

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 2, No. 30

September 11, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue:

Page

Election Results in Chile.....	1
The General Strike in Nigeria.....	3
Colonial People Grateful for Cuban Example.....	8
Canadian Students Impressed by Cuban Revolution -- by Ross Dowson.....	9
New Wave of Militant Action in India -- by Kailas Chandra.....	11
Indian Communists Schedule Rival Congresses -- by A. Raheem.....	13
Opposition in U.S. to Role in South Vietnam.....	16
Mississippi's Long Hot Summer -- by Evelyn Sell.....	18
Johnson's Strategy -- by Joseph Hansen.....	20
Report on Alexander Case.....	24
Alexander Defence Rally in London.....	26
"I Have Not Forgotten. . ." (Concerning Thorez and Togliatti).....	27
Documents:	
Hands Off North Vietnam!.....	30
Ceylonese Trotskyists Oppose Coalition Platform (Text of Speech by Edmund Samarakkody).....	31

ELECTION RESULTS IN CHILE

It was reported in Washington that when the results of the September 4 election in Chile were announced, the sighs of relief in the State Department and White House were the loudest since the 1948 election in Italy when it was thought that the Communist party there might win a majority. (At that time President Truman was rumored to be readying the armed forces; and the United States was swept by one of the most intense war scares of the whole postwar period.) The Johnson administration, visualizing the possibility of the FRAP [Frente Revolucionario de Acción Popular] winning a majority in Chile,

saw one more major crisis looming on the international horizon. Even though the FRAP was only a Chilean version of the "popular front," its victory could touch off a revolutionary process that might end in a situation comparable to the one in Cuba.

The official returns, as announced by the Chilean Ministry of Interior, were as follows:

Eduardo Frei Montalva, candidate of the Christian Democrats, received 1,404,809 votes.

Salvador Allende Gossens, candidate of the FRAP, received 975,210 votes.

Julio Duran, candidate of the Radicals, ended up with only 128,350 votes.

These results registered popular repudiation of the government of President Jorge Alessandri and a shift toward the left although a more moderate one than the leaders of the FRAP had hoped for. (Followers of Khrushchev were even under the illusion that the election might demonstrate the feasibility of actually achieving, for the first time in history, a socialist overturn along the "peaceful" road.)

Allende campaigned for nationalization of the holdings of American imperialist interests in Chile, for "socialism," and for a radical agrarian reform. Frei advocated only that Chile should receive a bigger share in American exploitation of the country's resources and that some mild social reforms should be undertaken. He was especially careful not to antagonize the American interests.

The main factor that determined the outcome of the election was the exclusion of a big part of the electorate from the ballot box because of literacy requirements. In addition, landholders, capitalists and agents of American imperialism -- the whole camp of reaction, in fact -- rallied behind Frei as a "lesser evil" in order to block a victory by Allende.

The counterrevolutionary victory in Brazil last April also acted as a depressing factor in Chile as it has throughout Latin America.

Frei and his well-wishers in the State Department gained more time for capitalism in Chile but also received notice that it is only a breathing spell. The new president is faced with problems of crisis proportions inherited from Alessandri. These include industrial and agricultural stagnation, massive unemployment, bitter poverty, illiteracy, utterly inadequate housing and all the associated evils of these scourges. The agrarian problem is eloquently indicated by the fact that 2,800 holdings of more than 1,000 hectares each [one hectare = 2.47 acres] cover seventy-five per cent of the **arable land**.

An Eyewitness Account

THE GENERAL STRIKE IN NIGERIA

[In the first two weeks of June, Nigeria was rocked by a general strike involving 1,000,000 workers. The strike had loomed since the unions united in forming a Joint Action Committee shortly after Nigeria achieved the status of a republic last October. The Joint Action Committee called for establishment of a federal minimum wage of £20 [\$56] a month. The minimum wage for government employes in the capital city of Lagos at the time was £7/12s. [\$21.28]. Under heavy pressure, the government set up a commission headed by Chief Justice Adeyinka Morgan to make an inquiry. It came in with many recommendations for improvements, including a minimum wage of £12 [\$33.60] a month. The government, however, was slow in publishing the report. On May 26 the Joint Action Committee served an ultimatum on the government -- publish the report within 72 hours or face a general strike. On Saturday, May 30, the unions began strike preparations. Police attacked a rally that day, injuring dozens and arresting a number of people. The general strike began June 1. On June 3 the government published the Morgan Commission report with an accompanying White Paper that offered a minimum wage of only £9/2s. [\$25.48]. The strike continued with mounting impact. The following is an eyewitness account which we have received from our Lagos correspondent. -- Editor.]

