiling masses were invited by the LSSP leaders to go forward to socialism under the leadership of Mrs. Bandaranaike, along with all the other "progressive forces". Today, the "progressive forces" have been reduced to the Sinhala-Buddhist forces which have a correct understanding of Buddhist Philosophy, and their aim has become the setting up of a Dhammasamajaya in place of a Samasamajaya. Finally, in place of the class struggle which they have abandoned, the LSSP leadership has substituted the communal struggle of the Sinhala-Buddhists against the other permanent inhabitants of various races and creeds.

That the leadership of the CP is completely in accord with their comrades of the LSSP today is completely understandable. Those past masters in the strategy of betrayal of the working class are quite pleased that they have succeeded in bringing down the LSSP leadership to their level. But among the rank and file of these two parties there are, we are certain, many who have now been disillusioned and who realise that they, together with a large section of the toiling masses, have been most heinously deceived

by their respective leaderships. In order to prevent them from calling their "leaders" to account the latter are doing their damndest to keep up the pressure of the most backward and conservative elements by pandering to their racial and religious bigotry.

Having abandoned the anti-capitalist struggle and paved the way for the regroupment of the capitalist class under the banner of the UNP, the leaders of the LSSP and the CP seek to cover up their treachery by substituting a communal 'struggle' under the pretext of 'driving a wedge between the UNP and the FP'.

Having surrendered the leadership of the working class to the communal and capitalist SLFP and thereby betrayed the linguistic and religious minorities, the leaders of the LSSP and the CP must needs compensate themselves by assuming leadership of the Sinhala-Buddhist forces and pitting them against the minorities whom they themselves have driven into the arms of the UNP and the FP. The 'leaders' cover up their treachery by diverting the feelings of the disappointed and frustrated supporters of the SLFP-LSSP-CP Coalition into a campaign of revenge against the linguistic and religious minorities who voted the National Government.

Not all their clever analyses of the March Elections can hide the stark fact that the LSSP and CP leaderships have played the role of agents of the bourgeoisie in the working class movement. By their class-collaborationist tactic of coalition with the capitalist and communalist SLFP they have deceived, disoriented and divided the working class and helped to preserve the capitalist status quo. Encouraged by the paralyzing of the anti-capitalist struggle the capitalist class has regrouped its forces and taken over not only the Government but even the "socialist" programme with which the SLFP and its Left agents fooled the masses. Unable to resuscitate the anti-capitalist struggle, the LSSP and CP leadership have no alternative but to try to cause a rift in the National Government on communal lines. But their communalist politics

only result in keeping the working class movement in a state of permanent paralysis. These so-called leaders thus continue to play their role of agents of the bourgeoisie, while their bourgeois masters sit back and let them do their dirty work of keeping the working class and proletarian masses effectively divided on communal and religious lines.

The inability of the capitalist class to solve the social and economic problems of a backward, multi-racial and multi-religious country must inevitably result in racial and religious conflict. The only way to avoid such conflicts is to provide the antagonistic factions with a clear-cut programme for struggle that will cut across all racial and religious conflicts and at the same time have as its objective the elimination of the social and economic problems that give rise to such conflicts. Only a clear-cut anti-capitalist programme with the perspective of the overthrow of the capitalist social order, that is to say, only a **Marxist programme of action** can ideologically unify the genuinely progressive forces that are desirous of a revolutionary change of the social order—the forces of the working class that lead behind them the petty-bourgeois and proletarian masses of town and country. The task of providing the revolutionary programme that will unify the genuinely **anti-capitalist forces** and lead them forward towards their objective devolves on that political party of the working class which is grounded on the theory and practice of Marxism.

When the leaderships of the LSSP and CP which claim to be parties of the working class are judged by this standard they are found to be absolute fakes. Whatever claims they may have had at one time to be considered Marxists their assumption of the leadership of the most despicable communalism of the "majority variety" is ample testimony to the absolute bankruptcy of their politics and their abandonment of Marxism, and together with it their betrayal of the Ceylonese working class and the struggle for the socialist transformation of society.

# AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF MARXISM (VI)

By R. S. BAGHAVAN

(Part V of this article appeared in issue No: 10)

## XI. THE MATERIALIST CONCEPTION OF HISTORY (Part 2)

### The Cause of Social Change

Marx not only laid bare the "anatomy of civil society", he indicated the sources of change in society the causes of social "self-movement".

