

# YOUNG

# SOCIALIST

EDITORIALS ON: The UNP and the Workers; For a United Front of the Working Class; Oily Business; SLFP sacrifices Teachers to the UNP; The Plight of the University Students; Coup d'etat in Algeria; The Indo-Pakistan War.

Leon Trotsky  
1879—1940

My Life with Trotsky  
by Natalia Sedova Trotsky

Who is taking whom for a Ride?  
by Wilfred Pereira

The Revolution in South Vietnam  
by Prins Rajasooriya

The British Young Socialist Movement  
by Upali Cooray

The Guerrilla Movement in Guatemala—Discussion Article  
by the Editors

An Introduction to the Philosophy of Marxism (Part VII)  
by R. S. Baghavan

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 4

October 1965

Whole Number 14

---

## *Editorial Notes*

### THE UNP AND THE WORKERS

The published reports of the speeches of the Prime Minister and the Minister of State at the 16th Annual Sessions of the UNP manifest the keen desire of these two leaders of the Ceylonese bourgeoisie to secure the support of the working class for their new government. Mr. Dudley Senanayake has said that the services of the workers of this country are considered essential for the improvement of the economic conditions of the country as well as for the stability of the government. Obviously, he has not forgotten the great Hartal of 12th August 1953, nor the powerful strikes waged by various sections of the working class under the SLFP regimes. Mr J. R. Jayawardena has said that the workers should "forget their politics, if any, and give their best to the duly elected government of the country." Obviously, he has not forgotten the shattering political defeat of the UNP in the 1956 general election, to which the enfranchised and politically conscious workers made a very big contribution.

What is of political significance to the working class in the speeches of the two bourgeois leaders is that they are seeking working class support for the present government **in the same way** that leaders of the SLFP led governments of the last nine years have sought it: that is by seeking to deceive the workers into believing that the improvement of their conditions of life as workers depends on their giving **their sweat** to the bourgeoisie and **their political support** to the bourgeois government. What the working class must bear in mind is that it did swallow, to a large extent, the promises

held out to the workers by the late S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike and by his widow, when they sought the co-operation of the workers to the self-same end.

If there is one lesson that at least the more developed sections of the working class should have learnt by now, it is that political support of a government that maintains bourgeois rule, and sweating submissively for the bourgeoisie does **not** bring even the most meagre improvement in their conditions of life. The lakhs of plantation workers who followed Thondaman and Aziz provide a striking example of this fact. **Those workers gave their full support to the various SLFP—led Governments since 1956 and also did not carry out a single strike on the plantations for an improvement in their wages or living conditions.** With what result? They did not get **even the paltry special living allowance of Rs. 17-50** from the bourgeois plantation owners, whose ownership of the plantations remained as firmly established when the Bandaranaikes headed the government as when the Senanayakes or Kotelawala headed it.

Today Thondaman has swung over from Mrs. Bandaranaike's SLFP to Dudley Senanayake's UNP. Aziz hangs uncertainly between N. M. Perera, Pieter Keuneman, Leslie Goonewardena and the "Coalition Leftists" still hang behind Mrs. Bandaranaike. Whither the workers, on the plantations and elsewhere? **There is only one correct road for them—the road of the class struggle under their own class banner—the road to the overthrow of bourgeois rule and the establishment of a workers' state in Ceylon.**

To that end the workers will spurn collaboration with the bourgeois regimes either of the UNP or the SLFP. To J. R. Jayawardena's request that they "forget their politics" the workers will reply: We will abandon **class collaborationist** politics and turn to **Revolutionary** politics instead!

## FOR A UNITED FRONT OF THE WORKING CLASS

The Hartal of August 1953 demonstrated to the capitalist class the growing opposition to UNP rule and the potentiality of the mass movement then under the leadership of the LSSP. After a further brief period of unstable UNP rule the bourgeoisie handed over power to its liberal wing represented by the SLFP. The SLFP government trying to balance itself between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat was compelled to disrupt the capitalist economy in order to maintain class equilibrium. It was compelled to dip into the state finances in order to supplement wages by means of food subsidies etc. In order to conserve

the state finances it was compelled to increase taxation, curtail imports. In its efforts to subsidise the new industrialists seeking to produce substitutes for formerly imported goods it was compelled to clamp down a wage freeze in spite of the rising cost of living. When these measures tended to disrupt social equilibrium, the SLFP called in the aid of the Left Fakers in order to contain the growing mass opposition within safe limits. But nothing the SLFP could do with the aid of the 'golden brains' could succeed in restoring the capitalist economy. All the measures intended to assist the industrialists and particularly the 'little men' only resulted in antagonising the more powerful trading and landed interests and disrupting the capitalist economy, and further depleting the state finances.

## YOUNG SOCIALIST

Printed by John James Sarangapany for Sydney Wanasinghe, 388, Galle Road, Colombo 6, at the Wesley Press, 490, Havelock Road, Col. 6.

Contents	Page
Editorial Notes ... ..	139
Leon Trotsky 1879—1940 <i>by the Editors</i> ... ..	145
My Life with Trotsky <i>by Natalia Sedova Trotsky</i> ... ..	147
Who is taking whom for a Ride <i>by Wilfred Pereira</i> ... ..	154
The Revolution in South Vietnam <i>by Prins Rajasooriya</i> ... ..	161
The British Young Socialist Movement <i>by Upali Cooray</i> ... ..	169
The Guerrilla Movement in Guatemala— <i>discussion article by the Editors</i> ... ..	172
An Introduction to the Philosophy of Marxism (Part VII) <i>by R. S. Baghavan</i> ... ..	179

Volume 3. No. 4. October, 1965 Whole No. 14

**Editorial Board:** WILFRED PEREIRA  
SYDNEY WANASINGHE

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

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

**All correspondence and remittances to:-**

SYDNEY WANASINGHE,  
388, Galle Road,  
Colombo 6, Ceylon.

But once the more powerful sections of the bourgeoisie felt that the working class had been given its quietus, even though temporarily, they decided that the time had come to hand power back to the UNP in order to restore the capitalist economy. It is to the accomplishment of this urgent task that the UNP has now addressed itself and that is the significance of the measures now incorporated in its first budget with their reliance on the big bourgeoisie to whom concessions are being given for the capitalist development of the country. This shift of the bourgeois apparatus rightwards will widen the gulf between bourgeoisie and proletariat and also between the bourgeois state and the basic elementary needs of the economy and the living standards of the people, and will thereby create the conditions for a new upsurge of the working class movement.

Just as the urgent task of the bourgeoisie is to repair the capitalist economy at the expense primarily of the proletariat, so also is it the urgent need of the proletariat to close its ranks in preparation for the struggles ahead. The most weighty sections of the capitalist class in relation to the economy have now got together under the banner of the UNP. However the struggle that lies ahead must be waged not merely as an anti-UNP struggle but as an anti-CAPITALIST struggle, and it must be fought under the hegemony of the working class. The means of unifying the presently divided and disoriented working

class is the United Front of working class organisations on an agreed list of common anti-capitalist demands.

The 50 million dollars foreign aid offered by international finance capital to the UNP government is only a token advance. The massive aid that is needed will be forthcoming only if the UNP proves to the satisfaction of its imperialist masters that it is capable of keeping its promises to provide a salubrious investment climate—promises on which the first advance payment is being made. The severity of the struggles ahead can be gauged when it is remembered that the full weight of world imperialism would be on the side of the government to defend its investments. The mobilisation of the toiling masses of town and country for this struggle can be accomplished only by the working class provided that the working class itself shows that it has closed its ranks to present a solid front not merely for the defence of its living standards but for taking the offensive for the overthrow of the capitalist social order.

#### OILY BUSINESS

The Dudley Senanayake Government has rushed through legislation legalising its payment of compensation to the oil companies outside the provisions of the Ceylon Petroleum Corporation Act. That Dudley Senanayake has also violated the principles regarding retrospective legislation, which he so stoutly defended against the previous SLFP-led governments, indicates the urgency of the need of the Ceylon bourgeoisie to come to terms with their imperialist masters while the masses are still unprepared to intervene—thanks to the class-collaborationist tactics of the Left Fakers.

N. M. Perera has admitted in parliament that he too negotiated with the oil tycoons unofficially and that he had the approval of the Coalition cabinet to bid up to Rs. 47 million. He, however, avers that the Coalition government would not have **paid** any compensation against the provisions of the Ceylon Petroleum Corporation Act; i.e. that the two parties would have gone before the prescribed Tribunal for final sanction. However, the fall of the Coalition has prevented the testing of these good intentions.

But the pressure to which the Coalition government was subjected and its readiness to yield is indicated by N. M. Perera's admission that his negotiations with the oil tycoons took place on **their initiative**. Whether it is the previous Coalition government or the present UNP-led Government, the oil tycoons were out to cash in on the Government's desperate financial plight. Not that a few millions more or less would have made much of a difference to the oil companies. All that they were concerned about was to show the Ceylon bourgeoisie its place (on its knees) after the SLFP-LSSP Coalition had put the working class in its place (dangling at the end of a noose).

What is noteworthy about this oily deal is the ease with which the UNP-led Government was able to utilise the 'democratic process' to legalise its violation of an Act of Parliament that was passed with the UNP's consent. So much for parliamentary democracy! All this has been sought to be justified by the fact that by making an illegal but quick deal with the oil companies, the 'country' was getting five times the amount of the compensation in "soft" foreign loans. The SLFP-LSSP-CP opposition made radical noises in parliament and denounced the deal as a "sell-out". But these people who now call themselves the "United Socialist Opposition" and claim to have the backing of the majority of the Sinhala-Buddhist masses, are utterly incapable of mobilising any united opposition in the "extra-parliamentary arena" of which they have recently been talking (vide the victimised teachers). Having sold out the class struggle in order to support the "progressive" bourgeoisie of the SLFP and paved the way for the return of the long-standing friends of the imperialists, the Left Fakers can only try to cover up their own treachery by accusing the Government of "selling the country"—the typical 'catch thief' tactic of even the not so golden-brainy thief in flight from his pursuers.

The "sell-out" consists not in the payment of compensation considerably in excess of the assessed value of the oil companies assets—the previous coalition government too was prepared to do this!—nor in its violation of the law, but in its being a token of the softness of the Ceylon bourgeoisie, their eagerness to restore good relations

with their imperialist overlords and an earnest of the UNP-led Government's intentions to honour its debts at all times and at the expense of the toiling masses.

As long as this country is ruled by a capitalist government the penetration of international finance capital under the guise of 'foreign aid' must result in strengthening the partnership of local and foreign capitalists for the intensified exploitation of the toiling masses and the abandonment sooner or later of all pretences of democracy. The present overtures of the Government towards the working class are intended to lull the workers and keep them in their present state of passivity to which the Left Fakers have brought them, until the Government is ready for a direct assault with 'foreign aid' on their democratic rights. The ability of the working class to fight back before it is too late depends on its freeing itself from the class-collaborationist noose which the Left Fakers helped Mrs. Bandaranaike to place round its neck. An attempt to struggle with one's head in a noose must only result in breaking one's neck.

### THE SLFP SACRIFICES TEACHERS TO UNP

One of the first acts of the Government through its Minister of Education was to interdict 143 teachers and transfer nearly 3000 others for allegedly taking part in politics, i.e., the election campaign.

Most of these victims are members of the Jathika Guru Sangamaya. Also, it is no secret that the sympathies of the majority of them were with the outgoing Coalition Government.

The whole business was carried out with a bureaucratic indifference to the merits of each case. Departmental officials made ex-parte decisions, in many cases at the request of the victorious Government MPs, and defeated UNP candidates seeking political revenge.

In many instances, families have been broken up, contrary to all the rules of the service. The teachers of this country were the first victims of the new "democracy".

The struggle against the transfers, we regret to note, fizzled out. Its leadership was half-hearted, weak-kneed and chicken-chested. One could of course expect no better from a **political** leadership that had long ago sold out the workers for a few cabinet posts.

However, large the casualty list may be, if the teachers were to learn the central lesson of their recent experience, we may see the beginning of a new wave of struggles.

Let them remember that political rights for government servants including teachers was one of the 21 demands. Let them remember that they are today paying the price for the failure of the SLFP-LSSP Coalition to grant the demand for political rights. The teachers, as all other sections of the workers can take the next step on the road to victory only when they break with the opportunist leadership that sold them to the UNP.

### THE PLIGHT OF THE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

The thousands of youth who have been fortunate enough to be selected for University education have had a foretaste of the life that is ahead of them.

We do not refer to the adolescent pranks of the "seniors" in ragging the freshers, which the capitalist press has spotlighted in order to cover up the far more serious problems facing these students.

The shortage of classroom accommodation, furniture etc. which was the characteristic of **rural** schools has suddenly become a problem for the major institutions of learning of this island. The Iron Chancellor has had among other things to borrow chairs from other institutions.

The shortage of housing accommodation for these students has become nobody's concern. The snobs of the Lake House Press derisively described parents accompanying their children, pillows and suitcases in hand. Is that not symbolic of the acute housing problem ?

What of transport? Is the Ceylon Transport Board equipped to transport thousands

of students between 7 and 8 a.m. daily? The people in the queues know the answer to that one.

The problem will be more acute next year, worse the year after.

Where are the dreamers who spoke so enthusiastically of a single residential University at the Peradeniya campus? What a sad comment on their vision that they could not foresee the crisis in higher education looming a few years ahead.

We wish the students all success despite the difficulties they face in housing, transport, educational facilities.

We do not wish to upset them now. But there is another very important question. Where will they find employment once they graduate ?

#### COUP D'ETAT IN ALGERIA

On June 19th Ahmed Ben Bella, President of Algeria was hauled out of his bedroom by the conspirators. This coup d'etat judged by experts to be one of the most skillful in history was planned and carried out by Colonel Houari Boumedienne, the Defense Minister of Ben Bella's government. He had the backing of the entire armed forces and the few demonstrations by teenage youth against the coup were dispersed quite easily.

Two weeks after the coup the composition of the "National Council of the Revolution" was revealed. It was found to be a combination of military chiefs under Boumedienne's command and some former military ministers belonging to Boumedienne's clan.

Two facts emerged from a discussion of the coup. Firstly, Ben Bella was overthrown without a struggle. There was little organized or unorganized popular response or resistance to the coup. The People's Resistance Organization which has issued a call for popular resistance against the new regime does not seem to have support of any significance.

Secondly Ben Bella came out on top from the struggles within the FLN and the Provisional Government in 1962 with the sup-

port of Boumedienne and had his support during his three year period of office. Since Ben Bella has had important disagreements with Boumedienne in the past one would have expected him to build up the organizations of the masses into a force which could counter the Army that was controlled by Boumedienne. But Ben Bella refused to call upon the masses at this critical moment. This was consistent with his attitude to the Algerian masses in the past, and is also a characteristic of petty bourgeois nationalist leaders.

What becomes clear from the coup and the absence of any intervention by the masses to defend Ben Bella is that his was a Bonapartist regime seeking to safeguard the interests of the weak Algerian bourgeoisie while tying the organised workers to the bourgeois state apparatus through their participation in management of the Nationalised ventures.

The workers and poor peasants lacked a genuine Marxist leadership. The National liberation struggle was fought under petty bourgeois leadership and ended in a compromise with French Imperialism whereby the weak Algerian bourgeoisie took the place vacated by the French Colonialists. Nationalisation of French Colonialist property was not socialism, but a means of providing state assistance for the development of the Algerian bourgeoisie.

The overthrow of Ben Bella signifies an attempt on the part of the Algerian bourgeoisie to move against the workers and toiling masses.

#### THE INDO-PAKISTAN WAR

While the people of the world must have heaved a sigh of relief that the Indo-Pakistan war was ended, no one cared to mention that the biggest casualties in the whole episode were the working classes of India and Pakistan.

For both regimes this was "just what the doctor ordered" in relation to their working classes. The beginning of the border war was also a guarantee of class peace. The workers of India rallied solidly behind their "country" i.e., the capitalist regime, and so did the workers of Pakistan. The capitalist systems of both countries have gained time.

The Chinese manoeuvre in the middle of the border crisis, however much it must have gained China the sympathy of the Muslim peoples of the Middle East and North Africa (currently the target of Chinese overtures), did not help the workers of either India or Pakistan to clarify their minds as to the real issues in the problem or increase their class consciousness. Rather, it had just the opposite result: China not only alienated the sympathy of the Indian proletariat, it helped Shastri and his class to bind the workers hand and foot to their war effort, their economy and their class interests.

The Russians with their non-committal approach also showed that what interested them was not the development of the class struggle in India and Pakistan and the establishment of workers regimes in these countries, but the guarantee of "peace", i.e., class peace in the vast sub-continent.

The national interests of India, Pakistan, China and Russia have reached a new equilibrium. And the oppressed people of India and Pakistan, no less than those of Kashmir will have to suffer longer under the capitalist yoke.

## THE YOUNG SOCIALIST FUND

The increase in cost of printing due to the scarcity of printing paper compelled us to appeal to our friends and wellwishers for funds to continue publication of the magazine. The Fund launched at the end of August to collect Rs. 5000/-, the estimated subsidy required to continue publication of the magazine until the end of 1966 has realised Rs. 650.88 to date.

We sent our appeal to all Marxist journals with whom we have fraternal relations. We are happy to note that the NEWSLETTER published by the Socialist Labour League in England and the BULLETIN OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM published in New York have given publicity to our appeal. In addition the NEWSLETTER extended its patronage to a dance organised by the Friends of the Young Socialist in London to raise money for the fund.

The opinion has been expressed that we have aimed at too high a target. The fund is open till the end of 1966 and the response we have had so far indicates that we shall be able to make it well ahead of time.

This fund in addition to subsidising the Young Socialist will help us to step up our publication programme. REFORM OR REVOLUTION by Rosa Luxemburg is in press now and after publishing her WHAT IS ECONOMICS which is the next in our programme, we hope to get back to Trotsky's works.