* * *

It was rather flimsy, starting a general strike for slowness in publishing a government report. But discontent had been brewing in the country for three years since Independence. Also public assemblies, demonstrations and meetings of most sorts had been declared illegal by executive decrees called "promulgations." These ran something like this:

"No Assemblies Lagos

"January 1 to 10, 1964.

"Order dated Dec. 31, 1963."

"No Assemblies Northern Region

"January 15 to February 18.

"Order dated January 14, 1964."

And so on for all parts of the country.

When the Joint Action Committee called a meeting in a hotel for Saturday, May 30, it was strictly not within the law. At the rally, M.A.O. Imoudu made an impassioned speech on the lot of the workers, on the need for political freedom, violations of the Constitution, etc. His most biting remarks concerned the ban on demonstra-

tions. Nigeria's No. 1 labour leader shouted, "Now we will break the so-called ban!"

The crowd of workmen carried him off on their shoulders and the demonstration had begun. It consisted of a long massive march from the Lagos mainland towards the island.

Besides being illegal, the demonstration was unplanned. Hence the crowd was unprepared for the squads of riot policemen they encountered in battle readiness at the corner near the entrance to Carter Bridge.

Alhaji Adehdu of the United Labour Congress, the government-recognized union affiliated to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, decided to stop and have a chat with the police officer in charge. Imoudu asked to be put down so that he could march properly across the bridge on his own feet.

This pause of less than sixty seconds gave a favorable opening to the police. They charged the workers from three sides. The crowd had no place to go but backwards along a single street.

Soon Adehdu was being hit with batons. He went down and was trampled by workers beginning to stampede. Imoudu, by moving quickly forward, had broken through the police lines but found himself alone on the bridge. He turned to join the workers, again going through the police formation. He received some baton blows on the head but managed to rejoin his comrades and escape.

This episode became known as the Battle of Carter Bridge and is now often cited.

On the next day, workers throughout the country were able to read the headlines, "Workers Leaders Beaten Up by Police and Taken to Hospital." Despite this shocking news, something favorable had happened. The ban on freedom of assembly had been broken. There was no doubt that the strike to begin on Monday June 1 would be a big one. The workers were furious and determined.

At 6:30 a.m. I found three railway crossing gates removed. The trains were not running. I went to the docks at 7 a.m. and by noon we learned that all the ships were idle. The strike was virtually complete although not yet nation-wide. It was, however, spreading with enormous speed. Water was still available as well as electricity. Soldiers were keeping the power plants running. They did this by protecting the European staff with drawn batons.

On Tuesday municipal bus, sewage and other workers stopped work. Production throughout the country came to a virtual standstill.

In the north of Nigeria the unions are not as well organized as in the south. The first news of what was happening there came

Wednesday, June 3. Not only had the strike spread there, but the union leaders were being dragged to court on charges of "sabotage." What this referred to was the strike of workers in essential services.

In the west, a union leader who had criticized the strike preparations on Saturday as "flimsy," swung around by Tuesday and became a most efficient strike organizer. At Ibadan University the solidarity was not complete. Students beat up workers who refused to serve them because they were on strike. (African students were once the most dynamic in the world!)

A powerful new surge in the strike struggle occurred when the civil servants joined in. Their strike was one hundred per cent solid whereas the strike of the commercial workers remained spotty.

In eastern Nigeria, at Port Harcourt, two hundred workers marched fifteen miles to "free" some workers still on the job at a factory.

At Aba, women and workers marched to the High Court there and asked the judge why he was not on strike. His lordship fled, leaving his wig behind, according to eyewitnesses.

It was also in eastern Nigeria that workers marched on the police station to release their leaders held in cells. The police fled. The gates were forced open, the leaders freed, and the strike continued.

In bourgeois circles it was generally forecast that the strike would end on Monday, June 8. But anyone who attended any of the mass meetings held throughout the country on the Saturday before would have disagreed. Immense activities were taking place in the workers movement and in left circles. The fruit of this appeared during the following week. "SS Committees" were set up in every factory. These were strike committees of activists, most of them oriented toward the recently formed Revolutionary Marxist Group. The SS Committees did excellent work so far as organization was concerned.