"Self-movement" says Lenin, "is the core of Hegelianism...."

"This core had to be discovered understood, rescued, laid bare, refined, which is precisely what Marx and Engels did.

"The idea of universal movement and change (1813 *Logic*) was conjectured before its application to life and society. In regard to society it was proclaimed earlier (1847) than it was demonstrated in application to man (1859)"\* (259)

For Marx, history was "the self-developing social state" of man. (260). From his point of view "the evolution of the economic formation of society is viewed as a process of natural history." (261). He showed the cause of social self-movement by indicating the contradictions and the conflicts in human society and history.

"The development of the contradictions within a historical form of production is the only way in which they can be resolved and a new form established," Marx says, summing up the principle of social self-movement. (262).

Lenin emphasised this: "...Social development...proceeds in contradictions and through contradictions..." (263)

### Stages of Social Development

"The history of the development of human society", says Trotsky, "is the history of the succession of various systems of economy, each operating in accordance with its own laws." (264).

Marx characterised these social systems by their production relations: "In broad outlines, Asiatic, ancient (slave), feudal and modern bourgeois modes of production can be designated as progressive epochs in the economic formation of society." (265)

Each epoch had its characteristic mode of production, its property relations, its class structure and its state form.

As we have seen earlier, Marx analysed the contradictory nature of production, classes and property. The very existence of the state is an indication of the contradictory and conflicting interests in the social structure. (266).

### Social Production v. Individual Appropriation

How did the transition from one such epoch to another occur? What caused the change? Where was the contradiction?

Marx pointed out that *the basic contradiction in all class society is that production is social while appropriation is individual* (267)

All class society is based on the expropriation of the surplus product of the producers by the class which has the monopoly of the means of production.

"Surplus-produce must have been produced by the slave, or the slave-owner would not have kept any slaves. Surplus-produce must have been produced by the serf, or serfdom would have been of no use to the landed gentry. Surplus-produce, only to a considerably larger extent, is likewise produced by the wage worker, or the capitalist would have no need to buy labour power. The class struggle is nothing else than the struggle for surplus produce," writes Trotsky. (268).

The contradiction between social production and individual appropriation finds expression in the contradiction between pro-

---

\*The reference is to Hegel's *Logic* (1812 & 1813), Marx & Engels' *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (written 1847) and Darwin's *Origin of Species* (published 1859).

ductive forces and production relations, and in class conflicts, which, in their extreme development, lead to the revolutionary transformation of society or its self-destruction.

### **Productive Forces v. Production Relations**

"The history of society," writes Marx, "is the history of the material production and of the contradictions between the material forces of production and the production relations which arose and are solved in the course of development." (269).

At a certain stage of the development of the productive forces, there occurs a negation in the character of the production relations:

"In the development of productive forces a stage is reached where productive forces and means of intercourse are called into being which, under the existing relations, can only work mischief, and which are, therefore, no longer productive but destructive forces," says Marx. (270).

At this stage society enters a critical period.

"At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production, or—what is but a legal expression for the same thing—with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relationships turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change of economic foundation the entire superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed..." writes Marx in the summing up in his *Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy*. (271).

### **The Rise and Fall of Slave Societies**

We have seen that in pre-class society, when productivity increased and surplus was produced, tribal relations broke down and slavery arose. (272). The first victim of man's advance was man himself.

The exploitation of slave labour, it is true, yielded a greater surplus, but on the whole productivity was less than in the older society. Slave labour crushed the free crafts and crippled technological advance-

ment. "...It is a universal principle in production by slave labour that none but the rudest and heaviest implements shall be used..." observes Marx. (273).

Moreover, the slave system, based on violence, had to be preserved by war. The exploitation of slaves had to be augmented by conquest and plunder. Not only had the frontiers to be expanded and rival slave states crushed, new slaves had constantly to be captured. The history of ancient Greece is the history of chronic rivalry between the city states; the history of ancient Rome, that of constant struggle to expand her empire.

War inevitably drained the resources of the slave states, demanding a great and crippling sacrifice of men and materials.