We record our thanks to all those who have so generously helped us and appeal to all friends to give our appeal the widest possible publicity and help to make it a success.

All communications and remittances to Sydney Wanasinghe, 388, Galle Road, Colombo 6.

**SYDNEY WANASINGHE**  
(On behalf of the Editorial Board)



# LEON TROTSKY

1879 — 1940

Leon Trotsky died in Mexico at the hands of a Stalinist assassin twenty five years ago—on August 21st 1940.

He began his political activity in the last decade of the last century, at a time when the very thought of establishing a workers' state in the empire of the Czars was dismissed as a romantic dream.

We live at a time when the memory of the Czars is covered with so much dust. And not the memory of the Czars alone. The name of Stalin who was the leader of the forces that exiled and finally assassinated Trotsky has also been struck out of the memory of Soviet citizens.

It is true that Trotsky has not been rehabilitated in Soviet Russia. However the republication of Lenin's "Testament" and John Reed's "Ten Days That Shook the World" in both of which Trotsky figures prominently, must surely have set Soviet citizens thinking. We would be hopeless pessimists if we did not look forward to the day that Trotsky's work is given its rightful place in the land in which he led the workers to victory.

Now, however, it is for us, to the best of our ability, to keep alive his work, memory and above all his revolutionary tradition.

Trotsky the mature revolutionary spent only some twelve years in Russia. He emerged prominent on the revolutionary horizon in 1905 as leader of the Petrograd Soviet. Arrested and sentenced to exile in Siberia, he escaped abroad. He returned in 1917 to take up the work that had been interrupted, was Lenin's closest co-worker in the turbulent days of the revolution, led the insurrection, served as Commissar for Foreign Affairs, founded the Red Army and was Commissar of War, and within ten years of the revolution found himself exiled once more—this time by the forces of reaction that had taken power under Stalin's leadership.

But Trotsky's stature must not be measured by his practical achievements alone. In the field of revolutionary theory where clear and far-sighted thinkers are so few, Trotsky made original and invaluable contributions. Only Trotsky's analyses of Fascism and Stalinism have stood the test of time.

And above all there is his theory of the "permanent revolution", the guide to revolutionaries in backward and underdeveloped countries, meaning thereby countries in which the bourgeoisie has been unable to complete its historical role.

To quote Trotsky's summary of the theory :

"The permanent revolution, in the sense which Marx attached to this concept, means a revolution which makes *no compromise with any single form of class rule*, which does not stop at the democratic stage, which goes over to socialist measures and to war against reaction from without; that is, a revolution whose every successive stage is rooted in the preceding one and which can end *only in the complete liquidation of class society.*"

(*Permanent Revolution*: New Park Publishers; p. 6.)

There, in clear and unequivocal language, is the programme for the working class of the world.

It was Trotsky's great merit that he, following in the revolutionary traditions of Marx, Engels and Lenin, mapped out so clearly the road of the working class to socialism.

**Isaac Deutscher**

	Rs. c.
Russia in Transition	11 00
Prophet Armed (paperback edition)	14 50
Prophet Unarmed (hardcover edition)	31 40
„ (paperback edition)	14 50
Prophet Outcast (hardcover edition)	37 00
„ (paperback edition)	14 50
Stalin—a political biography	10 00

**George Lukacs**

Essays on Thomas Mann	13 60
Meaning of Contemporary realism	13 60
Studies in European realism	12 50
The historical novel	12 50

**James P. Cannon**

The History of American Trotskyism	9 00
The 1st Ten Years of American Communism	30 00
The struggle for a Proletarian Party	10 00
Eugene V. Debs	1 00
Socialism on Trial	2 00

**William F. Warde**

An Introduction to the Logic of Marxism	4 00
The Long View of History	1 25
The Irregular movement of History	1 00
The Moscow Peking debate	2 00

**Rosa Luxemburg**

Accumulation of Capital	20 00
Socialism and the Churches	50
The Mass Strike, Political Party and Trade Unions	2 00

**Hegel**

Science of Logic — Volume I	25 00
„ — Volume II	25 00
Encyclopaedia of Philosophy	20 00
Hegel Highlights—An Annotated Selection	18 00

**MONTHLY REVIEW PUBLICATIONS**

	Rs. c.
Caste, Class and Race by Oliver C. Cox	37 50
The Political Economy of Growth by Paul A. Baran	26 00
Capitalism Yesterday and Today by Maurice Dobb	5 00
Guerrilla Warfare by Che Guevara	17 50
Marxism of Our Time by Giles Martinet	16 25
American Radicals by Harvey Goldberg	7 25
The Second Revolution in Cuba by J. P. Morray	16 25
Cuba—Anatomy of a Revolution by Huberman & Sweezy	9 00
The United States, Cuba and Castro by W. A. Williams	16 25
The Man at the door with the gun by Cedric Belfrage	21 75
The Present as History by Paul M. Sweezy	17 50
World Crisis in oil by Harvey O'Connor	36 00
The Alienation of modern man by Fritz Pappenheim	8 75
North from Mexico by Carey McWilliams	24 00
Menace of the Miracle by Heinz Abosch	25 00
The Ordeal of British Guinea by Philip Reno	4 00
The Socialist Register—1964	12 75
„ 1965	12 75
Notes from China by Joan Robinson	4 75
Monthly Review Supplement—1965	5 00
Marxism and Moral Concepts by Williams Ash	21 00
Theory of Capitalist Development by Paul M. Sweezy	32 00
Parliamentary Socialism by Miliband	11 00
We, the People by Leo Huberman	27 50
Man's Wordly Goods by Leo Huberman	15 00
In Place of Fear by Aneurin Bevan	23 00
The Guerrilla Movement in Guetamala by Adolfo Gilly	4 00
American Labour in Mid Passage by Bert Cochran	6 25
Economic Growth and Planning by Maurice Dobb	17 50
Whither Latin America by Carlos Fuentes	9 00
Monthly Review—past copies, each	2 00

**SURIYA BOOKSHOP**

388 GALLE ROAD,  
WELLAWATTE.

# MY LIFE WITH TROTSKY

by

NATALIA SEDOVA TROTSKY

“YOU are the grave-digger of the revolution.” That shouted accusation against Stalin at a meeting of the Soviet Political Bureau in the Kremlin in 1927 was the signal for the end of Leon Trotsky.

I shall always remember that day. We were gathered in our Kremlin apartment while Leon Davidovitch (Trotsky) was at the Political Bureau. Piatakov entered. He was as pale as a sheet.

“Why did Leon Davidovitch say that?” he exclaimed.

He was so shaken that he was unable to tell what had happened.

## BREACH

We found out when Leon Davidovitch arrived, worn out but calm. He told us that in the course of the meeting he had accused Stalin of destroying the revolution.

Stalin had lost his temper and left, banging the door after him. The breach between the two leaders was complete.

It was from 1925, the year of the 14th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, that Trotsky's fight against the spread of bureaucracy in the regime became stronger, and the slander campaign against him started quite openly.

Zinoviev and Kamenev were opposed to Stalin and temporarily joined the opposition which was headed by Trotsky. They did not wish to create a new party, however, but to regenerate and democratise the Bolshevik Party.

Later Zinoviev, Kamenev and several others submitted to Stalin's will in order that they might remain in the Party. But Trotsky and a few loyal friends would not budge.

At the time of the alliance with Kamenev and Zinoviev there used to be meetings, either in Kamenev's apartment, in Karl Radek's or in ours. Kamenev used to imitate Stalin and that annoyed Trotsky.

“He is disagreeable enough in person,” he used to say. “We are not going to impersonate him as well....”

Leon had noticed that the masses were tired and he realised that the fight would be long. Kamenev and Zinoviev on the other hand were confident in Trotsky's enormous popularity and were most optimistic.

We had to go to Berlin, however, for Leon's health had grown worse and his intermittent fever continued. There his tonsils were removed, but without result.

Suddenly we had to seek refuge in the Russian Embassy, because of an alleged “White” attempt on my husband's life. He made use of his forced inactivity while in hospital to write a book, “Whither England.”

Then came the Chinese Revolution. Stalin ordered the Chinese Communists to remain allied to Chiang Kai-Shek when he showed signs of being anti-Communist.

The result, as Trotsky suspected was a general slaughter of Chinese Communists, exactly 24 hours after Stalin had stated in a speech that Chiang was a puppet in the hands of the Communist International.

This occurrence resulted in bitter arguments at the Central Committee of the Russian Party, and as much as anything it brought to a head the conflict between Stalin and Trotsky.

Leon was tired, his health was poor. Sometimes he would say to me, “My head feels empty”. As he read the newspapers which were full of repulsive lies about him, he used to say that it made him sick.

At last he could not even read them, but set them aside with a gesture of disgust. He told me: "One could make an effort to read them if it were only possible to answer them."

It was the tenth anniversary of the revolution. The Opposition took part in the celebrations carrying their own flags and banners.

There was fighting in the streets. People were constantly being expelled from the Party.

On the evening of that day Leon decided to leave the Kremlin forever. We went to the home of a friend. On November 15, 1927, it was announced that Leon had been expelled from the Party.

The following day his friend, Adolph Joffe, who was ill, shot himself through the head. Trotsky spoke at the funeral. It was his last speech on Russian soil.

#### DEPORTED

From that day onward we were constantly expecting to be banished. Somebody suggested to Trotsky that he should go to Astrakan of his own free will, but he refused. On January 16, 1928 it was decided that Leon Trotsky should be sent forcibly to Alma Ata, in Central Asia.

But the station was so full of his friends and workmen that the authorities were frightened and postponed his departure until the following morning at dawn.

When the G.P.U. came to fetch him, Trotsky refused to go out. We shut ourselves in the room and an officer called Kitchkine, who had been in the front line with Trotsky, shouted, "Shoot at me, Comrade Trotsky," as he started to push down the door.

That cry cost him his life for someone among the group of men with him shot him down. When the door had been smashed in, the soldiers had to carry Leon Davidovitch because he refused to follow them.

Accepting deportation would be to own himself guilty of the crime which was sup-

posed to justify it—counter-revolutionary activities.

We made the journey by train and by car surrounded by the G.P.U. and 20 soldiers. Part of our luggage was lost.

When we arrived in Alma Ata, we went to an hotel where we stayed until we found a large enough hut. We later learned that the Communist press abroad had described the journey as having been made in a luxury train.

Meanwhile members of the Opposition were expelled, banished, imprisoned. We estimated the number at 8,000 at the very least.

#### JOURNEY

Alma Ata was a small Kirguiz town with little light but a great deal of malaria. Floods were frequent and earthquakes too, but the town was surrounded with apple trees which were a lovely sight in the spring and the summertime.

In the spring Leon used to go fishing. We managed to establish clandestine contact with friends in Moscow. One of them came to Alma Ata disguised as a cart driver.

He told us that Lena, Trotsky's daughter by his first wife was ill in Moscow with tuberculosis. She wrote to us, but the G.P.U. kept the letter until her death, so that Leon should not ask leave to see her for the last time. Lena's husband had been banished.

From that time on we received no more letters. We were isolated. A G.P.U. envoy gave Trotsky an ultimatum.

If he did not cease all political activities, he would be forced to make him do so. Leon refused.

He wrote that he was not prepared to abandon "a fight for the proletarian cause which I have carried on for 32 years, that is during all my adult life."

In January 1929 the G.P.U. announced to Trotsky the decision to banish him from Russia. Trotsky signed a document and added to it:

"The decision of the G.P.U., criminal in essence and illegal in form, was communicated to me on January 20, 1929."

But where could we go? Germany, with a Socialist Government refused to receive the revolutionary leader.

England, despite a powerful Labour Government, also closed her frontiers. Stalin's Government approached the Turkish Government to see if it would allow Trotsky in.

We travelled for twelve days with the railway carriage full of soldiers and were not allowed to leave the train until we reached Odessa. A vessel took us to Istanbul where we arrived on February 12.

Leon gave a letter to the first Turkish Customs official he met. It was addressed to Mustapha Kemal and said: "I have arrived in Turkey against my will and I only cross your borders because violence is being used against me."

The G.P.U. agent in charge of our last journey on Russian soil was shot in 1937.

### REFUGE

For a time we were accommodated in the Istanbul Soviet Consulate. We could not go to an hotel because there were so many White Russians in the city that we would be in serious danger of being assassinated.

A friend found for us a semi-abandoned house on the island of Prinkipo, and we went to live there. The island was safe, being almost deserted. Two policemen protected us.

We did not contact the Turks or the cosmopolitan society of the city, which Trotsky only visited in a carriage. Our son, Leon Sedov, who by then was 21 years old, used to go out every time something was needed. We did not obtain permission to go to Germany or England.

Friends in Germany, France and the United States used to come and see us and relieve our solitude. They used to translate Leon Davidovitch's books.

His profits from articles and books provided us with sufficient money to live on and to keep up our correspondence and even to help with the publication of the Russian Opposition — which later Leon Sedov published in Paris.

The bulletin did not reach Russia easily, but it was read in Soviet Embassies all over the world and in Russian Government circles.

Those were years of very hard work. Besides his political work and huge correspondence Leon wrote his life and a history of the Russian Revolution.

### WORK

He used to seek for proof of every detail in his books, and the files we managed to bring out of Russia were most useful. The books were published simultaneously in Russian, French, English and German.

Later, they were translated into other languages. Trotsky used to correct the translations, including the punctuation and that left him little time for friends.

He used to chat with his few friends when he went fishing, for that was his only time of rest. When he came back, he used to say:

"It is as if the mind worked alone. Once it starts I only need to follow." That is how he was able to write, "My Life" in a few months.

Sometimes we used to get letters from Russia. It was through such smuggled mail that Leon, while we were at Alma Ata, obtained details of the Political Bureau meeting during which Stalin proposed Trotsky's banishment, stating that it would be easier than trying to discredit him.

Bukharin voted against the proposal. When some friends suggested to Lenin's widow, Nadejda Krupskaya that she should protest against the decision, she answered hopelessly: "Whom can we complain to?"

Many of the Opposition capitulated in order to avoid being expelled from the Party.

In February 1932 the political bureau deprived Trotsky and those members of his family who were abroad of their Soviet nationalities.

In October of the same year Trotsky and I went to Copenhagen where Leon was to lecture to a Danish Students' Association.

We obtained visas, which seemed extraordinary to us. During the voyage we visited the ruins of Pompeii. We crossed Paris, surrounded by policemen, incognito.

In Copenhagen Leon spoke at the Station. That was the only speech he delivered during his long exile.

### SURPRISE

The King of Denmark refused to allow the lecture to be broadcast and later declared that Trotsky should not be allowed to remain in the country any longer. But we had time to talk to several political friends who rushed to come and see us.

We also managed to speak on the 'phone with Leon Sedov who was in Berlin at the time and had not been able to obtain a visa to come and see us. We were not granted a visa to visit Sweden either.

The Swedish Government had no objection to our visit, but the Soviet Ambassador, Alexandra Kolontai, who once opposed the Extreme Left, had objected.

On our return to Corinthia we found a surprise. There was a crowd at the port who cheered Trotsky. It was then that our fellow passengers realised who the silent Mr. Sedov (the name adopted by Leon) really was.

We were living in Norway in 1933 in the house of the Socialist Deputy Konrad Knudsen at Weksal, when the news of the trial of the Trotskyist-Sedovist centre in Moscow was received. It was the Trial of the Thirteen.

When we received the text of the trial sessions, in which Trotsky was constantly mentioned, the trial had been finished and the sentence carried out. Trotsky and his son, Leon Sedov, were condemned to death.

Vyshinsky ended his accusation speech with the following words: "I demand,

comrade judges, that those mad dogs should be shot, from the first to the last." The mad dogs were the men of October 1917.

Yagoda, Chief of the Political Police, who organised the monstrous trial, was to be executed soon afterwards.

### TIRED MAN

Leon Davidovitch spent feverish days in our little house in Weksal. He copied the text of the trial and showed its falsehood. He sent a telegram to the Moscow tribunal asking to be called to trial.

He received no reply. He was exhausted. At times he would go for a walk among the fir trees.

"I am tired," he used to say. He was tired of feeling his hands tied, being unable to fight.

I do not wish to bring up now the accusations made against Trotsky, but I must repeat what he said then, that of the seven members of the Revolution Political Bureau, one had died, five were shot and only Stalin remained alive.

The accused men confessed. But Trotsky in Norway continued to fight. He took the trial to pieces and proved it unfair. But that was of no avail. It was really the beginning of the end.

### ESCAPE

I cast my mind back over the years. I remembered Leon's visit to London before the war to see Lenin. In spite of disagreements and discrepancies, the friendship born of that visit never faded.

We were in Geneva when we heard the news of the blood-stained Sunday in St. Petersburg, of the march led by the priest, Gapon, which was machine-gunned by the Cossacks.

We decided to return to Russia immediately. I went first, with a false passport. Leon followed a few days later.

By then he was known as Leon Trotsky. It was the name on his false passport when

he had escaped from Siberia years before—the first name that came to his mind, that of one of the wardens in the prison.

When the Workmen's Council or Soviet of Petersburg was formed, Trotsky was named chairman. The revolutionary movement failed, and Leon was arrested and imprisoned in the Peter and Paul Fort.

He was sentenced to be banished for life. "I thought we would have been sentenced to hard labour," was his comment when the sentence was read.

He left for Siberia in a military train. Soldiers rather ashamed, watched over him and Okrana agents watched over them. He never reached Siberia because he escaped before arriving there.

I can still see him as he looked when he wrote in Finland the story of his escape, "Return Journey," before we went to London. His unruly hair and small moustache were brown and his eyes were blue and fiery behind the glasses which he wore since quite young.

There were no such things as visas then. Thanks to the salary received from a Kiev Liberal newspaper, we avoided poverty.

We settled down in Vienna and there—together with Joffe, who later committed suicide as a warning and protest against deformation of the revolution Trotsky organised **Pravda** which was smuggled into Russia.