In some shops and offices where expatriates were working, most of them Southern Europeans, the SS Committees marched in and "freed" them, threatening the employers.

On June 8 Prime Minister Alhaji Sir Abubaka Tafawa Balewa gave a nation-wide address in which he served a 48-hour ultimatum to the workers to return to work or face the direst consequences, including dismissal.

As the two days expired, thousands of leaflets appeared in Lagos giving the prime minister an ultimatum. The leaflet read as follows:

"Balewa Ultimatum"

"Sweating in their workshops and offices, the toilers of Nigeria create wealth but enjoy the fruits therein not. Consequently we are on strike. A nation-wide strike for a living wage does not seem to impress our oppressors. Instead of negotiations they give us ultimatums.

"Today the workers prove that they cannot be intimidated by any ultimatum or show of forces. We are not returning to work.

"Instead we give an ultimatum to the Balewa Government to resign since they cannot fulfill the aspirations of our toiling countrymen. If they cannot implement Morgan Commission Awards, resign within 48 hours or face the wrath of the forces of the united toilers of Nigeria.

"Morgan or no Morgan the struggle of the Nigerian workingman continues. Today it is the strike and we are going to Strike, Strike and Strike again. Tomorrow it is workers Power!

"Our aims are peaceful but if violence is used against us, we, the toiling millions, shall defend ourselves. Bayonets cannot stop us nor shields made of baskets. [Nigerian police shields are made of canes.]

"All striking workers and progressive citizens are forming workers defence committees to keep vigilance and protect the population. Strike, Strike and Strike again. Down with Balewa.

"Issued by the Lagos Workers Defence Committee."

The demonstrations increased. More police attacks occurred. Tear gas, baton charges, hospitalizations. Police armed with bayonets often stood at the ready near workers rallies, which were still illegal. However the cases of unlawful assembly brought against the trade-union leaders after the Battle of Carter Bridge were suspended.

During the week, the police declared that Imoudu was wanted. Plainclothesmen came to his house where he was still in bed from the clubbing he had received but they did not dare try to go through the workers surrounding the place.

At their rallies, the workers began picking up new slogans: "Power!" "Imoudu, our Prime Minister!" "Give us a Labour party!"

At the Ibadan race course grounds, a resolution was passed unanimously, demanding formation of a Labour party.

Prime Minister Balewa, who had been vacationing out of town,

returned to Lagos. I watched him as he drove into Tafawa Balewa Square. The crowd boomed. They called him, "Ole! Ole!" (The translation is thief or robber.) The prime minister stayed but shortly and left town again.

As the strike continued, a cabinet meeting was called. The Nigerian Employers Consultative Association [NECA] began to hold meetings. They were weakening, but they still did not want to meet the wage level called for in the Morgan report. They put notices in the newspapers dismissing employees who failed to return to work by such and such a date. No one paid any attention.

By Friday July 12, marketwomen were ready to go on strike. The meaning of this can be gathered from the fact that ninety per cent of the distribution of the Nigerian economy is in the hands of these women.

Just before this the youth began staging demonstrations in Lagos. They came from three corners of the city and converged towards the center. Most of them were members of the Action Group youth's association. They carried sticks and sang war songs. Not a single policeman was to be seen in any of the streets occupied by the youth.

The Cabinet indicated Friday that it would retreat. The government, the NECA and the Joint Action Committee went into negotiations.

At the same time, rumours circulated that some expatriate employers wanted to murder M.A.O.Imoudu. The volunteer workers' guard around him was doubled. Other kinds of rumours circulated concerning an army take over.

It happened that I was arrested on Friday. The police chief asked me about attempts to topple the government. But I assured him that this would not occur because the government would certainly accept the Morgan report either that very day or by Sunday at the latest.

The prediction turned out to be accurate. When they turned me loose Saturday morning, the headlines announced that the strike had come to an end because the Government, the NECA and the Joint Action Committee had agreed to use the Morgan report as the basis for negotiations. The workers had gained their point.

The most important gain of the 1964 general strike, however, was a great rise in the political consciousness of the workers. This will bear fruit in the coming period.

COLONIAL PEOPLE GRATEFUL FOR CUBAN EXAMPLE

The Cuban Revolution has had deep-going influence not only in the Western Hemisphere but throughout the colonial world. This was vividly shown by the messages of solidarity sent to the Castro government from all continents on July 26, Cuba's national holiday.