Slavery led society into a blind alley, and slave societies were destroyed by their inner contradictions.\*

### **The Decline of Feudalism.**

The feudal system, which replaced the slave societies in Europe, was no solution to the contradictions of class society. (274). However, a new property system and new class relations permitted the productive forces to develop to a higher level than under slavery.

"In the feudal period," says Marx, "the chief forms of property consisted on the one hand of landed property with serf labour chained to it, and on the other hand of individual labour with small capital commanding the labour of journey-men..." (275)

The growth and the rise of the towns, the intensification of the conflict between town and country (276), on the one hand, and the internecine wars between the feudal states, and since the end of the 15th Century, the voyages of discovery and conquest of the world, on the other, led to a rapid development of the means of production; and these at a certain stage of their growth conflicted with the production relations.

"The feudal system of industry, in which industrial production was monopolised by

\*For detailed accounts of slave society see Engels *The origin of the family and Kautsky The Foundations of Christianity*.

**BOOKS — PAMPHLETS**

by LEON TROTSKY

	Rs. c.
My Life	12 50
Permanent Revolution	10 00
Revolution Betrayed	12 50
In Defense of Marxism	12 50
Third International after Lenin	12 50
Terrorism and Communism	9 50
The Russian Revolution (edited)	8 50
Diary in Exile	8 50
The Essential Trotsky	6 80
A Trotsky Anthology	5 00
Living Thoughts of Karl Marx	3 00
Where is Britain Going ?	2 50
Problems of Life	1 00
The Only Road for Germany	1 00
In Defence of October	50
Culture and Socialism	50

**SURIYA BOOKSHOP**388, Galle Road,  
Wellawatte.

closed guilds, now no longer sufficed for the growing wants of the new markets..." notes the *Manifesto*. (277).

**The Origins of Capitalism**

The economic forces of capitalism emerged out of and in mortal conflict with the feudal system.

Marx points out: "The economic structure of capitalist society has grown out of the economic structure of feudal society. The dissolution of the latter set free the elements of the former." (278).

In the *Communist Manifesto* he says: "...The means of production and exchange, on whose foundation the bourgeoisie built itself up, were generated in feudal society. At a certain stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange... the feudal relations of property became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces; they became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder.

"In their place stepped free competition, accompanied by a social and political constitution adapted to it, and by the economical and political sway of the bourgeois class." (279).

This process was protracted over several centuries and always accompanied by violence. Bourgeois power was everywhere achieved through civil war, revolution and conquest.

"Capital," Marx says, "comes dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt." (280).

**The Revolutionary Role of Capitalism**

One has only to glance through Section 1 of the *Communist Manifesto* to realize the importance and credit Marx and Engels gave to the world role of the capitalist class.

"The bourgeoisie, historically has played a most revolutionary part," they wrote (281)

Capitalism played a progressive historical role in breaking down all feudal fetters on the development of the forces of production.

It harnessed the forces of production to the discoveries of science and technology.

It developed further the division of labour, increased productivity, organized the labour force and rationalized production as far as the individual factory was concerned.

It discovered and conquered the world, making the whole globe its market, and later, its field of investment. It created the international division of labour, covered the planet with a network of transport and communication, drew backward peoples into its civilization.

It flooded the world not only with cheap commodities but with education and a world literature. "The intellectual creations of individual nations became common property," states the *Manifesto*. (282).

At the same time, however, it concentrated the means of production further and the appropriators of the social product became fewer. The basic contradiction of class society, far from being resolved, became aggravated.



The more capitalism became the dominant mode of production, "the more glaring necessarily became the incompatibility of social production with capitalist appropriation," writes Engels. (283).

And, politically, "The contradiction between social production and capitalist appropriation became manifest as the antagonism between proletariat and bourgeoisie." (284).

### The Contradictions of Capitalist Society.

Marx's voluminous writing on economics which is the bulk of his total literary output is a criticism of the capitalist system and an analysis of its contradictions.

Suffice it here briefly to pinpoint some of the major features of the capitalist system.

".. The tendency of capitalist production", says Marx, is "to develop the productive forces in such a way that only the absolute power of consumption of the entire society would be their limit." (285).

Having unleashed productive forces capital places a limit on production determined by the profit motive. The contradiction between social production and individual accumulation, far from being eliminated, manifests itself in a new, and more intense form.