At the outbreak of the first world war, the Vienna Chief of Police called on Leon Davidovitch and invited him, most courteously to leave the country within 24 hours. He went to Zurich, and then Paris.

Until then, the Russian police had not ceased to watch Leon Davidovitch. During the revolution in prison, in Siberia and in exile, we lived under a constant threat. That was only the beginning.

During the war Leon Davidovitch's participation in the Zimmerwald and Kienthal conferences in Switzerland resulted in his expulsion from France.

Internationalists and Socialists from belligerent countries on both sides came to these Swiss villages and manifestos were published—one by Trotsky stressing the need for a revolutionary peace. The Russian Embassy in Paris asked the French Government to banish Leon Davidovitch.

England, Italy and Switzerland refused him entry. French policemen accompanied him to Iran.

Their attitude was most cordial. We travelled from Spain in the liner **Monsalat** and landed in New York.

His first sight of the great city brought this comment: "It is the most complete expression of our time."

We lived in the Bronx and Trotsky worked with Bukharin—who later was shot by Stalin after having been his ally editor of the Russian paper **Novy Mir**.

## 1917

When news of the fall of the Czars came, the Russian Consul gave us passports. We went to Canada where Trotsky was put in a camp. Then on to Russia, after an absence of twelve years.

In St. Petersburg we lived on the same modest scale as in Paris. There was the constant problem of finding food. Trotsky had become the most popular orator in the city. He used to deliver several speeches a day.

This made it necessary for him to look after his voice and to sleep enough. It also made us accept as logical the hate which surrounded us.

Neighbours did not speak to us and looked at us sideways, but the masses believed in him, he was the man from whom they took advice.

In July 1917, a really spontaneous revolution broke out. Leon Davidovitch found himself near the Tauride Palace when some people surrounded the Revolutionary Socialist Minister, Tchernov, trying to lynch him.

Trotsky climbed on to a carriage and managed to make his voice heard. He said

simply: "Let all those wishing to exert violence on citizen Tchernov lift their hand. What no one? Then citizen Tchernov may go free."

Lenin had to flee to Finland. He was accused of being a Czarist agent. Trotsky had not been so slandered. He wrote to the Government defending Lenin. He was arrested.

When the magistrate, while questioning him, mentioned German money, Trotsky tore up the documents shown to him and refused to answer any more questions, stating that it would demean him to accept that sort of questioning.

He was released on bail of 3,000 roubles which was paid by the Petrograd Syndicates' Committee. At that time General Kornilov rebelled against the Government.

I went to fetch my husband at the prison, but he was not there. He had gone to the Soviet.

He was elected President of the Soviet, and Tseretelli, on handing over to him, said, "I wish you to keep it for three months." This showed the uncertainty and danger in which we lived. In actual fact, as I have already shown, the danger was only starting.

In December 1936 we received a letter from Mexico. Unknown friends had obtained from the President Lazaro Cardenas, a promise that we should be admitted into the country.

#### MEXICO

On January 9, 1937, we arrived at Tampico on the **Ruth**. A few Mexican friends, Max Shachtman and George Novack, were there to meet us.

The G.P.U. had agents in Mexico as elsewhere, so a government train took us to an unknown place. There we found a car, a house with a large yard. It had been the home of a famous painter.

In January 1937 another trial was held in Moscow, that of the Seventeen. Karl Radek among them. Trotsky and his son, Leon, were as usual the principal persons accused.

All traces of Serge, Trotsky's other son who had been sent to Siberia, had disappeared. "My death might perhaps have saved Serge," Leon said to me. In May 1937 a secret tribunal sentenced to death Marshal Tukachevsky and seven other generals of the Revolution.

In February 1937, Leon Sedov had died in Paris after an operation. G.P.U. agents had long been following and bothering him.

In March 1938 another trial was held in Moscow, with 21 prisoners, among them Bukharin, Rykov and Yagoda—the ex-G.P.U. Chief who organised the previous trial. Vyshinsky was still the Attorney-General and Trotsky the principal accused.

In Spain, during the Civil War, one by one, several of Trotsky's personal and political friends disappeared. They included his ex-secretary, Irwin Wolf, the leader of the Catalan Proletariat, Andre Nin, as well as the Australian Socialist, Kurt Landay, and the Italian Anarchist, Barnico.

#### TRIAL

In April 1937, the Investigation Commission named by the North American Committee met for the defence of Leon Trotsky at Coayacan.

Trotsky was interrogated for several days. He produced proofs of the falsehoods in the Moscow trials and finally, in December 1937, the Commission gave its verdict.

This was that the Moscow trials were a false imputation and that Trotsky and Leon Sedov were innocent.

Meanwhile the Mexican Communists asked for the expulsion of Trotsky, calling him an agitator and other things.

There followed some short trips to Taxco and Vera Cruz to rest and fish. There were scares, too, which made us change our home, first to near Chapultepec and then to Coayacan. Here we lived in a large old house with high walls which seemed impossible to climb over.

However, on May 24, 1940, a group of men dressed as policemen managed to



break into the house and several shots woke up Trotsky and the rest of us. His secretary, Bob Sheldon-Harte, disappeared and his body was later found outside.

Six bullets were fired in Trotsky's bedroom. The famous painter D. A. Siqueiros, was arrested by the police as head of the assailants.

Precautions were increased and steel doors and shutters were set up at the house. But that did not stop the friend of a Trotskyist girl, who gave his name as Jacques Mornard, from gaining entry into the house.

In the afternoon of August 20th 1940, Mornard found himself alone with Trotsky in the latter's study.

Mornard struck Trotsky down with an axe. When arrested Mornard stated that he was an ex-trotskyist. But during his trial it was proved that he was in fact a Stalinist.

#### THE END

Trotsky was taken to the hospital, Cruz Verde, and I went with him. When

they cut his hair to clean the wound, he said ironically: "The hairdresser at last!" The hairdresser used to go to him in his home and had been asked to come two days previously but had not done so.

When one of the nurses started to undress him Trotsky said to me: "I don't want her to undress me. You do it for me."

Those were his last words because immediately after that he became unconscious and died at 7-45 p.m. on August 21. He was cremated.

While Trotsky was dying, the Stalinist Press in Russia accused him of trying to get Mexico mixed up in international complications.

This was untrue, but sometimes Leon used to say to me, "I must be very tiresome in everyday life with my fussiness for order and accuracy." But what he termed fussiness insured that his books and articles should not contain wrong information or involuntary falsehoods.

for

BUILDING  
DRAINAGE  
WATER SERVICE  
DECORATION  
ALTERATION

**TUDAWE BROS., LIMITED.**

505/2, Narahenpitiya Road,  
COLOMBO 5.

Telephone: 84494

# WHO IS TAKING WHOM FOR A RIDE?

By WILFRED PEREIRA

*The first act of revolutionary policy is to unmask the bourgeois fictions that poison the mind of the popular masses. These fictions become particularly malevolent when they are blended with the ideas of 'Socialism' and 'revolution' (1)*

*To teach the workers to recognise reactionary philistines under all their masks and to despise them regardless of the mask is the first and paramount duty of a revolutionist. (2)*

The bourgeois press and all the propagandists of the capitalist class, both secular and clerical, have been working overtime trying to convince the general public that Mrs. Bandaranaike's LSSP allies corrupted her government and that the LSSP and CP leaders, whom they denounce as "Marxists", are continuing to use her as a 'cover' and a 'front' for their nefarious purposes, that they are 'taking her for a ride', etc., etc. The capitalist class is only too well aware of the services rendered by Mrs. Bandaranaike's Leftist lackeys who helped her to check the threatening working class offensive and give the capitalist class a breathing space to reorganise its forces. But instead of showing its gratitude the capitalist class displays its typical bourgeois arrogance. The way to keep lackeys on their toes is to curse and swear at them. For all the merited contempt with which their bourgeois masters treat the Left lackeys the former know that they cannot do without them particularly when there is some specially dirty work to be done. For instance, are not the Left lackeys poisoning the mind of the working class with racist and religious communalism and enabling the capitalist class to pose as paragons of democratic virtue?

But there is more to the campaign of vituperation against the so-called 'Marxists' than meets the eye. By portraying the betrayers of the anti-capitalist struggle as 'Marxists' who are taking Mrs. Bandaranaike for a ride the propagandists of the bour-

geoisie are strengthening the illusions of the potentially dangerous Left pro-coalitionists who fondly believe that the 'Golden Brains' are engaged in a very subtle manoeuvre to 'take over' from that good but gullible lady at the appropriate time and usher in the Golden Age. But, at the same time, the more they are denounced as vile Marxist schemers against Mrs. Bandaranaike and her S.L.F.P. the more vehemently do the Marxist renegades affirm their allegiance to her and help to strengthen the illusions of the pro-SLFP masses in her 'middle-path' policy as a 'progressive' alternative to the 'reactionary' policy of the U.N.P. Thus by falsely accusing the Left Fakers of being 'Marxists' the capitalist class keeps its lackeys in thrall and furnishes them with a 'Marxist' alibi for the villainies committed in their masters' service.

## CONFESSION

While the capitalist press accuses Mrs. Bandaranaike of permitting the S.L.F.P. to be 'subjugated' by the so-called Marxists, the so-called 'power-hungry', 'scheming' leaders of the LSSP now confess that they were in actual fact helpless prisoners in the ill-fated coalition government. However, this confession of importance is not intended to educate the anti-capitalist masses or even their own party followers. The opportunist LSSP Leaders make a virtue of their impotence to prove their bourgeois respectability and abject loyalty to Mrs. Bandaranaike by showing that they were completely innocent of the charge of 'subverting' the coalition government in 'typical Marxist fashion'. They reaffirm their loyalty by accepting her as "leader" of the so-called "United Socialist Opposition" which is but a new name for the old "united progressive forces" with which they deceived the anti-capitalist forces all this time.

This confession of impotence, which is at the same time an admission of the failure of the much-vaunted 'tactic' for pushing

(1) Trotsky. 'France at a Turning Point', Preface to 'Terrorism and Communism'

(2) Trotsky. 'The Lessons of Spain—the Last Warning'.

the SLFP leftwards, is made in an official document put out by the Central Committee of the reformist LSSP. The blame for the defeat of the Coalition Government is laid at the door of the so-called "rightists" of the SLFP, accusing them generally of defeating the moves of the LSSP's and the so-called "progressives" to implement progressive measures, and specifically of

- (1) preventing the government from fighting rising prices and the scarcity of goods through the formation of Peoples' and Vigilance Committees, and thereby encouraging black-marketeters;
- (2) effectively sabotaging moves to grant political rights to public servants and enact laws to prevent ejection of tenants and control house rents; and
- (3) preventing organisation of the people for support of the SLFP's industrial policy.

### QUESTIONS

If the LSSP's had indeed been pressing for such measures and were being obstructed by the "rightists" why did they keep silent about it all this time? Why did not the LSSP's join forces with the "progressives" and fight the "rightists"? If that was not enough, why did they not appeal to the organised working class for supplementary action on the extra-parliamentary front? And why did they not proceed to organise Peoples' and Vigilance Committees on their own, with all the mass backing that they had?

Such, we are sure, must be some of the questions that the more politically wide-awake members of the LSSP would like to ask their leadership. However, the leadership was able to forestall embarrassing questions of this nature by diverting the struggle against the UNP-led National government along communal lines. But the appeal to communal sentiments has not met with sufficient response both within and without the party. Besides, the inability of the National Government to solve the country's economic problems within the capitalist framework must sooner or later give rise to mass unrest and working class struggles. So the opportunist LSSP leader-

### A GOLDEN-BRAINY STRATEGEM?

The contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is a fundamental one. That is why the attempt (of the Chinese CP) to bridle the Chinese bourgeoisie by means of organisational and personal manoeuvres and to compel it to submit to combinationist plans is not a manoeuvre but contemptible self-deception, even though it be colossal in scope. Classes cannot be tricked. This applies, considered historically, to all classes and it is particularly and immediately true of the ruling, possessing, exploiting and educated classes. The world experience of the latter is so great, their class instinct so refined, and their organs of espionage so varied that an attempt to deceive them by posing as somebody else must lead in reality to trapping, not the enemy, but one's own friends.

Trotsky

*"The Third International after Lenin"*

ship is compelled to pretend that it has modified its tactics in the light of the recent coalition experience.

### PAWNS

The toiling masses who were induced to believe that only the peaceful parliamentary road to socialism was compatible with their national genius and culture, are now to be mobilised for action on the "extra-parliamentary front". The SLFP-LSSP-CP front which was set up to *prevent* the development of a mass struggle is now going to "spur" the masses into extra-parliamentary action. The masses are of course just pawns in the game of bourgeois power-politics. They can be ordered to forget about strikes and go-slows and to tighten their belts and work hard when the SLFP bourgeoisie is in power, and then be ordered to go into action when the UNP bourgeoisie is in power.

But has not the LSSP leadership's experience of being subjugated by the SLFP "rightists" taught them anything? They entered Mrs. Bandaranaike's service on her terms and helped her to divide and disorganise the working class by paralysing the threatened offensive of the united trade unions. They now see their chance of driving the divided and disorganised working class forces, now even more divided on racial and religious lines, into action against the National Government. By this means

they will help the UNP to complete the task that was begun by the SLFP—the task of smashing up the working class movement.

### LESSONS

There are, however, some lessons that the working class can learn from the coalition experience without waiting for the National Government to drive them home with the aid of batons and sten guns. Let us, therefore, probe a little deeper into the opportunist LSSP leadership's confession of impotence against the SLFP "rightists".

Mrs. Bandaranaike's loyal lackeys helped her to paralyse the struggle for the 21 Demands which included the demand for political rights for public servants. By doing so they strengthened the hands of the "rightists", a good many of whom showed on December 3rd that their sympathies lay with the UNP. These reactionaries wearing progressive masks exploited the situation presented to them by the LSSP lackeys and obstructed any progressive measures that would have lightened the burdens of the toiling masses. In doing so the 'rightists' could proudly claim that they too were being loyal to Mrs. Bandaranaike and helping her to safeguard the capitalist system. How then could the "progressive" SLFP'ers quarrel with them? As for the LSSP'ers, having helped Mrs. Bandaranaike to strangle the working class movement, they dared not raise their voice against the "rightists" nor appeal to the working class for extra-parliamentary assistance, as such a move would have disrupted the holy alliance of "progressive forces" represented by the Coalition. It is therefore clear that coalition as a pressure tactic was doomed to failure from the very start.

### POLARISATION

By shifting the blame for the blatantly pro-capitalist policy of the Coalition Government on to the SLFP "rightists" and seeking to differentiate between "progressives" and "rightists" in the SLFP, the LSSP charlatans are trying to cover up their own treachery in persuading the masses to believe that the SLFP was a "leftward moving" party. If the SLFP was in fact such a party where did the "rightists" come from? Either, they

### "FORWARD TO SOCIALISM UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF MRS. BANDARANAIKE!"

The most important, best established, and most unalterable rule to apply in every manoeuvre reads: You must never dare to merge, mix or combine your own party organisation with an alien one, even though the latter be most 'sympathetic' today. Do not undertake such steps as lead, directly or indirectly, openly or maskedly, to the subordination of your party to other parties, or to organisations of other classes, and therewith restrict the freedom of your own agitation, nor take any step through which you are made responsible, even if only in part, for the political line of other parties. You shall not mix up the banners, let alone kneel before another banner.

Trotsky

"The Third International after Lenin"

were already there, or a section of the "progressives" must have been encouraged by the LSSP'ers "tactic" to move *rightward*. In any case, the "rightists" did their dirty work hiding behind the "progressives" while the LSSP'ers provided both wings of the SLFP with a 'left' cover for their *anti-working class* policy.

A good portion of the 'rightists' went over to the side of the UNP on December 3rd. The Left Fakers tried to palm this off as a 'polarisation of forces' to fool their own party men with pseudo-Marxist phraseology and give the impression that the SLFP had been purged of 'reactionaries'.

**But are not those who still remain with the SLFP the very people who shielded the 'rightists' and allowed them to sabotage 'progressive measures' without a murmur of protest? And do they not include Mrs. Bandaranaike herself? Yet it is to Mrs. Bandaranaike that the leaders of the LSSP and the CP have now decided to entrust the "leadership" of the so-called 'United Socialist Opposition' against the UNP-led National Government!**

### ORIENTATION

Of the three instances of 'rightist' obstruction adduced by the LSSP leadership the one that betrays the true orientation of the opportunist leaders is the accusation of

preventing the organisation of the people for support for the SLFP's industrial policy. But what is this policy? Industrial development *by private enterprise for private profit*, with the state playing the role of fairy godmother to protect the patriotic industrialists against all risks both economic and political. This differs from the industrial policy of the UNP only as regards the nature and scope of the public sector. The larger the public sector the greater the scope for petty bourgeois functionaries and trade union bureaucrats to sell their loyalties to the government and the greater the opportunities for the small investors, the petty commercial and industrial bourgeoisie who constitute the SLFP's main support. It is primarily in the interests of the industrialists that Mrs. Bandaranaike sought and obtained the help of the Left to paralyse the working class movement and preserve the wage-freeze. What more 'support', what more sacrifices by the people and hard work by the toilers to assure the profits of the industrialists do the LSSP charlatans want the people to be organised for?

The financial policy forced on the Coalition government by its obligation to work within the capitalist framework eventually made it impossible to provide the industrialists with the necessary imported raw materials and machinery while also providing them with the necessary incentives, tax concessions etc. The only way out for a capitalist government in such a situation is to 'organise' the plunder of the people more ruthlessly. The Left Fakers are very annoyed that the 'rightists' deserted and brought down the Coalition government before it had time to demonstrate to the capitalist class how efficiently it could, with the help of the 'golden brains', "organise the people" into a properly disciplined and pliable mass willing to bear patiently all the burdens of industrial development for private profit. That task has now been taken over by the National Government after the initial softening up of mass resistance has been accomplished by the SLFP-Left Faker Coalition. The only grouse of the pro-coalitionist petty bourgeois parasites is that they will not be there to get their 'cut'.