Appreciation of the Cuban victory was particularly well indicated by two messages. One came from the underground freedom fighters in the Portuguese colony of Mozambique. It was signed by the Central Committee of the FRELIMO [Frente de Liberação de Moçambique -- Mozambique Liberation Front]. The other came from a public meeting held in Bombay under auspices of the Indo-Cuban Society, headed by S.B.Kolpe.

The text of the FRELIMO message was as follows:

* * *

"It is not enough for us to congratulate the People of Cuba and their leaders. More than that we want to thank them, because the revolutionary work done by Cuba has not been only for the people of Cuba, but also for all the peoples of the world who are suffering through imperialist oppression.

"The anti-imperialist struggle lead by the people of Cuba, mainly against the North American imperialism is a struggle against imperialism in Africa and all over the world.

"It is through the material support given by International Imperialism headed by the United States of America that Portugal is able to maintain a 99% illiteracy rate in Mozambique, forced labour, the misery, the hunger and the trade in slaves to South Africa and Southern Rhodesia.

"It is the International Imperialism headed by the United States of America who supplies arms to Portugal which are used to murder our brothers in Mozambique, Angola and 'Portuguese' Guinea. It is due to the help given by the imperialist countries through NATO that Portugal is able to prepare for war in Mozambique, where she has already introduced many implements of destruction and an army of more than 35,000 men equipped and armed up to the teeth.

"Taking Cuba as an example, the Mozambican people -- following the historical revolutionary process -- have no fear of any threats.

"The Mozambique Liberation Front and all the People of Mozambique are sure that Freedom is more necessary for humanity than life under imperialist slavery."

* * *

The text of the Bombay message was as follows:

"This meeting of the citizens of Bombay held under the auspices of the Indo-Cuban Society sends its fraternal greetings to the people of Cuba on the occasion of their historic July 26 Revolution Day, and expresses its solidarity with them in their determination to defend their inherent right to shape their destiny according to their own genius and build a social order of their own choice, without any outside interference.

"The Cuban people under the inspiring leadership of Fidel Castro have not only liberated themselves from imperialist domination by overthrowing the dictatorial Batista regime which subserved imperialist interests on their soil, but also have engaged themselves in the heroic task of rebuilding their economy on socialist lines under extremely difficult conditions.

The people of India cannot but have admiration for the indomitable courage of the Cuban people who are threatened with imperialist intervention at every step. The aggressive designs of the U.S. Administration aimed at organising a counterrevolutionary uprising against the present socialist regime, by means of nuclear blackmail and invasion of the Cuban territory by armed mercenaries must be unreservedly condemned by all the freedom-loving people all over the world.

"This meeting appeals to the various mass organisations and political parties in India to mobilise public opinion in the country in defence of the gains of the Cuban Revolution."

CANADIAN STUDENTS IMPRESSED BY CUBAN REVOLUTION

By Ross Dowson

The Canadian students who have just returned from a two-month work tour of Cuba "were especially impressed by the spirit and enthusiasm the people have for building socialism in their country."

Twenty-seven of the group of 45 arrived in Toronto on August 30 after having been delayed and split up due to the submission of British authorities at Nassau to U.S. pressure. A plane supplied by the Cuban government was refused permission at the last moment to land at Nassau and the students were compelled to return via Mexico, with some of their number flying direct to Vancouver and Calgary.

Organized by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee [FPCC] in collaboration with the Cuban government, the project drew students from university campuses across the country. Coming from widely varied backgrounds, many of them leaders in campus organizations, the 45 had been selected by a special committee of eminent educators in the

Toronto area.

The most impressive aspect of their reactions to what they saw and heard in Cuba was their almost unanimous, highly enthusiastic, approval. When they entered the air terminal at Malton, the students immediately presented two declarations to the press -- one signed by 27 of the English-speaking students and another signed by the 10 French Canadian students. Six had been compelled to leave the tour before the statements had been drawn up due to previous commitments. The press searched out those who did not sign. One who characterized the rest as "a bunch of starry-eyed people" explained that he had not signed because the declaration "was all positive and no negative." Another of the nonsigners made the same criticism in response to probings of Canadian press representatives at a special conference that evening. But when asked to comment on some negative features, to her embarrassment she was unable to do so. Another replied that she had not signed because in the search for unanimity the statement had become "too watered down," although it was not inaccurate.