Thus arises "the antagonistic character" of the capitalist system which Marx describes:

".. The production relations in which the bourgeoisie moves have not a simple, uniform character, but a dual character; that in the self-same relations in which wealth is produced, poverty is produced also; that in the self-same relations in which there is a development of the productive forces, there is also a force producing repression; that these relations produce *bourgeois wealth*, i.e., the wealth of the bourgeois class, only by continually annihilating the wealth of the individual members of this class and by producing an ever-growing proletariat.. ." (286).

### Anarchy in Production

".. On the present false base," says Marx, "every development of the productive

powers of labour must tend to deepen social contrasts and point social antagonisms." (287).

Although at the level of the individual factory production is organized and rationalised, there is anarchy in social production.

".. In a society with capitalist production, anarchy in the social division of labour and despotism in that of the workshop mutually condition one another.." notes Marx. (288).

Apologists for capitalism never tired of praising this period of free competition and drew from Marx a scathing comment:

"The social division of labour confronts, one with another, independent producers of commodities who recognize no other authority than that of competition, the coercion exercised upon them by the pressure of their reciprocal interests—*just as in the animal kingdom the war of all against all maintains, more or less, the condition of existence of all species*" (289).

Engels added: "Darwin did not know what a bitter satire he wrote on mankind, and especially on his own countrymen, when he showed that free competition, the struggle for existence, which the economists celebrate as the highest historical achievement, is the normal state of the *animal kingdom*". (290).

Capitalism, precisely because of the contradiction between social labour and the profit motive, has never been able to work on the basis of a national plan. The closest capitalist nations ever reached to a national plan was under conditions of total war and destruction.

### The Product is Master of the Producer

Production regulated by the principle of profit-making can never be anything but blind. Whereas originally commerce ruled production and demand created supply, capitalist production rules commerce, and millions are wasted in advertising for the creation of demand to meet the supply.

Engels writes:

"Every society based on commodity production has the peculiarity that in it

the producers have lost control of their own social relationships. Anarchy reigns in social production. But commodity production, like all other forms of production, has its own laws, which are inherent in and inseparable from it; and these laws assert themselves in spite of anarchy and through anarchy. These laws are manifested in the sole form of social relationship which continues to exist, in exchange, and enforce themselves on the individual producers as compulsory laws of competition. They assert themselves therefore apart from the producers and against the producers, as the natural laws of their form of production, working blindly. The product dominates the producers." (291)

"All kinds of capitalist production" writes Marx, "in so far as they are not merely labour processes but also processes for promoting the self-expansion of capital, have this in common, that in them the worker does not use the instruments of labour, but the instruments of labour use the worker. However, it is only in machine production that this inversion acquires a technical and palpable reality. Through its conversion into an automaton, the instrument of labour comes to confront the worker during the labour process as capital, as dead labour, which controls the living labour and sucks it dry." (292).

### World Market and Nation State

While capitalism was successful in creating a world market, its political achievement could not go beyond the creation of the national state, at most with colonial appendages.

This contradiction between restricting political frontiers and insatiable economic drives, led to the unceasing effort to expand national boundaries and conquer new territories and thus to chronic convulsions of permanent war.

The bourgeoisie "has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood," notes the *Manifesto*. (293).

Writing in the period of the First World War, when rival capitalist nations battled

for control of the world market, Rosa Luxemburg states:

"Today, nothing is as striking, nothing of such decisive importance for the shaping of social and political life as the glaring contradiction between the economic groundwork, which grows daily stronger and more closely-knit, which unites all peoples and all lands into one large entity—and the political superstructures, the national states—which attempt to divide humanity into alien and hostile portions, by artificial means, by border lines, tariff barriers, and militarism." (294).

She adds: "Storms are brewing in world economy which will wipe the 'microcosm' of the bourgeois state from the face of the earth as if it were a chicken coop.." (295).

Rosa Luxemburg's optimism proved premature. Imperialism survived the First World War, but the contradictions between state form and world market soon embroiled the nations in another World War.

Trotsky summarises the problem:

"Capitalism achieved the twin historical merit of having placed technique on a high level and having bound all parts of the world with economic ties. Thus it pledged the material pre-requisites for the systematic utilization of all of our planet's resources. However, capitalism is in no position to fulfil this urgent task. The nidus of its expansion continues to consist of circumscribed nationalist states with their customs houses and armies. Yet the productive forces have long ago outgrown the boundaries of the national state, thereby transforming what was once a progressive historical factor into an unendurable restraint. Imperialist wars are nothing else than the detonations of productive forces against the state border, which have come to be too confining for them.." (296).