### "THE 'RIGHTISTS' OBSTRUCTED PROGRESSIVE MEASURES"!

The sole condition for every agreement with the bourgeoisie, for each separate, practical and expedient agreement adapted to each given case, consists in not allowing the organisations or the banners to become mixed directly or indirectly for a single day or a single hour;..... and in not believing for an instant in the capacity or readiness of the bourgeoisie either to lead a **genuine** struggle against imperialism or **not to obstruct** the workers and peasants. ....purely practical agreements, such as do not bind us in the least and do not oblige us to anything politically, can be concluded with the devil himself, if that is advantageous at the given moment. But it would be absurd in such a case to demand that the devil should **generally** become converted to Christianity, and that he use his horns not against workers and peasants but exclusively for pious deeds. In presenting such conditions we act in reality as the devil's advocates, and beg him to let us become his god-fathers.

Trotsky

"*The Third International after Lenin*"

### PERSEVERANCE

The LSSP and CP charlatans, however, have not given up hope. They are determined to bring the coalition back to power in order to complete what they had to leave undone the last time. They are most persevering agents of the capitalist class in the working class movement. In order to continue to deceive the masses they have re-discovered the extra-parliamentary arena for the 'struggle' against the UNP-led government. This is only an attempt to hide the old trap in a new place. The extra-parliamentary struggle can have any meaning only if it is directed against the extra-parliamentary base of the UNP-led capitalist government, that is, the capitalist property system. Such a struggle can be fought only under the hegemony of the working class led by a Marxist revolutionary party.

The Left Fakers know that a fresh wave of strike struggles must arise sooner or later. Their new interest in the extra-parliamentary arena is intended to take charge of the coming struggle and keep it within safe limits that will not harm the interests of the 'patriotic' industrialists. But

since it is not possible to separate the latter's interests from those of the capitalist class as a whole, the struggle of the toilers is to be directed towards merely a change of government, to replace the UNP-led coalition with a SLFP-led coalition. The struggle is to be confined to one between the two wings of one and the same capitalist class. So the "masses must be made aware that their arch enemy is"...? NO, not the capitalist class...but the "reactionary forces which are now power". And who are these reactionary forces? The reactionaries of the UNP, the 'rightists' who stabbed the coalition in the back, and...the racial and religious minorities whom the SLFP and its Leftist allies drove into the arms of the UNP and the FP. And what are the 'progressive forces' that the Left Fakers seek to mobilise for the 'struggle'? They are left with the pro-coalition Sinhala-Buddhists who have "a correct understanding of Buddhist philosophy". This is how Sri Lanka is to go forward to socialism under the leadership of Mrs. Bandaranaike, ably assisted of course by her Leftist stooges! If the left fakers succeed in "spurring" the disorganised and disoriented working class into action on the extra-parliamentary front it will only be to help the UNP-led Government to give it the *coup de grace*.

### ILLUSIONS

There are pro-coalitionists who still have illusions about the socialistic pretensions of the Left Fakers, even if they may have none about the SLFP. They argue that the LSSP'ers went into the coalition not with the intention of overthrowing capitalism immediately but only to work within the capitalist framework and pressurise or even inveigle the SLFP into implementing progressive measures that would facilitate a later all-out struggle of the proletarian forces for socialism. We have already examined not only why the "tactic" failed but also why it was doomed to failure from the start. But let us try to find out whether the LSSP'ers really tried to press for measures that would facilitate the struggle of the proletarian forces. If that were so, we should have expected them to lose no time in pressing for at least the following: repeal of the Public Security Act, amendments to the trade union laws, political rights for public servants, citizenship and franchise rights

"One cannot sing lullabies to the masses day after day, full of gabble about a pacific, law-abiding, parliamentary, democratic transfer to Socialism, and then at the first blow on the nose, to arouse the masses to armed resistance. That is the surest way of assisting in reaction's break-up of the proletariat. In order to prove themselves capable of revolutionary resistance the masses must be ideologically, organisationally, and materially prepared for it. They must understand the inevitableness of intensification of the class struggle, and its transformation at a certain stage into civil war. The education of the working class and the selection of personnel for leadership must be adapted to this perspective. It is necessary from day to day to struggle against compromising illusions, in other words, to declare a life and death fight with MacDonaldism."

Trotsky

*WHERE IS BRITAIN GOING?*

for the plantation workers of Indian origin, safeguarding of the linguistic and religious rights of the minorities. For only by the implementation of such measures, which should be well within the capacity of any capitalist government which claims to be democratic and progressive—only by such measures would it have been possible to achieve the unification of the proletarian forces without which there cannot even be any talk of struggle for socialism. If these things had been conceded by the Coalition Government not only would it have strengthened the unity of the working class, the UNP would never have been able to return to power.

Leave alone getting them implemented, if the LSSP'ers had merely placed these demands before the Government openly before the eyes of the masses and called upon the organised working class to exert extra-parliamentary pressure on the SLFP if the latter proved recalcitrant, all the proletarian forces could have been rallied under the banner of the LSSP. Even if the Coalition cracked up under the pressure, and even if a resulting general election did by some remote chance bring the UNP back to power, the proletarian forces would have stood prepared and mobilised in a solid phalanx to meet any onslaught, like the one that the National Government is now preparing against the working class, instead of being divided and ideologically disarmed as they are today. But as we discovered earlier it was the necessity to

preserve the unity of the so-called progressive forces (unity with the SLFP bourgeoisie) that prevented the LSSP'ers from making any such demands. By continuing to remain in the coalition when they found that they were powerless they helped the SLFP to deceive the masses. They could remain in the coalition only by adapting themselves to the SLFP policy. Their repudiation of everything they stood for and their turn to communalism is the translation of opportunism into the language of petty bourgeois Sinhala-Buddhist politics.

### FLIGHT OF FANCY

How the incorrigible petty bourgeois succumbs to the bourgeois propaganda about the fake Marxists is illustrated by the naive belief that the Leftist leaders are genuine socialists who have broken out of the trammels of orthodox Marxism. There are pro-coalitionists who ask: what is to prevent the Leftist leaders from taking over from Mrs. Bandaranaike after the SLFP-LSSP-CP coalition comes back to power, and then proceeding to implement their own socialist programme? They must have profited by their last failure and should be better prepared next time. By going along with Mrs. Bandaranaike or rather pretending to go her way, jollying her along, they will be able to increase their influence among the SLFP supporters and obtain a much stronger parliamentary representation at the next elections. Let us also go along with our naive optimists on a flight of fancy. What happens will depend on the numerical strength of the Left bloc vis-a-vis the SLFP in the coalition.

First, if the Left bloc is a minority, it will be faced with the task of jockeying itself into position to take control of the government. This must be done without showing its hand too soon and creating dissention. That is to say, the unity of the progressive forces both within parliament and outside must be preserved until the Leftists are ready for their coup. This will entail lying doggo and letting the SLFP do as it likes—a repetition of the previous experience.

If the Left bloc commands a majority it should be in a position to carry out its coup without beating about the bush. As soon

as the Left bloc shows its hand the SLFP'ers will stab the government in the back and scamper off to join the UNP. The Left bloc will then have to face fresh elections or resort to an extra-parliamentary show-down—with the bourgeois property system and state apparatus, armed forces and all, still intact. The prospect of winning the elections on a socialist programme under such conditions is unthinkable. Then what are the forces at the disposal of the Left bloc for an extra-parliamentary show-down? The united progressive forces consisting of good Sinhala-Bhuddhists will be in a state of disarray due to the defection of the SLFP. All that will be left are the LSSP and CP supporters whose class-struggle and revolutionary will would have been numbed by accommodation to the bourgeois-democratic perspectives of the 'progressive forces'. Need we go any further?

### GUARANTEES FOR THE FUTURE

The ideological agents of the bourgeoisie are in league with its political agents in the working class movement to foster illusions among the various strata of the potentially anti-capitalist masses. The capitalist class is only too well aware that the day will come when it will have to delegate its power of attorney once again to the SLFP, which it regards as "the democratic alternative to the UNP", if capitalism is to be saved. This is yet another reason why its propagandists are so concerned to keep the democratic image of the SLFP unsullied by association with "Marxists". But in order to postpone the evil day, the capitalist class and its ideologists carry on a vicious campaign against Marxism as a cover for their preparations for an all-out attack on the working class. However, even while they carry on a relentless campaign purported to expose the "Marxists" who "subverted" the coalition, they take particular care to protect the demagogic character of their Leftist agents in the working class movement against the day when their direct services will be needed once again to prop up a tottering capitalist government.

The capitalist press gleefully reports differences among the opportunist LSSP leaders. But whatever differences there may be, the leaders are united as one man

in accepting Mrs. Bandaranaike as the "leader of the United Socialist Opposition". Mrs. Bandaranaike is also the leader of the SLFP which, on the inside information furnished by the LSSP leaders, was incapable of standing up to a handful of its own rightists' who obstructed all progressive measures. If the first coalition was due to a misconception of the class character of the SLFP, there can no longer be any doubts on that score after its capitulation to the 'rightists' who found their true affinity with the UNP. If there could be any doubts about the motives of the LSSP leaders in June 1964 there can be none whatsoever about their motives in persisting with their "association" with the SLFP after their confession of impotence in the coalition. The opportunist leadership of the LSSP still stand solidly together, irrespective of other differences as in June 1964, in order to deceive and betray the revolutionary struggle for socialism by helping the capitalist class to tighten the noose that N. M. Perera helped Mrs. Bandaranaike to place round the neck of the working class.

### BOURGEOIS FICTIONS

The capitalist class knows it can depend on its Leftist agents in the working class movement. While its propagandists pretend they want to break up the SLFP-Left Faker alliance, they help to foster illusions among the Leftist pro-coalitionists in the socialistic and even 'revolutionary' pretensions of the so-called 'Marxists' by warning Mrs. Bandaranaike that she is "being taken for a ride" by her 'Marxist' friends. They foster illusions among the militant sections of the working class that the Leftist leaders are Marxist revolutionaries in disguise who should be allowed to carry out their cunning manoeuvre undisturbed by strikes, etc. They foster illusions among the faint-hearted petty bourgeois pro-coalitionists that the Leftist leaders have discovered a new secret short-cut to socialism that will avoid the dangers and discomforts of the class struggle. The capitalist class knows how to make use of its Leftist agents in the working class movement, whether as fake Marxists or as renegade Marxists with equal facility, in order to confuse the proletarian forces and keep them in subjection.

Only conscious traitors or hopeless muddle-heads are capable of pretending that a SLFP-LSSP-CP coalition under the leadership of Mrs. Bandaranaike is in any way capable of offering an effective opposition to the UNP-led capitalist government and taking this country forward to socialism. Only the inveterate petty bourgeois refugee from the class struggle is capable of believing that the Marxist renegates have found a short-cut to socialism.

The eulogists of other peoples' revolutions, both those who prate about the "confirmation" of Trotsky's Theory of Permanent Revolution wherever the petty bourgeois nationalists have ridden to power on the backs of the toiling masses, and also those who denounce that Theory as a counter-revolutionary obstacle to the aspirations of petty bourgeois nationalists, have now come together and established what they hope is a permanent refuge from the class struggle under the benign patronage of "Mother Lanka". Bourgeois ideologists would have us believe that this is a cover for a cunning manoeuvre that only 'golden brains' could devise but is beyond the comprehension of 'romantics' and 'sectarians' who are still under the influence of Marxism and think in terms of class struggle as the means of mobilising the revolutionary proletariat for the seizure of power, etc.

### THE GOLDEN AGE

Since the Ceylonese proletariat is non-revolutionary it devolves on the petty bourgeois intellectuals who have outgrown the puerilities of Marxism to bring the benefits of socialism to the helpless and down-trodden masses by sleight of hand and slickness of brain. The strategem is so cunning that it deceives not only the SLFP; the working class remains spell-bound, while the petty bourgeois are just... stupified. But that is all part of the strategem—to give the petty bourgeois leaders a free hand without any intervention by the common herd.

Having put the forces of the "united socialist opposition" through an intensive course of Buddhist philosophy, on the auspicious day and hour determined by pro-coalitionist soothsayers, the crafty Left Leaders will marshal their forces and order

*(Continued on page 171)*



# THE REVOLUTION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

By PRINS RAJASOORIYA

If the present trend of events continues in Vietnam there will be over 200,000 American soldiers in South Vietnam by the end of this year. "In Honolulu General Westmoreland (the US Commander in South Vietnam) asked for a blank check to bring up to 75,000 more US troops to Vietnam by the end of this year. This would bring the total US strength to 150,000" (*Newsweek* of 19-7-65). Since July this figure has been increased. In any case this figure does not take into account Australian, South Korean and other forces already in South Vietnam.

American planes are bombing not only South Vietnam but North Vietnam as well. In fact fighting in Vietnam has gone on intermittently for the last 20 years. Therefore an understanding of today's events in Vietnam requires an examination of yesterday facts and events which led up to the present crisis.

## VIETNAM UNDER THE IMPERIALISTS

Over a hundred years ago, Vietnam was a part of the Chinese empire. With the weakening of Chinese control over Indo-China the rulers of Vietnam only nominally acknowledged Chinese suzerainty paying tribute to Peking from time to time.

In the second half of the 19th Century, Western Imperialist powers waged war against China, taking over chunks of her territory. In 1883, the French invaded and occupied Indo-China and annexed her to the French Empire. French Indo-China as the area came to be called comprised Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam.

In spite of French armies of occupation, a number of uprisings occurred which were put down with much bloodshed, and the French set about incorporating Indo-China into the French Empire. What was the

French policy as applied to the people of Indo-China?—"In French eyes the function of a colony was to supply the mother country raw materials and products which did not compete with their own," and to be a market for French manufactured goods. "The economy of French Indo-China therefore came to depend completely on French interests". *The Economic History of South East Asia* by Professor Hall Professor of Economic History—University of London P. 654

In this area "the chief aim of French educational policy was at first simply to train interpreters" (p. 644) Ibid. By 1912, of a population of 15,000,000 there were only 12,103 people in Government primary schools (p. 645)

"Even as late as the latter part of the last century, feudal methods of land tenure and patriarchal methods of village organisation persisted. The French brought their reforms. Before French occupation inequalities in land were counterbalanced by joint responsibilities of the village. The French administration favoured the establishment of large estates and European plantations. In Cochin-China, the concentration of land went so far that the landed class came to control over 80% of the rice fields with 200,000 families employed as share croppers" (p. 655). "By the 1930s the general picture was that of an upper class with an agricultural proletariat densely packed into two rice producing areas with too much labour employed on the land."

The Vietnamese farmer was dependent on his landlord for loans, tools, buffaloes and supplies of seed and manure and usually at the rate of 50% for a period of one year to eight months. So that French rule meant grinding poverty, exploitation and misery for the majority of the people.

Almost without exception economic enterprises were financed and controlled by

the French. Except in very rare instances, no Vietnamese occupied any place of significance in the administration. In these circumstances, there was no Vietnamese capitalist class of any significance and hardly any stratum of Vietnamese middle class society.

### THE VIETNAMESE FIGHT BACK

Many attempts were made to drive out the French but all these had been unsuccessful. Came the second World War. The French in Indo-China and those sections of the population collaborating with the French tamely surrendered. The Japanese were permitted, without a shot being fired, to use airfields and ports in Indo-China, to drive southwards to Singapore and Java. In spite of the French surrender to the Japanese, an underground movement came into existence and was active against the Japanese throughout the latter part of the war. This movement was led by Ho Chi Minh.

Faced with collapse on most war fronts, the Japanese proclaimed "independent" kingdoms in Annam, Laos and Cambodia. Bao-Dai was declared Emperor of Vietnam. In spite of the creation of an "independent" Vietnam even before the departure of the Japanese, effective control was however, in the hands of the National Liberation Front or Vietminh led by Ho Chi Minh, who enjoyed the confidence of the majority of Vietnamese. The Vietminh had its army and its civil administration, its currency and post office system. At the end of the war, except in the large cities occupied by the Japanese the rest of Vietnam was controlled and governed by the Vietminh.

### HORSE-DEAL BY BIG POWERS

In the meantime, arrangements were being made by the victors of the war to redivide the world. At Potsdam, behind the backs of the Vietnamese people, their fate was being decided. With the blessings of Stalin, Vietnam was to be handed back to the French. The expulsion of the Japanese was not to be followed by Vietnam being handed over to the Vietnamese people. It was to be handed back to the French.

The plan of re-occupation was as follows: Chinese troops of Chiang Kai Shek were to take over from the Japanese forces from the north, down to the 16th parallel. British forces were to occupy the country from the south upto the 16th parallel.

The troops of Chiang Kai Shek duly occupied the north, while British forces under General Gracey arrived in Saigon on 13th September, 1945. Except for the big cities, which were occupied by foreign troops, most of the country continued to be controlled by the resistance fighters of the Vietminh.

In 1946, the French arrived to take over from the British. Chiang's forces, however, refused to budge from the north. Chiang used the occasion to negotiate with the French and force them to give up their claims to rights in the proposed Hanoi-Yunan railway. In spite of Chinese troops, however, the Vietminh controlled most of present North Vietnam, including the city of Hanoi. This was as far back as 1946, before the establishment of the present Government of the People's Republic of China.

In the face of this, the French were forced to recognise reality. They knew that they could not easily re-impose French rule and enjoy a position similar to that which existed before the War.

### ATTEMPT AT COMPROMISE

It was better to compromise and try to save what could be saved rather than lose all. The French created "The Independent Republic of Vietnam". Vietnam's independence was, however, limited, as it was understood to be (with Laos and Cambodia) part of the French Indo-China Federation, which was itself part of the French Union—an anomalous situation in which nothing was clear. A future conference was to be summoned to clarify matters needing clarification. In the meantime, French troops poured into the country and France bided her time.

In April, 1946 was held one of the many proposed conferences and it was clear that

“independence” meant one thing to the French while it meant quite a different thing to the Vietnamese. It also became clear that the French were not ready to come to an agreement with Ho Chi Minh and those political forces in whom the Vietnamese people had confidence, but were seeking a political compromise behind the backs of the Vietnamese people with their own chosen puppets.

### WAR WITH THE FRENCH

By November, 1946 all negotiations had failed. French planes bombed the city of Haipong causing grave loss of civilian lives and the Vietminh resorted to an armed insurrection. By December the French had suffered defeats in a number of garrison towns held by them.

In the face of this failure the French took other measures and...“on May 20th, 1948 proclaimed the Central Provisional Government” with Nguyen Van Xnam as its head...On 8th March, 1949 Bao Dai, the former “Emperor”, who had been head of the Japanese puppet regime, was brought back to become this time a French puppet. “It was, of course, yet another bogus version of ‘independence’ (says Professor Hall) and Ho Chi Minh’s position was in no way weakened by the fact that he had 100,000 of France’s best troops fighting against him”.

What happened thereafter is recent history. Vietnam became the grave of nearly 100,000 French soldiers. Army after army sent by the French was decisively defeated until at Dien Bien Phu, a bloody defeat was inflicted by the Vietnamese people on the French on 7th May, 1954.

### THE GENEVA AGREEMENT

In 1954, in conformity with the resolution adopted by the British, French, US and Soviet Foreign Ministers at the Berlin Four Power Conference on Far Eastern Problems, talks commenced at Geneva at the former seat of the League of Nations on (1) the Korean Question, and (2) the problem of restoring peace in Indo-China. In addition to the four sponsors to the talks, the U.S. and the French, the British and the Soviets, nineteen other countries were represented at the talks.

In May a Vietnamese delegation led by Phan Van Dong arrived to participate in the talks.

On 21st July 1954 an armistice was agreed upon with an immediate ceasefire. This agreement has subsequently come to be called the Geneva Agreement.

In addition to the cessation of hostilities, the country was to be divided into two areas temporarily, the 16th parallel being the dividing line. Paragraph 6 of the Agreement reads “the conference recognises that the essential purposes of the agreement relating to Vietnam is to settle the military question with a view to end hostilities and that the military demarcation line should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a territorial or political boundary. It expresses the conviction that the execution of the provisions set out in the present declaration and in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities creates the necessary basis for the achievement in the near future of a political settlement in Vietnam.”

Para 7 states: “The conference declares that so far as Vietnam is concerned the settlement of political problems effected on the basis of respect for the principles of independence, unity and territorial integrity shall permit the Vietnamese people to enjoy the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by democratic institutions established as a result of *free elections by secret ballot*.... General elections shall be held *on July, 1956* under the supervision of an International Commission composed of members of the International Supervisory Commission” (established by the Geneva Agreement).

### ENTER THE US

At the same time the leader of the US delegation to the Geneva talks, Walter Bedel Smith, issued what is called the United States declaration.

Para 3 “Declares that with regard to the aforesaid agreements that (1) It (the US) will refrain from the use of force to disturb them (the Vietnamese)....

“(2)...In connection with the statement in the declaration (quoted above) concerning free elections in Vietnam the

US Government wishes to make clear the position it has expressed in a declaration it has made in Washington on June, 29th, 1954 (by President Eisenhower and Sir Winston Churchill) as follows: "In case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to strive to achieve unity through free elections supervised by the UN."

What happened in Vietnam? "Elections to unify the country were to have been held in 1956 but were opposed by South Vietnamese President Diem...." (p. 131—*South East Asia Today & Tomorrow*, Richard Butwell. Asst. Professor of Social Science, University of Illinois). The reason for Diem's opposition is not far to see. D. F. Fleming, Emeritus Professor of International Relations at Vanderbilt University has this to say: "The elections were frustrated by President Ngo Dinh Diem whom Secretary of State John Foster Dulles had selected to rule South Vietnam, because both knew that the vote would almost certainly be for union under a Communist oriented leadership." (p. 12, *Progressive USA* June)

In his book "The White House Years", President Eisenhower says "I have never talked or corresponded with a person knowledgeable in Indo-Chinese affairs who did not agree that had elections been held as of the time of the fighting, possibly 80 per cent of the population would have voted for the Communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader". To prevent the manifestation of the will of the vast majority of the people of Vietnam US conspired with its puppet Diem to prevent elections. So much for American talk of democracy.

America's bloody role in Indo-China did not commence with Diem's accession to power. The Finance Commission of the French National Assembly has calculated that the total cost of the Indo-China war was 3,000,000,000,000 francs—as at 1954. Of this, the direct US contribution was 48,000,000,000 francs, other estimates vary at 500 million dollars annually from 1946 or so to 1954—(Butwell, p. 131).

At the time of the Geneva Conference there were American "advisers" in South

Vietnam. Their role was to prop up Diem who in turn would keep South Vietnam divided.

### THE "DEMOCRATIC" FACADE

At first it was hoped to have a facade of democracy in South Vietnam and for Americans to keep not only the country of Vietnam divided but to divide the people and win over sections away from the legitimate aspirations which they had set their eyes on. If these methods failed, then naked force would be the answer.

What type of government came to be set up after the Geneva Conference? "Diem, holds office for 5 years and can be re-elected for two additional terms. On paper, as well as in practice, he dwarfs the single-house National Assembly, which although elected directly by the people by secret ballot is nevertheless composed exclusively of supporters of President Ngo Dinh Diem because the candidates are controlled. To date the Assembly has been nothing more than a rubber stamp for President's policies. The 3rd division of the Government, the Judiciary, has not been any more independent, despite its description in the constitution as a separate branch of the state structure."

"...President Ngo Dinh Diem has ruled the country autocratically.... In the August 1959 elections he evicted the only opposition member elected in the 123 man Assembly. The action was not unique and illustrates the controlled environment of Vietnam Government and politics. Diem was re-elected over only token opposition in April 1961." (Butwell p. 41).

The attempt at creating a facade of democracy did not last for long. There was no economic base in South Vietnam to permit this experiment. There was no capitalist class of any proportions in Vietnam on whom the Americans could depend. The French had seen to that. All industrial enterprises worthy of any mention were owned and financed by the French. With the withdrawal of the French there was no time for a native bourgeoisie to emerge. Nor would the Vietnamese people tolerate the replacement of one oppressor by another.

It was natural that the Diem clique could not build any roots or find any support for its policies based on continued capitalist exploitation. It was natural that the Diem regime should turn into a vicious bloody dictatorship. In 1961 Dr. Burtwell wrote, (p. 55) "Governmental and political change can really occur only by forcible means in South Vietnam where the legislature is controlled, the press muzzled and free political parties non-existent. Opposition to President Ngo Dinh Diem's regime can be expressed only by violence." Finally Diem was deposed by violence.

### AMERICA'S MILITARY INTERVENTION

The Diem regime would have collapsed much earlier if not for American arms and money. A representative of the American ruling class after a visit to Vietnam in 1962 said, "After seven years,....and two billion dollars worth of US aid,....the severe difficulties remain, if indeed they have not multiplied..Diem's ....armies (armed with US weapons and paid with US dollars) have won some successes....But there are absolutely no grounds for optimistic conclusions." Indeed he notes that "after a year of Government's successes there are more guerillas in the field than ever before." (*Newsweek* 11-3-63 after an interview with Senator Mansfield). Indeed the Vietnamese people are as determined as ever before to fight. The report continues, "without the full support of the Vietnamese people the outcome of the jungle warfare remains in doubt."

In fact throughout 1963 and 1964 the American-trained American-equipped army of South Vietnam was whipped in battle after battle. These regular soldiers of South Vietnam were whipped by irregulars of the Viet Cong Guerilla army. How could well trained soldiers equipped with the most modern weapons be so easily defeated in this way? The Americans make out that battalions of North Vietnamese soldiers, with weapons supplied from China and Russia, form the Viet Cong armies. But let us examine American press reports. In October 1963 such contradictory reports of conditions in Vietnam were reaching US ruling circles that the American President decided to send Defence Secretary Mac

Namara on a fact finding mission. *Newsweek* of 13th October 1963 reports:—

"Is this Chinese?" asked Secretary Mac Namara, pointing at a formidable looking weapon in a pile of captured Viet-Cong arms." "I am afraid I have to say" answered his embarrassed Vietnamese Guide "that this is a regular American 57 MM Recoiless Rifle which they captured from us."

"Into the S. Vietnam jungle outpost swarmed several hundred Vietcong troops.. Then following a set plan the Viet Cong pulled back with two captured 105.m. howitzers and proceeded to lay down a blistering mortar barrage..So desperate were the besieged Government troops that when the US helicopter crewmen tried to take off they had to push away scores of beseeching soldiers...."

"The remaining 100 defenders held out at Ba Gia with little choice to fight or to die —General Thi the South Vietnam Commander refused to send reinforcements only 10 miles for fear they would be ambushed. Instead Thi called for a detachment of U.S. marines. Needless to say the marines did not relish an ambush either and his request was denied." (*Newsweek* 19-7-65.

In the "Monthly Review" of February 1964 is an article on Vietnam which contains the following paragraph from New York Times of 7-12-1963.

"Last month 300 guerillas stole into a heavily armed camp west of Saigon. They inflicted heavy casualties and marched off with a load of arms, money and ammunition. From Saigon's roof tops, the deep boom of Government's artillery could be heard. And on clear days persons lunching in the 9th floor restaurant of Caravalle Hotel can watch Government planes dropping napalam on guerillas across Saigon River. From almost every direction guerillas creep" close to Saigon and their attacks grow bolder. Indeed as already noted—by U.S. Senator Mansfield the outcome of jungle warfare remains in grave doubt for the Americans.

What is happening in South Vietnam? After Diem was deposed a military junta

took over. Since then civil government has been completely absent and the country has been under arbitrary military rule. One general of the South Vietnamese army succeeded another and no amount of U.S. persuasion and pressure has been able to reconcile the different warring factions of the South Vietnamese army. There have been nine successive rulers so far. They have been inefficient, brutal and corrupt. At least one of them has embezzled one million U.S. dollars and fled the country. The latest South Vietnamese Prime Minister is "34 year old Air Vice Marshall Cao Ky, just the last person among the bickering generals and politicians that anyone would have thought suited by temperament and training to head the South Vietnamese Government...."

"When Air Vice Marshall Cao Ky was not flying missions he could always be found leaning against a juke box in one of Sa'gon's many coffee houses or at his favourite night club. During dinner parties Cao was notorious for getting up from his chair and reciting long and tearful poems dedicated to the comeliest woman in the room.... Indeed all the young officer had to his credit—until the military junta surprised everyone by pushing him forward... was a reputation for being a hot shot pilot and an off duty play boy". (*Newsweek* 12th July, 1965.)

### RAIN OF DEATH

How are the Americans winning the war in South Vietnam? "All last week Air Force bombers from Da Nang and carrier based planes spread devastation in North and South Vietnam. In dozens of villages bewildered peasants found themselves forced to cover in their impoverished bomb shelters or risk being caught in a rain of death. And all too often the men in the planes had no way of knowing whether their bombs were hitting Vietcong or non-combatants—or nobody at all" (*Newsweek* 16th August 1965.)

In the same *Newsweek* Morley Safer who was on the scene describes how the U.S. marines "had orders to burn the hamlet (of Cum Ne) to the ground if they received so much as one round (of fire) (shades of Lidice.) First however they replied to the

sniper fire with a rocket barrage, wounded three women and killed one infant." Then after this great feat the U.S. marines "moved into the village and proceeded first with cigarette lighters then flame throwers to burn down an estimated 150 dwellings. Old men and women who were pleading with the marines to spare their houses were ignored... The operation netted 4 prisoners—old men."

This issue of the *Newsweek* further describes similar U.S. victories. "Morton Perry *Newsweek* correspondent accompanied troops of the 173rd Airborne Brigade on a sweep through the jungle in search of Vietcong.

"After waiting until B 57 Bombers from Guam had plastered the area we whistled into the scene—in helicopters) riddling the nearby bush with automatic fire... the troops jumped out, some were dodging across paddies firing their M-16 light weight rifles from the hip..." "something moving over there" some cried and the whole platoon ripped off fire in that direction. At the tree line where the paddies gave way to the jungle the men crouched firing into the forbidding darkness—not a guerilla dead or alive could be seen. By now a second line of troops was landing.—"Did you see anything?" they asked "Nct a thing man. Did you?" "I think I killed a water buffalo" was the reply. And so death rains down from the skies in Vietnam.

"It was an American Senator who made a sharp statement in 1955 challenging the U.S. military build-up and the sending in of military advisers. It was none other than Lyndon B. Johnson who said then, "It would be wrong to send American G.I's into the jungle of Indo-China on a blood letting spree to perpetuate colonialism and white man's exploitation of Asia."

### THE REAL REASON

But there are powerful forces in the U.S. profiting by the war in the form of contracts. Here are some examples of such contracts.

1. Bell Aero Space Corp.—100 million Dollar order for helicopters
2. Oscar Meyer & Co.—2.6 million dollars for canned beans.

3. Reigel Textile Corp.—1.6 million dollars for uniforms
4. Borg & Warner of Chicago—2.6 million dollars for steel helmets.
5. Hughes tool company—Multi-million dollar contract for helicopters.
6. American Machine & Foundry—17 million dollars for Mark 2 Bomb Assemblies
7. Honeywell and Co.—3.3 million dollars for bombs.
8. Kaiser Jeep Corporation—58 million dollars for army trucks.

This list could be greatly added to but the examples given above are sufficient to show how American big business is profiting from the war in Vietnam.

What are American aims in South Vietnam? In Washington Secretary of State Dean Rusk scornfully ridiculed those critics who had been calling for a U.S. withdrawal in Vietnam. "Let us be clear about what is involved today in South East Asia", he told a meeting of the American Society of International Law. "We are not involved with empty phrases or conceptions which ride upon clouds. We are talking of vital interests of the United States and the peace of the Pacific. We are talking about the appetite for aggression... We are talking about the safety of nations with whom we are allied... and the integrity of the American commitment". Newsweek—3rd May, 1965.

..the integrity of the American commitment indeed! If this argument is correct U.S. forces should have invaded India because Indian troops crossed the Indo-Pakistan border and Pakistan is a military ally of the U.S. But no. Other logic applies when the clash is between two capitalist powers. No U.S. troops are needed in the Indo-Pakistan war. Whichever side wins capitalist property relations are not in danger.

The Newsweek of March 1st, 1965 contains on page 11 the following:—"We seek no wider war", said Johnson..in some remarks added at the last minute to a speech before the National Industrial Conference Board, "we will persist in the defence of

## VIETNAM : THE TRUTH

by William Warbey, M.P.

This up-to-date account of the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people, released from the press last month, traces the history of that country from the time of the French occupation. Written by a British Labour M.P., who has twice visited Vietnam, in May 1957 and again this year, it recounts the tragic events that followed the re-emergence of Vietnam as a single sovereign independent state on 2nd September 1945 with Ho Chi Minh as President, the decision of western powers to arrange the future of Vietnam over the heads of the people of Vietnam, in conformity with Great Power aims—first to partition then permit the re-entry of French and later the Americans. It shows the responsibility of the Labour Governments from 1945 for this tragedy. In addition, this well documented work exposes the role played by the United States from 1945 to date.

Running into 176 pages and priced at Rs. 8/95 this book is retailed by us who have the sole distributing rights in Ceylon. V.P.P. orders are accepted.

### SURIYA BOOKSHOP

388, Galle Road,  
opp. Vihara Lane,  
Wellawatte.

freedom" ..Whose freedom? And freedom to do do what?

Forgotten are the words of the leader of the U.S. delegation to the Geneva Conference which state.."It (the U.S.) will refrain from the use of force to disturb them" ....(the Vietnamese people)..Apparently the need to hold free general elections by secret ballot....under U.N. supervision no longer (or never) existed—and why? There was no guarantee that with conditions what they were in existence in Vietnam a government acceptable to the U.S. Government would be returned to power. As shown from the quote already given above Eisenhower realised this years ago. Today that same U.S. Senator who in 1955 condemned sending American G.I's on a blood letting spree into Indo-China to perpetuate colonialism has taken on the task of sending not Ameri-

can G.I's but American armies equipped with the most deadly weapons on a massive scale. We agree that American troops and money assisted first the French to fight the Vietnamese people and then propped up puppets after 1954 to perpetuate colonialism. But we cannot by any stretch of imagination or logic agree that American armies in Vietnam are there today to perpetuate anything else but colonialism or neo-colo-

nialism. We might conclude with a quotation from an American magazine. "No longer do State Department spokesmen repeat the phrase, "A Vietnamese war to be won by Vietnamese". For inch by inch the war in Vietnam has become . . . an American war on the mainland of Asia". p. 20, Newsweek—16th August, 1965.

*(To be continued)*

## 'Mom, Why Must I Kill Women and Kids?'

An Associated Press dispatch of September 30th from Wichita, Kansas, quoted the following from a letter by Corporal Ronnie W. Wilson in Vietnam to his mother :

"There are so many Cong here that in three days we captured 12 Viet Cong and killed 33. Mom, I had to kill a woman and a baby.

"We were sweeping the jungle and all of a sudden the Cong opened up on us. People were falling and Cong were clipping 81 mortars on us. The Lieutenant had us move out towards the firing. We killed eight Cong and about 30 got away.

"Anyway we were searching the dead Cong when a wife of the one I was checking ran out of a cave and picked up a sub-machine gun and started firing at us.

"I shot her and my rifle was automatic, so before I knew it, I had shot about six rounds. Four of them hit her and the others went in the cave and must have bounced off the rock wall and hit the baby.