### Crises

"Capitalist production cannot develop except by fits and starts," notes Lenin, "two steps forward and one step—sometimes even both steps—back." (297).

This is clearest at the time of world market crises. Even pre-Marxist writers have

noted the absurdity that "In civilization, poverty springs from superabundance itself." (298).

"In world market crises," says Marx "the contradictions and antagonisms of bourgeois production break through to the surface." (299).

It would be worth our while to look a little deeper into Marx's explanations of the market crises of capitalism, for here, all the laws of dialectical development are dramatically illustrated.

"Periodically, the conflict of antagonistic agencies seeks vent in crises. The crises are always but momentary and forcible solutions of the existing contradictions, violent eruptions, which restore the disturbed equilibrium for a while:

"The contradiction, generally speaking, consists in this, that the capitalist mode of production has a tendency to develop the productive forces absolutely regardless of the value and of surplus value contained in it and regardless of the social conditions under which capitalist production takes place; while it has on the other hand for its aim the preservation of the value of the existing capital and its self-expansion to the highest limit..." (300).

"The last cause of all real crises," Marx explains, "always remains the poverty and restricted consumption of the masses as compared to the tendency of capitalist production to develop the productive forces in such a way that only the absolute power of consumption of the entire society would be their limit." (301).

In such periods, society, in the words of the Manifesto, "suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism." (302).

"The contradiction," says Engels, "has grown into an absurdity. *The mode of production rises in rebellion against the form of exchange.* The bourgeoisie are convicted of incapacity further to manage their own social productive forces." (303).

#### **The Immanent Barriers of Capitalist Development.**

Marx's analysis of the inner workings of capitalist economy revealed the immanent barriers of the capitalist system.

He writes: "The capitalist mode of production...meets with barriers at a certain scale of production which would be inade-

quate under different conditions. It comes to a standstill at a point determined by the production and realization of profit, not by the satisfaction of social needs." (304).

"Since the aim of capital is not to minister to certain wants, but to produce profits, and since it accomplishes this purpose by methods which adapted the mass of production to the scale of production, not vice versa, conflict must continually ensue between the limited conditions of consumption on a capitalist basis and production which for ever tends to exceed its immanent barriers." (305).

"Capitalist production is continually engaged in the attempt to overcome these immanent barriers, but it overcomes them only by means which again place the same barriers in its way in a more formidable size.

*"The real barrier of capitalist production is capital itself.*

"...This unconditional development of the productive forces of society comes continually into conflict with the limited end, the self-expansion of the existing capital. Thus while the capitalist mode of production is one of the historical means by which the material forces of production are developed and the world-market required for them created it is at the same time in continual conflict with this historical task and the conditions of social production corresponding to it." (306).

#### **The Absolute General Law of Capitalist Accumulation**

"Accumulation of capital is," Marx points out "increase of the proletariat." (307). "Accumulation of wealth at one pole is therefore at the same time accumulation of misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental degradation, at the opposite pole, i.e., on the side of the class that produces its own product in the form of capital." (308)

The "antagonistic character" (308) of capitalism polarizes society, pauperises ever increasing layers of the population, cutting them off from the consumption of produce and thus limits the market for commodities. Marx's so-called "Theory of Increasing Misery" has been attacked by almost every bourgeois critic. Optimistic blindness, is, however, no refutation of Marx's analysis:

"The same causes which develop the expansive power of capital, develops also the labour power at its disposal. The relative mass of the industrial reserve army increases therefore with the potential energy of wealth. But the greater this reserve army in proportion to the active labour army, the greater is the mass of a consolidated surplus population, whose misery is in inverse ratio to its torment of labour. The more extensive, finally, the Lazarus-layers of the working class, and the industrial reserve army, the greater is official pauperism. *This is the absolute general law of Capitalist accumulation.*" (309).

### The Historical Tendency of Capitalist Development

Capitalist economy not only comes up against the limits set by its own development, it creates at the same time the forces necessary for overcoming these limits, forces that bring about capitalism's, self destruction.