"Mom, for the first time I felt really sick to my stomach. The baby was about two months old....

"I swear to God this place is worse than hell. Why must I kill women and kids? Who knows who is right? They think they are and we think we are. Both sides are losing men. I wish to God this was over."

The Associated Press quoted Mrs. Wilson: "He is proud of being in the marines and of doing his job. It is a bad thing for parents to have raised their sons in church to have things happen like this."



# THE BRITISH YOUNG SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

by UPALI COORAY

Morecambe, a coastal town in the north of England, was recently the scene of a historic gathering. On February 27th and 28th over a thousand youth, delegates and visitors from Young Socialist branches up and down the country, met under the banners of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, to discuss and debate important political issues, which vitally affect the working class, nationally and internationally. Despite all attempts at sabotage by the right-wing Labour leaders, and all shades of centrists, the conference was a great success. The standard of discussion and the exemplary behaviour of the young workers participating made the bourgeois press very uneasy.

The Young Socialist movement was the youth organisation of the Labour Party. The Labour leadership from time to time attempted to harness the energies of youth to boost their dwindling Parliamentary strength. When the youth, however, became too radical for the class collaborationists, the bureaucrats did not hesitate to destroy it. All publications advocating the path of class struggle were proscribed. Those who urged youth to wage a real struggle against capitalism were expelled. The Stalinists and centrists aided and abetted the right-wing to weed out the militants. Thus, twice before, in 1939 and 1954, the Social Democrats disbanded the youth movement.

Successive General Election defeats after 1951 compelled the Labour right-wing, in an effort to minimise their electoral losses, to revive the youth movement. In 1960, though the bureaucracy, assisted by 26 full-time youth organisers, proposed the setting up of a national youth organisation, and the election of a national committee, their real aim was to establish a middle class youth group, whose members would serve as electoral functionaries to the Parliamentary careerists of the Labour Party.

Two major tasks faced the Marxists. They had to defeat the aim of the right-wing to create a servile middle class youth organisation by drawing in more and more working class youth. Secondly, after the Trotskyists had gained a powerful influence within the Young Socialists, they had to prevent the movement disintegrating under a Social democratic straight-jacket.

If the Marxists were to attract working class youth into the ranks of the Young Socialists then they had to understand and give leadership on those problems facing young workers. Capitalism could offer them only dead-end jobs, unemployment, and police violence. Young people are made to do the jobs of adult workers at a paltry wage. The treacherous trade union bureaucracies help the bosses to continue this exploitation. The 'lefts' of the Labour Movement made no attempt to understand these problems. In consequence the majority of this neglected youth, without the intervention of the Marxists, become apathetic towards politics and tend to be cynics and sceptics.

The failure of left-wing elements to understand the youth and the problems peculiar to them was no accident. Their attitude was based on the observations of an older generation of workers, and generalisations of the struggles of the preceding period. The advent of automation and the deepening of capitalist crisis in the metropolitan countries had a powerful impact on their economic infra-structure and hence on the political and social superstructure. The youth (who did not go through the experiences of the 20's and 30's) were affected more than the older workers by these developments. Thus there necessarily existed a gap between the levels of consciousness of the generations. Similarly there was a corresponding gap in theory. This explains the role of the 'lefts' and centrists within the Young Socialist movement. It also explains the great success of the mino-

rity of Marxists, who alone struggled for theoretical clarity.

The Trotskyists went ahead with their drive to recruit young workers. This was no easy or straight forward task. Even within their own ranks there was considerable discussion, dissension and debate over the ways and means of approaching working class youth. 1960 saw the Trotskyists only a small minority facing a right-wing, backed by full-time organisers and necessary finance. The 1961 annual conference elected only one Trotskyist to the National Committee. By the end of 1962, the deflationary cycle resulted in a large number of youth being thrown out of work. Here the Trotskyists organised the unemployed youth from the dole queues into demonstrations in order to highlight the acute problem facing the young workers and to give them experience in actions of class solidarity. On every possible occasion a unity was forged between older and young workers. In strikes and lock-outs the Young Socialists were mobilised to support the strikes and to prevent youth being used as 'scabs'.

By 1962, in the Young Socialists, the Trotskyist representation had increased to three, and in 1963 to five out of eleven National Committee members. Yet the right-wing, supported by the centrists, were in a majority. It was at this point that the bureaucracy began a full scale attack on the militants within the Young Socialists. Following the 1962 conference, all three Trotskyist National Committee members were expelled. The "Keep Left" paper was proscribed. ("Keep Left" was started by a Labour youth branch, in London, as a duplicated bulletin as far back as 1950, but it was taken over by the Trotskyists and soon became a printed paper sponsored by over 100 YS branches. It had a circulation of just over 400 in 1960, but by 1962 it had risen to 4,000, and in spite of the fact that it was proscribed by 1965 its circulation was over 11,000) To aid these desperate attacks even the strong arm of the law was marshalled to physically remove militant youth from YS meetings.

The Trotskyists recognised that the witch-hunt could only be met, not by retreating, but by continuing the struggle for real

socialist policies. There were casualties, but the victims of the witch-hunt became hardened fighters. The annual conference of the Young Socialists in 1964 was a resounding success for the Trotskyists. They got a decisive majority on the National Committee, and the conference overwhelmingly supported their policy statements which clearly rejected the policies of Wilson & Co for reforming capitalism. The youth stood for uncompromising socialist policies

The last and final nail had been hammered in. The right-wing realised the futility of fighting any further. They concluded that the time had come to disown and disband the youth movement as a national organisation. On this occasion they adopted a more subtle method to achieve their goal. They refrained from calling the democratically elected National Committee. In fact the only meeting that was called was suspended after 90 minutes by the officials. One after the other the Trotskyist NC members were informed that their branches had been disbanded.

The Trotskyist majority now had to make a vital decision. Should the Young Socialists accept the dictates of the bureaucratic leaders any longer? Should they surrender all that had been built up over the years? If not, then they had to defy the right-wing leadership and prepare the movement for a complete break with social democracy.

The centrists immediately retreated. "Stay in the Labour Party at *any cost*" was their only answer. But this was impermissible. The mass of the youth within the Young Socialists had been won to a revolutionary programme. Could they now be tamely handed back to a class-collaborating leadership? No, was the firm reply of the Trotskyists, and the National Committee majority prepared the movement for a break.

On the eve of the 1964 General Election the Young Socialists organised a massive demonstration of youth on the slogans "Out with the Tories" and "Labour to Power on real socialist policies". They marched behind the banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky. They criticised the reformist Labour Leaders for their retreats

and betrayals. They demanded the reinstatement of all the Young Socialists who had been expelled, and the convening of the National Conference immediately after the election. Thus they focussed the attention of the Labour Movement on the role of the Labour Leadership, who seeking to serve the interests of capitalism must prepare a betrayal for the working class.

The victory of the Labour Party by a very slim majority did not alter the situation. Social Democracy came to power at a time when it could not grant even meagre concessions to the working class. The Labour leadership was now called on to initiate attacks on organised labour in order to salvage British Capitalism. In consequence it could no longer tolerate the demands of the Young Socialists. Despite the demand of a majority of Young Socialist branches for the calling of a national conference, the right-wing remained silent. The National Committee majority decided to act. They called the conference amid agonised cries from the centrists that "the time was not ripe". All the old formulas were dragged out, even though the intention of the bureaucracy to destroy the youth movement was crystal clear. The centrists were prostrate, only the Marxists could move forward.

Thus the Morecambe conference met, and proved that working class youth could not be brow-beaten into submission by the Labour bureaucrats. The right-wing threat-

ened expulsion to all who attended, but the delegates and visitors poured into the conference hall.

Whilst, all over the world today, from Alabama to Dar Nan, and Barcelona to Moscow, youth has once again come to the forefront of struggle, what is significant about the British Young Socialist movement is that it has a Marxist orientation and a revolutionary perspective. There are those 'lefts' who belittle its achievements and who predict its liquidation in advance. They see its continued growth as merely temporary or transitory. Yet this is merely a cover for their own impotency to mobilise young workers.

Has the Young Socialist movement its problems? Of course, especially that of training cadres and raising the theoretical level of its members. But every growing organisation will be confronted by such questions. The Socialist Labour League, under whose guidance the Young Socialists has grown to its present magnitude, bears the responsibility of resolving these problems. Realising that theoretical understanding can only come from involvement in working class struggle, the SLL, as we have shown guides the work of the Young Socialists daily into this field.

Today there are indications that under the banner of revolutionary Marxism the Young Socialists will grow from strength to strength to build the mass revolutionary party in Britain.

## WHO IS TAKING WHOM FOR A RIDE ?

*(Continued from page 160)*

them to shout BANGAVEVA! The walls of the capitalist Jericho will collapse and the petty bourgeois parasites who have been treading on the heels of the leaders will enter into their heritage. After the Stalinists have helped their LSSP buddies to determine whether the productive forces are sufficiently developed for the construction of socialism in a single island, the mighty leaders will solemnly declare: NOW LET US (the leaders) GO FORWARD TO (the managing of) THE BUILDING (by the workers) OF SINHALA-BUDDHIST SOCIALISM FIT FOR A UNIQUE MAJORITY COMMUNITY OF A UNIQUE

ISLAND, THE LIKE OF WHICH WAS NEVER EVEN DREAMED OF BY MARX, ENGELS, LENIN OR TROTSKY, WITH THE HONOURABLE EXCEPTION OF STALIN !!!

The Golden Age would have dawned for the inveterate petty bourgeois whose eclectic mind and supple spine can be adapted to any kind of demagogic regime that ensures him his 'cut' from the surplus value extorted from a disciplined working class. The clang and the clatter of the class struggle will soon shatter his dreams.

20-8-65

# THE NEED FOR CONSCIOUS REVOLUTIONARY LEADERSHIP

DISCUSSION ON A REPORT BY ADOLFO GILLY ON

## THE GUERRILLA MOVEMENT IN GUATEMALA

THE May and June, 1965, issues of *Monthly Review* are mainly devoted to a report on the Guatemalan guerrilla movement by Adolfo Gilly, a left-wing Argentine journalist, who spent several weeks in January and February this year with the guerrillas in their mountain stronghold of the Sierra de las Minas. What is of particular interest in this report to socialists and revolutionaries is the political evolution of the organisation which provides the leadership of the movement, and is known as MR-13.

MR-13 (Movimiento Revolucionario 13 de Noviembre) takes its name from a nationalist military group which staged an abortive up-rising on November 13, 1960 against the Ydígoras regime which in addition to its tyrannical rule had permitted the training by the US imperialists of a band of mercenaries on a Guatemalan farm for the ill-fated Bay of Pigs adventure against the Cuban revolution. As the MR-13 leaders themselves have admitted, "it was the very limited scope of the movement's political orientation that caused its defeat". The rebels scattered; some went into exile, some gave up the struggle, but a small group decided to carry on the struggle. They severed their links with the army and entered into secret negotiations with various opposition parties, but this produced no worthwhile results.

In December 1961 a group of peasants contacted the MR-13 leaders and offered peasant support provided MR-13 would begin an armed struggle for the land. This acted as a powerful stimulus in leading the movement to put an end to its fruitless negotiations with bourgeois opposition parties and instead to launch guerrilla warfare. By February 1962 the guerrilla forces had been organised under the leadership of Marco Antonio Yon Sosa in the mountains of Izabal in the Sierra de las Minas.

"Guerrilla warfare, fighting with arms in hand and side by side with the peasants, had its own logic", as Gilly puts it.

"...The leadership of MR-13 underwent a period of internal transformation. From a nationalist and anti-imperialist orientation, it moved to an acceptance of Marxism as a method of analysis and action, and socialism as the goal of the struggle. From the concept of anti-feudal, democratic revolution, it moved to a program of anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist revolution, of socialist revolution and, following the path of the socialist revolutions of China and Cuba, of a government of workers and peasants as the goal of the revolutionary struggle. This transformation opened new horizons for the guerrilla struggle, which had reached a dead end; it opened the way for organisation of the masses; at the same time it transformed the conception of the guerrilla force's own role and its relation to the masses." (Adolfo Gilly).

This is confirmed by Yon Sosa who told Gilly: "The decisive turn occurred when we adopted a programme of socialist revolution...in the process of fighting, living with peasants, and encountering many frustrations, we reached the conclusion that in Guatemala the only real revolution of the masses that can be made is a socialist revolution...To those peasants who are looked to as leaders of their communities the idea of socialist revolution appears to be so simple and logical that they are impatient with anyone who attempts to propose some other solution. This is our strength, and it constitutes not only material strength but also the strength of our program."

Gilly also quotes Yon Sosa as follows: "Our struggle is not primarily military but social. It's not our intention to destroy the government by military means; we intend to dissolve it through social action.

*This means that at the same time we must be organising the bases of the government that will replace the old one, a government of workers and peasants. Our guerrilla force organises on the social level. True, we fight with arms in hand, but we also organise the peasant masses and the city*

workers. They are the ones who'll topple the capitalist dictatorship."

The political orientation of MR-13 is clearly explained by Francisco Amado Granados who was interviewed by Adolfo Gilly. Here are extracts from Gilly's report of the interview:

#### Interview with Francisco Amado Granados, a guerrilla leader of MR-13.

*Q. Does MR-13 have support in urban areas?*

Yes, widespread support. The people are with the guerrilleros, especially the students and the labour movement. The broad circulation of our newspaper (*Revolucion Socialista*) is a gauge of our popular support, even though it is published and distributed clandestinely, and those found in possession of a copy are risking imprisonment, as well as the usual harassment and torture which constitute standard police methods under a dictatorship. We see evidence of it also in the thunderous applause which greets even the most passing reference to our guerrilleros on any public occasion. The guerrilla force is a focal point, a repository of political authority for the entire population of Guatemala. This is not due primarily to the admiration felt for the heroism of the guerrilleros, but to the people's identification with our armed revolutionary struggle. This fact signifies that they are preparing to participate en masse, and our job is to organise their participation....

*Q. Members of your movement maintain that it is necessary to make a socialist revolution in Guatemala. The PGT (Partido Guatemalteco del Trabajo, the Communist Party of Guatemala) claims that what is needed is a democratic national revolution. What are the theoretical and practical implications of this divergency of opinion?*

Well, in the first place, there are differences in respect to the goal of the revolution and of revolutionary struggle; two distinct paths are being proposed. The PGT declares itself in favour of armed struggle; we are carrying out armed struggle. But armed struggle, though important, is a means. What is of real importance is the goal served by it. If it is used as a pressure device to force negotiations for the holding

of elections for example, then armed struggle will fail, it will lose all value. But if armed struggle continues its development, it will ultimately find its own socialist goal. That's what has happened to us; it was our involvement in the armed struggle that led us to conclude that there was no other solution but the socialist revolution.

In the revolutionary struggle the goal determines the means. This is very simple. If the goal is a government of "national democracy", which no one has as yet defined—after all, Marxism recognises only two kinds of states, in the present epoch, the bourgeois and the workers' state—then the means will be tailored to this goal. Such a government, it is said, would be made up of a four-class bloc: workers, peasants, petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie. To begin with, there is no national bourgeoisie in Guatemala; further, to specify the formation of this bloc as one's goal means to exclude all methods of revolutionary struggle appropriate to the working class. For example, it would be necessary to exclude as a method of struggle the revolutionary general strike, the occupation and workers' control of factories, the arming of the proletariat. All these methods, essentially revolutionary and not peaceful, would not be available to this suggested bloc. Such methods imply opposition between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, foreign and domestic. To exclude methods proper to the working class would mean to limit the scope and effectiveness of the struggle; it would lead to defeat or to an impasse. The PGT and the Communist Parties that, in broad outline, follow Moscow's line rule out these methods, because the independent revolutionary mobilization of the working class destroys any prospect of a so-called "four-class bloc". **But without independent revolutionary mobilization of the working class there can be no victorious revolution.**

The goal of a socialist revolution, on the other hand, brings peasant struggle and peasant warfare closer to the proletarian struggle, putting them at the service of a single revolutionary goal, the overturn of capitalism and the taking of power by the masses.

If we are not in agreement on the goal, it then becomes difficult to agree on the means. However, since the PGT also calls for a struggle against imperialism, we have publicly proposed to them and to other organisations that we form a **united anti-imperialist front, based on concrete points of agreement, so that we may strike collectively against the imperialist enemy.**

The PGT declares that the proletariat must exercise the leadership of such a bloc. We must, then, define "leadership". In all alliances it is not subjective interpretations that determine each group's role, it is the program. **If the program is bourgeois, then the forces of the bourgeoisie will exercise leadership, however tenuous it may be. Lenin taught us this. If the proletariat is to assume leadership in any alliance, it must do so through its own program, or at least through an essential and decisive part of its program; the alliance must move in the direction of such a program, even though it may not adopt it completely.** In Guatemala it is impossible to take even one step toward the revolution without a proletarian program. Such is the reality of the situation. And no bourgeois force will accept such a program. **The one proposed by the PGT, for the purpose of "attracting" the purportedly "non-imperialist bourgeoisie" is a program of accommodation to the capitalist system, of reform made within the framework of the system. We are against such a bloc; we are for the workers' and peasants' alliance, with a proletarian program and proletarian leadership.**

*Q. But does this mean that you reject all reform, all immediate democratic demands?*

No, not at all. What we reject is the concept of the conquest of democracy for the people under the capitalist system. **We don't separate our struggle for immediate demands from our struggle for power; our program of struggle includes a number of**

**immediate demands. But at the same time we maintain that they can only be won through the revolutionary mobilization of the masses. And this mobilization, when it gets under way, will be carried by its own impetus beyond immediate demands and will move toward the struggle for power. Immediate demands unify large sectors of the population and mobilize them into action; but we must not limit ourselves to them nor create the illusion that the winning of such victories can be consolidated without further struggle. The advances must continue; otherwise the victories fade.** The recent history of Latin America is proof of this, and we Guatemalans have had our own confirmation of this fact in the Arbenz experience and his subsequent overthrow. Therefore, we don't proclaim two separate goals—immediate demands on weekdays, and socialist revolution on Sundays. We consider them to be inseparably united. We don't have a minimal reformist program for today and a maximal revolutionary program for a distant future; we have a **revolutionary program of transition, in which all immediate demands are inseparably linked to the struggle for the socialist revolution.** On the basis of this program, we are establishing and we shall continue to establish **united fronts with all organisations and parties that coincide with some points of our struggle, so long as we are not thereby limited to the joint program alone, but are permitted to move ahead simultaneously in the organizing of the socialist revolution.**

*Q. What is the position of MR-13 on the Sino-Soviet conflict?*

Our documents set forth our position. We don't share the attitude of those who claim that the conflict is irrelevant to us and that we must remain neutral. This subject is of concern to revolutionaries throughout the world; vital questions of revolutionary strategy are involved. We do not share the position of the Chinese compañeros in all aspects, but we **think that their revolutionary line of opposition to peaceful coexistence and peaceful transition serves to activate the revolution and can provide a basis for discussion and the regrouping of all revolutionary forces, proletarian and national, throughout the world, on the path of violent armed struggle against capitalism and imperialism.** Such is

our general opinion and we have therefore supported certain moves made by the Chinese companeros, although there is no absolute identity of position.