"The laws of appropriation or of private property," Marx says laws that are based on the production and circulation of commodities, become by their own inner and inexorable dialectic changed into their very opposite." (310.)

"By maturing material conditions, and the combination on a social scale of the processes of production, it matures the contradictions and antagonisms of the capitalist form of production, and thereby provides, along with elements for the formation of a new society, the forces for exploding the old one." (311).

"The contradiction between capital as a general social power and as a power of private capitalists over the social conditions of production develops into an ever more irreconcilable clash, which implies the dissolution of these relations and the elaboration of the conditions of production into universal common social conditions." (312).

In the last Chapter but one of the first Volume of *Capital*, Marx sums up "the immanent laws of capitalist production", the historical tendency of capitalist accumulation:

"Along with the constantly diminishing number of magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolise all advantages of this process of transformation grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation,

exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organized by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung and flourished along with it and under it. Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated.

"The capitalist mode of appropriation, the result of the capitalist mode of production, produces capitalist private property. This is the first negation of individual private property, as founded on the labour of the proprietor. But capitalist private property begets, with the inexorability of a law of Nature, its own negation. It is the negation of the negation.

"The transformation of scattered private property into capitalist private property is, naturally, a process incomparably more protracted, violent, and difficult, than the transformation of capitalistic private property, already practically resting on socialized production into social property. In the former case we had the expropriation of the mass of the people by a few usurpers; in the latter, we have the expropriation of a few usurpers by the mass of the people." (313).

(To be continued).

### REFERENCES

259. *Lenin Collected Works* Vol. 38, p. 114
260. *Marx-Engels Selected Works* Moscow Vol. I, p. 351.
261. *Capital*. I Modern Library Edn. p. 15
262. *Ibid* p. 534-5
263. *Marx-Engels-Marxism* p. 288.
264. *Trotsky Living Thoughts of Marx* Cassel p. 3.
265. *Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy*, Sel. Works I p. 329. Cf. p. 84.
266. *German Ideology* p. 23; *Poverty of Philosophy*, Moscow. p. 174.
267. *Selected Works II* p. 141; *Anti-Duhring* Moscow p. 390; *Plekhanov Selected Works I*, p. 419 et seq.

268. *Trotsky Living Thoughts* pp. 8-9.  
 269. — Cf. *Sel. Works I* 38.  
 270. *German Ideology* p. 68; see also p. 73  
 271. *Sel. Works I* 329.  
 272. *Anti-Duhring* pp. 180-1; 216-217; *Origin of the Family*, etc.  
 273. *Capital I* 219.  
 274. *Poverty of Philosophy* p. 122.  
 275. *German Ideology* p. 12.  
 276. *Capital I* pp. 386-7; *German Ideology* p. 13, *Origin of the Family M Sel. Works II* p. 282 et. seq. *Kautsky Foundations of Christianity* p. 25 et. seq.  
 277. *Sel. Works I* p. 35  
 278. *Capital I*, p. 786  
 279. *Sel. Works I* p. 39  
 280. *Capital I* p. 834  
 281. *Sel. Works I* p. 35  
 282. *Ibid* p. 36  
 283. *Anti-Duhring, Moscow*. p. 298.  
 284. *Ibid* p. 299. et seq.  
 285. *Capital III Moscow* pp. 472-3  
 286. *Poverty of Philosophy* p. 123  
 287. *Sel. Works* p. 346.  
 288. *Capital I* 391. Cf. *Engels Sel Works II* pp. 131 & 141.  
 289. *Capital I* p. 391.  
 290. *Dialectics of Nature Moscow* p. 35; *Engels Sel. Works II* p. 311.  
 291. *Anti-Duhring* p. 299.  
 292. *Capital I* p. 462. Also see p. 396; 681  
 293. *Sel. Works I* p. 36.  
 294. *Rosa Luxemburg What is Economics? Pioneers 1954* pp. 28-9.  
 295. *Ibid* p. 29.  
 296. *Living Thoughts of Marx* pp. 43-44.  
 297. *Lenin Sel. Works. V.* p. 75.  
 298. *Anti-Duhring* p. 287. Cf. *Sel. Works II* 134.  
 299. *Marx Theories of Surplus Value* Chap. 2, 4c.  
 300. *Capital III* p. 244.  
 301. *Ibid*  
 302. *Sel. Works I* p. 38.  
 303. *Sel. Works II* p. 142.  
 304. *Capital III* 253.  
 305. *Ibid* 251.  
 306. *Ibid* 245.  
 307. *Capital I* p. 673.  
 308. *Ibid* p. 709.  
 309. *Ibid* p. 707.  
 310. *Ibid* p. 552.  
 311. *Capital I* p. 552  
 312. *Capital III* 259.  
 313. *Capital I* pp. 834 et. seq. Also *Sel. Correspondence* pp. 353-354