*Q. What are the perspectives of the Guatemalan revolution in the near future?*

Our revolution draws its strength not only from Guatemala but from the entire world. If it were merely a matter of our own forces, we would have been crushed already. Vietnam would also have been crushed. Yet "they" have not been able to accomplish this, not only because of support given by socialist countries, but also because of the strength of the world revolution. **It is no longer possible to measure the strength of a revolution in national terms alone; it must be measured in world terms. In every instance the relationship of world forces is reflected. We are part of a vast relationship of forces; we help to determine them, as they help to determine us. We exist within this context. It is in the light of these facts that we have opted for the goal of socialist revolution. We have in our favour the tremendous impetus of world revolution.** This is also true for Zanzibar, for example. If it were not so, how could they have undertaken to do what they have done, on an island whose total population is less than that of Guatemala City? Our greatest problem is not the strength and arms of our enemies—although they are vast—but our need to create in our ranks a team of activists and leaders—workers, students, peasants—who will understand the situation thoroughly and how best to take advantage of it; who will see clearly the relation of forces; who will understand the nature of our tasks and will attack them with boldness. When you're really convinced that you're in the right, when you have confidence in your own strength as well as in the strength and understanding of the masses, you will find that you possess a high degree of boldness. It is therefore our principle task now to organise and develop that confidence, through armed struggle and political struggles of all kinds. Confidence and boldness will be decisive to the course of the Guatemalan revolution in the near future, now that our movement is attracting the attention of the entire population. And we are firmly confident

that our struggle, as we conceive it, and our program will soon create repercussions throughout Central America and arouse a responsive echo in other countries of Latin America.

(our emphasis)

\* \* \*

Gilly's report also contains verbatim records of interviews with other leading personnel of MR-13 such as Yon Sosa, Luis A. Turcios and Evaristo Aldana. He summarises the program of MR-13 thus:

"The socialist program denies a revolutionary role to the national bourgeoisie and exalts the role of the diametrically opposing class, the proletariat. Consequently it is free to utilize, jointly with peasant warfare, the most appropriate methods of struggle, even the most drastic and violent methods such as the general strike and the urban insurrection at the decisive moment. Thus the guerrilla force links the peasant war, the general strike, and the urban insurrection in a process of parallel and joint actions."

"MR-13 maintains that the objective of the armed struggle carried out under its leadership is to establish a peasants' and workers' government, to overturn capitalism, expel imperialism, arm the working population and organize it in militias, organise workers' and peasants' committees as the base of power in the nation, institute an agrarian revolution, nationalise foreign industries and the principal national industries, establish workers' control in industry, institute a state monopoly of trade, set up alliances with socialist countries—in a word, to take the socialist path of the Cuban revolution, broadened by the experience of the Guatemalan revolution. As MR-13 sees it, only the working class in power, allied with the peasantry, can industrialise the country, distribute land, and carry out the democratic measures that the bourgeoisie has been incapable of instituting. To assign a role in the revolution to the national bourgeoisie, or even to foster illusions concerning its 'neutralisation', only serves to limit the program and objectives of the struggle, and consequently to weaken and confuse the revolutionary forces, all in the name of keeping a

non-existent 'ally'. The national bourgeoisie has no role in the revolution, MR-13 states, nor can it govern jointly with workers and peasants."

Gilly quotes Evaristo Aldana as follows: "The guerrilla force functions in certain respects like a party that leads, but we are also organising MR-13 among the peasants and in their committees, to give them added political force and vitality. If we are to fulfil the objectives to which we are

committed, a socialist program is indispensable; without it we could not possibly organise the committees. The committee is a form of organisation for struggle, a united front; it is also an embryonic form of mass political power. The committee has a class character, and we have discussed and overcome errors that were bound to arise in an organisation such as the committees, comprising both poor and rich peasants."

\* \* \*

"...to lead the masses of the people to victory over the bloc of the imperialists the feudalists and the national bourgeoisie—this can be done only under the revolutionary hegemony of the proletariat, which transforms itself after the seizure of power into the dictatorship of the proletariat."

#### Trotsky—THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

"No matter what the first episodic stages of the revolution may be in the individual countries, the realisation of the revolutionary alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry is conceivable only under the political leadership of the proletarian vanguard, organised in the Communist Party."

#### Trotsky—THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

"The dictatorship of the proletariat imperiously demands a single and united proletarian party as the leader of the working masses and the poor peasantry. Such unity, unweakened by factional strife, is unconditionally necessary to the proletariat in the fulfillment of its historic mission. This can be realised only upon the basis of the teachings of Marx and Lenin, undiluted with personal interpretations and undistorted by revisionism."

#### Trotsky—THE PLATFORM OF THE LEFT OPPOSITION

It is clear from Gilly's report and the statements of several leaders that MR-13 has reached a stage of political development which places it far in advance of any other guerrilla group in current history. Its socialist program, in its broad outlines, as depicted by Gilly, falls into line with that of Lenin's Bolshevik Party and the October Revolution which confirmed Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution.

The MR-13 leaders did not start off by taking the theory of permanent revolution as a guide to action. But they have arrived at their essentially Trotskyist position through their capacity to learn from their own experiences in living and fighting alongside the oppressed masses of Guatemala and also from a study of the current revo-

lutionary movements in the rest of the world. This confirms the validity of the theory of permanent revolution as being the expression of the inner logic of the forces of social change in the world today. It is however, necessary to take control of those forces which act through human agency, the conflict of classes, and make them work **consciously** towards their logical denouement in the world proletarian revolution. The alternative would be to submit to the blind interplay of those forces with their consequent cost in needless human suffering and the decay of civilization, if not the destruction of humanity itself. Having come thus far, the further development of the Guatemalan revolution thus depends on the **conscious** application of the theory of permanent revolution as a guide to action.



Revolutionary mass movements can throw up leaders who suddenly awake to the realisation that they have 'always been Marxists' or who for all practical purposes think and act like 'unconscious' Trotskyists. But the very immensity of the historic task that faces a revolutionary movement demands a much, much higher degree of consciousness in its vanguard than can be provided by successful improvisors however brilliant and courageous and however sincere their intentions.

However admirable a capacity to learn from past mistakes it is much more important to be able to foresee what is ahead and avoid mistakes when what is involved is the lives of people engaged in a bitter struggle for the overthrow of a reactionary social order. We have in mind the heavy price paid by the workers and peasants of China during the period of collaboration of the Chinese Communists (inspired by Stalin) with the Kuo-min-Tang. We also have in mind the heavy price still being paid by the masses of South Viet-nam for the class-collaborationist policy of the Viet Minh leadership (inspired by the Chinese Communists) which led to the betrayal on which the 1954 Geneva Conference set its seal.

Unless the practical lessons learned by the MR-13 leadership are utilised to develop the theory of the class struggle in the environment of a semi-colonial country in the epoch of the death throes of international capitalism, their correct practical conclusions can be vitiated by a gradual adaptation to the petty-bourgeois ideology of the numerically predominant peasantry for the sake of preserving the worker-peasant alliance.

As the experience of the LSSP in Ceylon has shown, a proletarian program in itself is no guarantee that a leadership will not succumb to alien class pressures and that the movement will not be swamped by petty-bourgeois reformists and opportunists masquerading as 'socialists', 'communists' and 'Trotskyists', who lean on the backward rural masses and who will sooner or later kick aside the proletarian program and betray the struggle. The proletarian program lays down the general strategical line; but the leadership will be tested in its tacti-

cal application of that program to the various stages of the struggle and the changing relationship of class forces, including the relationship between the proletariat and the peasantry. It is here that improvisations must prove fatal, and theoretical clarity is absolutely essential; for it is here that petty-bourgeois opportunist agents of the bourgeoisie find their chance to devise 'golden-brainy' tactics that disorient and paralyse the movement.

While the MR-13 leadership has escaped from the Stalinist trap of the "bloc of four classes", at least as regards its applicability for Guatamala, the views expressed by Granados (in the interview we have quoted) on the Sino-Soviet conflict indicate a leaning (with certain reservations) towards the Chinese Communists' "general revolutionary line of opposition to peaceful co-existence and peaceful transition". However, it is necessary to bear in mind that this Chinese line does not prevent its followers in Viet-nam and Indonesia from making the "bloc of four classes" the basis of their policies. An uncritical regard for the Chinese line can provide a cover for the intrigues of Left Fakers within MR-13 and help to deceive revolutionists who have not understood that that line is a Maoist seasoning for serving up Stalin's basic revisionist hogwash which provides the ideological sustenance of both the Moscow and Peking bureaucracies, and continues to poison the revolutionary consciousness of theoretically ill-equipped revolutionaries.

The ability of the MR-13 leadership to avoid the pitfalls that beset a revolutionary movement engaged in active struggle which sets in motion masses of politically backward people will depend on its ability to deepen its own understanding of the successes and failures of the world revolution, commencing from the Bolshevik Revolution, in the light of the theory of permanent revolution and Trotsky's invaluable analyses. Just as the attitude of the Chinese Communists to Trotskyism reveals that for all their revolutionary ballyhoo they are inveterate adherents of Stalin whose policy the MR-13 leaders have discovered empirically to be anti-revolutionary if not counter-revolutionary, so also the revolutionary bona fides of MR-13 will be tested in its attitude to Trotskyism and its readiness to

study and apply the theory of permanent revolution to the further unfolding of the Guatemalan revolution.

Evaristo Aldana says that the workers' and peasants' committees are "organisations for struggle, united fronts". This evidently means that within these committees are represented various political (ideological) tendencies. Now, in order to transform these committees into organs of "mass political power" it is absolutely essential that in the course of the struggle they should be unified not only organisationally but also ideologically. They must be imbued with a consciousness of their role and given a unity of purpose and perspective without which they will be unable to seize power and keep it.

Although MR-13 spokesmen speak out boldly about the necessity for revolution and a proletarian program, neither they nor their interpreter Gilly explicitly mention the dictatorship of the proletariat. Gilly however does speak of "the working class in power allied with the peasantry" and Granados speaks of "the workers' and peasants' alliance, with a proletarian program and proletarian leadership". This can only mean that the objective is the establishment of **the dictatorship of the proletariat with the support of the peasantry** as envisaged in the theory of permanent revolution. A proletarian program can be preserved unadulterated only under the hegemony of the proletariat in the struggle; and the hegemony of the proletariat must necessarily culminate in the dictatorship of the PROLETARIAT after the seizure of power in order to keep it.

The strategy and tactics of the struggle for power involves, then, an uncompromising ideological struggle for the emancipation of the committees from bourgeois ideology which blunts their revolutionary consciousness. This task can be performed only by a leadership which is itself conscious of where it is going and whose every step is illuminated with Marxist theory. But it can do so only if that consciousness leads to the building of a Bolshevik party as a constituent unit of a centralised and disciplined international leadership which unifies the activities of the various national parties. Only a proletarian party that is

## THE GUERRILLA MOVEMENT IN GUATEMALA

By ADOLFO GILLY

The story of the Guerrilla Movement in Guatemala, serialised in the May and June issues of the *Monthly Review*, available at Rs. 4/-, V.P.P. orders accepted.

**SURIYA BOOKSHOP**  
388, Galle Road,  
opp. Vihara Lane,  
Wellawatte.

being continuously invigorated by the accession of fresh cadres firmly rooted in the struggle of the toiling masses for emancipation from capitalist and imperialist slavery and theoretically equipped with the most up-to-date weapons from the arsenal of Marxism can ensure the continuity of the proletarian leadership in the event of the degeneration of individuals among the leadership. Only such a party will be capable of leading the struggle to the end, capable of transforming the workers' and peasants' committees from organs of struggle into the apparatus for the seizure of power and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat based on the support of the peasant poor.

Only under such a leadership will the workers and poor peasants of Guatemala be able to rally their class brothers in Latin America and the USA without whose aid the Guatemalan revolution cannot be defended against the attempts of Yankee imperialism to smash it. The counter-revolutionary intervention of the Yankee imperialists under cover of the OAS (the confederacy of the Latin American bourgeoisie) in the Dominican Republic is a case in point.

—The Editors.

# AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF MARXISM (VII)

By R. S. BAGHAVAN

## SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION

Marx showed that, in class society, economic evolution leads at critical points in development, to self-transformation, to social and political revolution. (314)

Specifically analysing the capitalist system, Marx showed that the laws of capitalism's self-movement lead inexorably to its stagnation, decay and destruction and to a transformation of the social order.

"The historic tendency of capitalist production," he writes, "is summed up thus:.. that capitalist property..cannot do other than transform itself into social property.." (315)

Capitalism, Marx points out, has created on a world scale the material preconditions for its transformation and at the same time created also the human agency by which this transformation is assured.

## THE MATERIAL BASIS OF COMMUNISM

Quantity and Quality figured large in Marx's perspective of social development. He made it quite clear that the higher form of society could be achieved only after critical limits in production had been passed.

"..Slavery cannot be abolished," he wrote, "without the steam engine and the mule and spinning jenny, serfdom cannot be abolished without improved agriculture.. 'Liberation' is a historical and not a mental act, and it is brought about by historical conditions.." (316)

Thus he explained the failure of the early "communist" movements under feudalism; the proletariat was as yet undeveloped, and the social and economic conditions for communism had yet to be created.

The proletariat can do away with the fundamental contradiction between social

production and individual appropriation only under specific conditions, only after the productive forces have grown to the point where they are capable of satisfying the needs of all mankind.

"If," says Marx, "...the proletariat should overthrow the political rule of the bourgeoisie, its victory would only be temporary, only an episode in the service of the bourgeois revolution, so long as the material conditions which would render necessary the abolition of the bourgeois mode of production, and consequently the definitive overthrow of the political rule of the bourgeoisie, had not yet been created in the course of historical development.."

"Similarly, the overthrow of the absolute monarchy would have been merely a momentary incident, if the economic conditions for the rule of the bourgeois class had not developed to the point of ripeness. Men do not build themselves a new world out of the fruits of the earth, as vulgar superstition believes, but out of the historical accomplishments of their declining civilization.." (317)

Marx and Engels repeatedly warned that the "development of productive forces..is an absolutely necessary practical premise because without it *want* is merely made general, and with *destitution* the struggle for necessities and all the old filthy business would necessarily be reproduced.." (318)

Capitalism has created the basic precondition for the creation of a new and higher stage of society, one without the fundamental contradiction between social production and individual appropriation.

"Only with big industry does the abolition of private property become possible," said Marx. (310)

The industrial resources created by capitalism on a world scale are now certainly

capable of satisfying the needs of all mankind. As early as 1878 Engels wrote that "...the possibility now exists for the first time." (320)

Just as the increase in the productivity of early Man led to a stage in which surplus produce was available, and exploitation, classes and private property were thus also possible, the increase of productivity under capitalism has created the material basis for the next social transition from quantity to quality—the abolition of private property, exploitation and classes.

This, for Marx and Engels, was another classic example of the working of the law of negation of negation. (321) Class society is replaced by a classless society, however, on a much higher social and cultural level than the primitive "communism" of the tribal infancy of Man.

#### THE REVOLUTIONARY CLASS

This transition from one social system to another does not take place automatically but through active, revolutionary human intervention.

Economic crises always manifest themselves in social convulsions. The conflict between productive forces and social relations cannot but have its reflexion in human relations, which, for Marx were *class relations*.

As the Communist Manifesto boldly proclaimed: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles... Oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary re-constitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes." (322)

The deeper the conflict, the more are the classes impelled into action. "With the thoroughness of the historical action, the size of the mass whose action it is will increase..." writes Marx. (323)

He says, "An oppressed class is the vital condition for every society founded on the antagonism of classes. The emancipation

of the oppressed class thus implies necessarily the creation of a new society..." (324)

As we have seen, Marx and Engels appreciated the revolutionary and progressive role of the capitalist class in the period of its ascendancy. But with the increasing contradictions of capitalist society the historic role of the capitalist class is exhausted; what was once a progressive class is now no longer progressive but reactionary, not only superfluous but also an obstacle. (325)

"It is unfit to rule," the *Manifesto* says pointedly, "because it cannot assure an existence to its slave within his slavery... its existence is no longer compatible with society..." (326)

The political force necessary for and capable of causing the change from capitalism to a higher form of society is the working class, which has to assume the leadership of the revolutionary masses.