for

BUILDING  
 DRAINAGE  
 WATER SERVICE  
 DECORATION  
 ALTERATION

**TUDAWE BROS., LIMITED.**

505/2, Narahenpitiya Road,  
 COLOMBO 5.

Telephone: 84494

# From the Arsenal of Marxism

## TROTSKY ON POPULAR FRONTISM

*(The following is an extract from An Open Letter to the Workers of India written from Coyoacan, Mexico in July 1939. Although it was addressed to the workers of India Trotsky's warning was directed to the workers of all colonial and semi-colonial countries. Many of those countries, such as India and Ceylon, have since then been granted 'independence' by their imperialist masters. But the capitalist classes of these newly 'freed' countries still maintain their ties with the imperialists who retain their grip on the economy of these countries through their Banks, Agency Houses, raw material producing industries (plantations) etc.*

*There is however a section of the capitalist class of such countries which tries to black-mail the imperialists into parting with a share of the means of exploitation. These are the 'National bourgeoisie' who put themselves forward as leaders of the struggle for national independence. The Stalinists have always functioned as their agents in the working class movement and advocated an alliance between these so-called "progressive" bourgeoisies and the working class. In Ceylon they have been joined by the fake Trotskyists of what was at one time considered to be the most powerful Trotskyist party in the world. And today the Ceylon working class also has had its own experience of betrayal by the united petty bourgeois agents of the "progressive" bourgeoisie who have established themselves in the working class movement.—Ed.)*

The Stalinists cover up their policy of servitude to British, French and USA imperialism with the formula of a "Peoples Front". What a mockery of the people! **'Peoples' Front' is only a new name for that old policy, the gist of which lies in class collaboration, in a coalition between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.** In every such coalition, the leadership invariably turns out to be in the hands of the right-wing, that is, in the hands of the propertied class. The Indian bourgeoisie, as has already been stated, wants peaceful horse-trading and not a struggle. **Coalition with the bourgeoisie leads to the proletariat's abnegating the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. The policy of coalition implies marking time, temporizing, cherishing false hopes, hollow manoeuvres and intrigues.** As a result of this policy, disillusionment inevitably sets in among the working masses, while the peasants turn their backs on the proletariat and fall into apathy. The German revolution, the Austrian, the Chinese revolution, and the Spanish revolution have all perished as a result of coalition policy. The selfsame danger also menaces the Indian revolution where the Stalinists, under the guise of a "People's Front", are putting across a **policy of subordinating the proletariat to the bourgeoisie. This signifies, in action, a rejection of the revolutionary agrarian programme, a refusal**

**to arm the workers, a rejection of the struggle for power, a rejection of revolution.**

If the Indian bourgeoisie ever finds itself compelled to take even the tiniest step on the road of struggle against Britain's arbitrary domination, the proletariat will naturally support such a step. But they will support it with **their own** methods: mass meetings, bold slogans, strikes, demonstrations, and more decisive combat actions, depending on the relationship of forces and the circumstances. **Precisely to do this the proletariat must have its hands free. Complete independence from the bourgeoisie is indispensable to the proletariat, above all in order to exert influence on the peasantry, the dominant mass of India's population.** Only the proletariat is capable of advancing a bold, revolutionary agrarian programme, of rousing and rallying tens of millions of peasants and leading them in struggle against the native oppressors and British imperialism. The alliance of workers and poor peasants is the only honest, reliable alliance that can assure the final victory of the Indian revolution. (Emphasis added).

\* \* \*

(The full text of this Letter can be found in THE AGE OF PERMANENT REVOLUTION: A TROTSKY ANTHOLOGY—Ed. Isaac Deutscher—Laurel Paperback).

**Lanka**

# ENVELOPES

160% 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

160% 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**