"The bourgeoisie begins with a proletariat which is itself a relic of the proletariat of feudal times. In the course of its historical development, the bourgeoisie necessarily develops its antagonistic character, which is at first more or less disguised, existing only in a latent state. As the bourgeoisie develops, there develops in its bosom a new proletariat, a modern proletariat; there develops a struggle between the proletarian class and the bourgeois class..." writes Marx. (327)

The capitalist class structure is a unity of conflicting opposites. Marx notes that "Capital... presupposes wage labour; wage labour presupposes capital. They condition each other; each brings the other into existence..." (328)

"The contradiction between social production and capitalist appropriation," Engels points out, "became manifest as the antagonism between proletariat and bourgeoisie..." (329)

An increase in capitalist development produces a proportionate increase in the working class. (330)

Moreover, the working class is "disciplined, united, organized by the very mechanism of capitalist production itself." (331)

"Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class." (332)

It has fought the capitalist class from its very birth. (333)

It is a class that "has nothing to lose but its chains." (334)

"What the bourgeoisie... produces, above all, are its grave diggers." (335).

The emancipation of the working class must be achieved by the working class itself. (336) "The proletariat of each country must... first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie." (337) But the working class cannot free itself without freeing *all* of society. (338).

"...The antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, "says Marx, "is a struggle of class against class, a struggle which carried to its highest expression is a total revolution. Indeed, is it at all surprising that a society founded on the opposition of classes should culminate in brutal *contradiction*, the shock of body against body, as its final *denouement*?" (339)

## REVOLUTION

"A high appreciation of revolutionary periods in the development of humanity is something that flows logically from the sum-total of Marx's views on history," writes Lenin "It is in such periods that the numerous contradictions that slowly accumulate in periods of so-called peaceful development become resolved. It is in such periods that the direct role of the various classes in the determination of the forms of social life must manifest itself with the greatest force, and that the foundations are laid for the political 'superstructure' which then for a long time continues to persist on the basis of the new relations of production" (340)

Revolution, especially proletarian revolution, was the central theme of the writings of Marx and Engels. Suffice it for our purpose to give a brief survey of their views.

They said: "This contradiction between the productive forces and the form of intercourse, which has occurred several times in past history, without, however, endangering the basis, necessarily on each occasion burst out in a revolution, taking on at the same time various subsidiary forms, such as all-embracing collisions, collisions of various classes, contradictions of consciousness, battle of ideas, political conflict, etc..." (341)

"Every revolution dissolves the old society; in so far it is social. Every revolution overthrows the old power; in so far it is political..

"The revolution as such—the overthrow of the existing power and the dissolution of the old conditions—is a political act. But without a revolution, socialism cannot be achieved. It requires this political act, so far as it has need of the process of destruction and dissolution..." (342)

"Revolutions," says Marx briefly, "are the locomotives of history" (343)

Rosa Luxemburg echoes the same view:

"Revolution is the political act of creation in class society... The whole secret of historical revolutions brought about by the use of political power lies precisely in the transition from merely quantitative changes to qualitative changes, or, to put it more concretely, in the transition from one phase of history, from one social order, to the next..." (344)

Thus, as revolutionary changes in society are brought about ultimately by objective factors, revolutions cannot be made at will. Summing up the objective situation and the subjective factors required for a revolutionary situation, Lenin states that these are "independent not only of the will of separate groups and parties but even of separate classes" (345)

We must note in passing that only the Marxist method enables us to understand the dynamics of revolution. Trotsky writes:

"For revolution to become inevitable, class contradictions have to be strained to the breaking point. It is precisely this his-

torically inescapable necessity for conflict which depends neither on good or ill-will but on the objective inter-relationship between classes, that makes revolution, together with war, the most dramatic expression of the 'irrational' foundation of the historic process

"'Irrational' does not, however, mean arbitrary. On the contrary, in the molecular preparation of revolution, in its explosion, in its ascent and decline, there is lodged a profound inner lawfulness which can be apprehended and, in the main, foreseen. Revolutions, as has been said more than once, have a logic of their own. But this is not the logic of Aristotle, and even less the pragmatic demi-logic of 'common sense'. It is the higher function of thought: the logic of development and its contradictions, i.e., the dialectic." (346)

### REVOLUTIONARY VIOLENCE

It is a rare bourgeois statesman who, like Bismarck, says bluntly that "the great questions of the day are decided not by speeches, not by votes of majorities but by blood and iron."

Most bourgeois politicians and writers criticise Marx for advocating violence. But Marx did not create the laws of capitalist self-destruction. He only discovered them.

What the apologists for the capitalist system never refer to are the corpses piled up day after day under "peaceful conditions" of capitalist exploitation. We need not speak of the corpses heaped up in the wars for the preservation of profit and property.

It is refreshing in this connection to remember Mark Twain's comments on feudalism and the French Revolution. He writes of "the blessed Revolution which swept a thousand years of such villainy away in one swift tidal wave of blood.." "...Our shudders," he complains, "are all for the 'horrors' of the minor terror, the momentary Terror, so to speak; whereas, what is the horror of swift death by the axe compared with lifelong death from hunger, cold, insult, cruelty and heart-break?..All France could hardly contain the coffins filled by that older and real

Terror—that unspeakably bitter and awful Terror which none of us has been taught to see in its vastness or pity as it deserves." (347)

"Theory and history teach," writes Trotsky, "that a succession of social regimes pre-supposes the highest form of the class struggle, i.e., revolution..Only a successful revolution can clear the road to socialism.." (348)

"History down to now has not thought out any other way of carrying mankind forward than that of setting up always the revolutionary violence of the progressive class against the conservative violence of the outworn classes." (349)

"History on the whole knows of no revolution that was accomplished in a democratic way. For revolution is a very serious contest, which is always settled, not according to form, but according to substance. It happens quite frequently that individuals lose their fortune and even their 'honour' when playing cards according to the rules of the game; but classes never consent to lose possessions, power and 'honour' by observing the rules of the game of 'democratic' parliamentarism. They always decide the question in grim earnest, i.e., in accordance with the real co-relation of the material forces, and not with the phantom shadows of these forces." (350)

Even a brief glance at the course of world history will show that wars and counter-revolutions have been far more bloodthirsty than revolutions. One can only console oneself with Trotsky that "Clio, the Muse of History, was never a member of the Ladies' Peace Society." (351)

### THE ANALOGY OF BIRTH

Neither gradualness not painless evolution is recognized by Nature or History as a supreme principle. Rather, it is in the dialectical nature of things that suddenness and violence are organically connected with the nature of change.

The analogy of birth has often been used by Marxist writers to illustrate the nature of revolutionary change.

“Force,” says Marx in a famous passage, “is the midwife of every society pregnant with a new one.” (352)

“Human childbirth,” says Lenin, “is an act which transforms the woman into an almost lifeless, bloodstained heap of flesh, tortured, tormented and driven frantic by pain. But can the ‘type’ that sees *only* this in love and its sequel, in the transformation of the woman into a mother, be regarded as a human being? Who would renounce love and procreation for *this* reason?” (353)

“The act of birth is never a ‘gradual’ process, but a biological revolution,” says Trotsky. Blaming the progressive class for revolutionary violence is, he says, like “..accusing a human being of the birth-pangs of the mother who brought him into the world.” (354)

Elsewhere he says,

“The natural act of birth becomes at a certain moment equally unavoidable both for the material organism and for the offspring.” (355)

It must be remembered, however, that, as has been said by Engels in another connection, in the case of societies, the birth of the offspring costs the mother its life.

### THE TASKS OF THE WORKING CLASS

In “normal” periods of capitalist existence the working class contents itself with sporadic struggles with limited aims. These, as Rosa Luxemburg observed, are attempts to preserve the gains of the *last*, that is, the bourgeois revolution.

But when the objective situation compels the working class to enter the revolutionary arena, it does so with the subjective aim of emancipating itself. In so doing, it takes upon itself also the task of overthrowing the capitalist system and of creating a new social order.

Marx and Engels set out the basic tasks that the working class had to accomplish in order to achieve the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society.

“The means of change of a given society,” writes Engels, “are to be sought for in the existing system of production.” (356)

The working class, however, has no control over the means of production which belong exclusively to the capitalists. And, moreover, the propertied classes will not abdicate freely in the interests of social progress.

The first task of the working class thus becomes quite clear: in order to bring about changes in the economic system, the working class must achieve political power.

This idea had crystallised in Marx’s mind quite early. In his writings of 1847 he states:

“The existing bourgeois property relations are ‘maintained’ by the state power, which the bourgeoisie has organized for the protection of its property relations. The proletariat must, therefore, overthrow the political power where it is already in the hands of the bourgeoisie. They must themselves attain to power, to revolutionary power.” (357)

The *Communist Manifesto* declares:

“The first step in the revolution by the working class, is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class..” (358)

In 1872, with the experience of the Paris Commune in mind, Marx and Engels warned: “One thing especially was proved by the Commune viz., that the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready made state-machinery, and wield it for its own purposes.” (359)

The question of smashing the bourgeois state is the central theme of all Marxian politics.

“All bourgeois states, “Lenin has warned us, are “inevitably the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.” (360)

“Political forms may change,” writes Trotsky, “Capitalist appetites remain.” (361)

The working class must organize its own state machine.

Marx writes: "Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the State can be nothing but *the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.*" (362)

During the period of the Russian Revolution, this question was, as was only to be expected, uppermost in the minds of the revolutionaries. Lenin devoted not a little time to the elaboration of the strategy and tactics of the working class. His *State and Revolution*, work on which was interrupted by the Revolution itself, remains, even in its fragmentary form, a classic exposition of the Marxist theory of the state.

Writing in 1919, after the experience of the Russian Revolution, Lenin states:

"If we translate the Latin, scientific, historico-philosophical term 'dictatorship of the proletariat' into simple language, it means the following:

"Only a definite class, namely, the urban and the industrial workers in general, is able to lead the whole mass of toilers and exploited in the struggle for the overthrow of the yoke of capital, in the process of this overthrow, in the struggle for holding and consolidating the victory, in the work of creating the new, Socialist, social system, and in the whole struggle for the complete abolition of classes." (363).

Once in power, the proletariat must take over the bulk of the means of production.

"The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the state, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible," declares the *Manifesto* (364)

Productive forces, released from the restraints of production relations based on the profit motive, can now be brought on to a planned basis. Anarchy and waste are eliminated. (365)

Private property in the means of production must be abolished.

Marx says: "When the proletariat proclaims the dissolution of the existing order of things it is merely announcing the secret of its own existence, for it is in itself the virtual dissolution of this order of things. When the proletariat desires the negation of private property, it is merely elevating to a general principle of society what it already involuntarily embodies in itself as the negative product of society." (366)

In the words of the *Manifesto*: "In all these movements they (the Communists) bring to front, as the leading question in each, the property question, no matter what its degree of development at the time." (367) The task of the working class is, in one word, "Abolish private property." (368)

With the abolition of private property, the fundamental contradiction between social production and individual appropriation is eliminated.

The proletariat, organised as the ruling class, can now lay the foundation for the abolition of classes.

Thus, the historic task of the proletariat is, ultimately, to abolish itself! (369)

## THE NEW SOCIETY

Thanks, thus to capitalism's historic role of creating gigantic productive forces on a world scale and with it a revolutionary proletariat of proportionate dimensions, capitalism can be replaced by a new society. Mankind can take another step forward.

"The bourgeois relations of production," Marx says in his summing up, in his Foreword to the *Critique*, "are the last antagonistic form of the social process of production—antagonistic not in the sense of individual antagonism, but of one arising from the social conditions of life of the individuals; at the same time the productive forces developing in the womb of bourgeois society create the material conditions for the solution of that antagonism. This social formation constitutes, therefore, the closing chapter of the prehistoric stage of human society." (370)

Engels says that it is only then that Man "leaves the conditions of animal existence



behind him and enters conditions which are really human." (371)

Not being Utopians, Marx and Engels made no blue prints for the future society. They were satisfied merely with indicating the basic features of the new social system.

As we have seen, the fundamental contradiction between social production and individual appropriation will be eliminated. Production will be for the needs of men, not for the profit of a few. Private property will be abolished. Classes will cease gradually to exist. And with this, the state will lose its reason for existence and wither away. "The public power will lose its political character," says the *Manifesto*. (372) "The government of persons is replaced by the administration of things," says Engels in a famous passage. (373)

It is only under such conditions that mankind can be said to be truly emancipated.

The *Manifesto* declares, "In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all." (374)

In another of his rare descriptive references to the new society Marx says:

"In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of individuals under division of labour, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished; after labour has ceased to be a means of life and has become itself the primary necessity of life; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly—only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be fully left behind and society inscribe on its banners: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." (375)

#### NO SOCIAL FORMATION IS FINAL

Social development does not cease with the attainment of communism, though it may not be as prolonged or painful as in class society.

Marx foresaw that "It is only in an order of things in which there are no more classes and class antagonisms that *social evolutions* will cease to be *political revolutions*." (376)

"Communism," Marx said in one of his early works, "is the phase of negation of the negation, and is consequently, for the next stage of historical development, a *real* and necessary factor in the emancipation and rehabilitation of man. *Communism* is the necessary form and the active principle of the immediate future, but communism is not itself the aim of human development or the final form of human society" (377)

Nothing can stop the dialectic of social development.

"There is," Marx says, "a continuous movement of growth of productive forces, of destruction of social relations, of formation of ideas; nothing is immutable but the abstract movement—*mors immortalis*." (378)

Only Death is Immortal !

#### REFERENCES

- 314 Poverty of Philosophy Moscow Edn. p 175; German Ideology Moscow Edn. p. 91 *Plekhanov* Selected Works I, pp. 414 and 419
315. *Marx Engels* Selected Correspondence Lawrence & Wishart Edn. p. 353-4
316. German Ideology p. 56; See also *Marx and Engels on Britain* p. 403 and 446
317. *Marx* Selected Essays pp. 137-8; See also *Bottomore and Rubel* Karl Marx p. 240
318. German Ideology p. 46; Cf. *Trotsky* Revolution Betrayed pp. 239 and 295
319. German Ideology p. 81; Cf. *On Britain* p. 403
320. *Anti-Duhring* Moscow Edn. p. 388; Selected Works II, p. 150.
321. German Ideology p. 64; Sel. Works. II p. 139 and 150, Capital I, Mod. Lib. Edn. p. 838
322. Sel. Works I p. 33
323. *Holy Family* Moscow Edn. p. 110
324. *Poverty of Philosophy* pp. 173-4

325. *Engels* The British Labour Movement  
Lawrence & Wishart Edn. p. 42;  
Anti-Duhring p. 391.
326. Sel. Works I p. 43.
327. Poverty of Philosophy pp. 122-3;  
See *Ryazanov* The Communist  
Manifesto pp. 99 and 288.
328. Sel. Works I p. 38.
329. Anti-Duhring p. 371.
330. Sel. Works I p. 38.
331. Capital I Mod. Lib. Edn. 836-7; See  
also *Lenin* A Great Beginning Sel.  
Works IX pp. 431-2
332. Sel. Works. I p. 42.
333. Sel. Works I p. 40
334. Ibid. p. 61
335. Ibid. p. 43
336. Ibid. p. 351
337. Ibid. p. 43
338. Ibid. pp. 24, 28.
339. Poverty of Philosophy p. 174
340. Marx-Engels-Marxism pp. 237-8
341. German Ideology p. 91
342. Selected Essays p. 132; See also Ger-  
man Ideology p. 86
343. Sel. Works I p. 198
344. *Paul Frolich*; Rosa Luxemburg, Gol-  
lancz London p. 68.
345. *Lenin*: Collapse of the 2nd Inter-  
national Collected Works, Inter-  
national Publishers Edn. Vol.  
XVIII p. 279.  
Left Wing Communism Moscow  
Edn. 1952 Chap. V. p. 113 et seq.  
*Trotsky*: History of the Russian Re-  
volution pp. 17-19; 97; 1020-3
346. Introduction to *Isaacs*: Tragedy of the  
Chinese Revolution
347. *Mark Twain*: A Connecticut Yankee  
in King Arthur's Court, Pocket  
Book Edition p. 85 et seq.
348. Living Thoughts of Karl Marx p. 35
349. Defence of Terrorism; Introduction  
to 2nd English Edn. Cf. German  
Ideology p. 86
350. Between Red and White pp. 74-76
351. Introduction to *Isaacs*
352. Capital I Modern Library Edn. p. 824
353. Marx-Engels-Marxism p. 437; also  
p. 413
354. Defence of Terrorism Chap. I.
355. History of the Russian Revolution  
p. 97.
356. Sel. Works II p. 125; Capital I  
pp. 534-5.
357. Selected Essays p. 136
358. Sel. Works I p. 50; See also p. 44 and  
German Ideology p. 95
359. Sel. Works I p. 22; See also p. 468  
et seq.
360. State and Revolution Chap. 2 Sec. 3.
361. Living Thoughts of Marx. p. 25.
362. Sel. Works II p. 30.
363. A Great Beginning. Sel. Works (Law-  
rence and Wishart) Vol. IX  
pp.431-432
364. Sel. Works I. p. 50
365. Anti-Duhring Lawrence and Wishart  
Edn. p. 310.
366. On Religion p. 57
367. Sel. Works I p. 67.
368. Ibid. p. 45.
369. Anti-Duhring p. 308; Sel Works I  
pp. 50-1; Poverty of Philosophy  
173-4
370. Sel. Works I 329
371. Anti-Duhring p. 311
372. Sel. Works I. p. 51
373. Anti-Duhring pp. 308-9 Also see  
Poverty of Philosophy p. 174  
Sel. Works. II. pp. 142 and 292;  
Sel. Works I p. 577; *Engels*:  
Letter to Van Patten Apr. 18, 1883
374. Sel. Works I p. 51
375. Sel. Works II p. 23; See also *Lenin*  
State and Revolution Chap. 2  
Sec. 4
376. Poverty of Philosophy p. 175; See  
also *Plekhanov* Sel. Works I pp.  
414 and 419.
377. Economic and Philosophical Manus-  
cripts p. 114
378. Poverty of Philosophy p. 110.

Previous instalments appeared in Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 13 of *Young Socialist*

**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**