The declaration expressed gratitude to the Cuban people for "the opportunity to witness their revolution first hand" and "the hope that Canada will move to better her relations with Cuba in the form of increasing her cultural and trade exchanges, and of protesting the embargo with a bolder, more independent voice."

The declaration then marked out five points upon which on the basis of their own real experiences they felt that the Canadian people hold misconceptions. They state that the "overwhelming majority of the (Cuban) people support with enthusiasm the revolution and Fidel Castro"; that the revolution "is firmly established" and "will not be dislodged by an economic blockade nor by an invasion." They note that the people are not starving; "now everyone receives staple foods and children and old people get special attention," that there is freedom to criticize the revolution, and that any Cuban is free to leave the country.

The declaration signed by the entire French Canadian contingent is, if anything, even stronger -- ending up with the words, "We have seen a free territory, the first in America." It scores American propaganda about Cuba as "completely false." "The enslavement of Cuba," they say, "is to the dignity of man; the tyranny to which Cuba is subjected is the freedom to work, the freedom to study at all ages, without distinction in color, or social class, and freedom to construct a just and free society."

The students were eight weeks in Cuba -- 10 days of which they spent working on the site of the great school-city Camilo Cienfuegos, alongside of Cuban workers, digging foundations, hauling cement, eating the same food, sharing the same accommodation. One of the students characterized this as "a unique experience." Another commented on the strong spirit of the workers to build the school and the warm relationship between the workers and the supervisors. Three of the

students -- Jacquie Henderson, Ruth Tate and Andre Beckerman -- were honoured as Vanguard workers and another three -- Bob Mahood, Dave Adams and Fay Frazer -- with another award. In response to various questions as to constitutional government and elections, several of the students stated that there appeared to them to be more elections in Cuba than anywhere else in the world. Kathy McLay said that the Cuban people are much closer to their government than Canadians are to theirs. "Fidel always goes to the people and they talk to him."

David Middleton, a former federal candidate of the New Democratic party who supervised the tour, commented on the enthusiasm demonstrated by bakery workers who use Canadian flour and workers at a rope factory whose product goes to Canada, at meeting the Canadian youth. The rope workers insisted on turning up at the factory on their day off and pointed out with pleasure that Canada had not joined the OAS [Organization of American States].

The students attended the July 26 celebrations at Santiago. There they played a baseball game with a Cuban team which included Fidel Castro. The Canadians were clobbered.

The students expressed enthusiasm over returning to their campuses to tell their fellow students of their experiences. FPCC national chairman Vernel Olson told the press conference that the committee plans two elaborate booklets containing contributions from the students -- one in English, the other in French.

NEW WAVE OF MILITANT ACTION IN INDIA

By Kailas Chandra

BOMBAY -- More than 1,000,000 industrial workers and employees in public and private undertakings all over the state of Gujarat went on a general strike August 5 in protest against the state government's failure to check spiraling prices of food grains and other essential commodities.

This was the first time Gujarat, home state of Mahatma Gandhi, considered a stronghold of the ruling Congress party, has witnessed such a militant action of workers and middle-class employees.

The general strike was organised by the Mahagujarat Janata Parishad [People's Conference] led by Indulal Yagnik, a Member of Parliament and peasant leader, and the Kamgar Sangarsh Samiti [Workers Action Committee] of Ahmedabad.

In the city of Ahmedabad, capital of the state, police opened fire on angry demonstrators. Four deaths resulted, one a police constable.

The Gujarat police arrested seventeen persons, including Dinkar Mehta, secretary of the state unit of the Communist party, and Ratilal Shah, secretary of the Action Committee. The latter is a Trotskyist.

Considerable significance is attached to the mass demonstrations organised by various trade unions in the state where the left movement has been relatively weak.

Addressing a mammoth public meeting in Ahmedabad on the day of the strike, Indulal Yagnik condemned the police violence and called on the people to throw out the Congress government in the state before Diwali (a Hindu holiday in November). All the leftist parties support this demand, including the recently formed United Socialist party.

More than seventy per cent of the some 100,000 cotton textile workers in the city of Ahmedabad responded to the strike call despite the influence among them of the "Gandhian" trade union, "Mazoor Mahajan." This is a clear indication that the working class, even in the backward regions of the country, is being drawn into the vortex of militant mass action against the government on the food question.

Similar token general strikes were organized recently in the states of West Bengal and Kerala. In Kerala the leadership came from the Communist party, controlled by the "centrist" leader E.M.S. Namboodiripad, and the Revolutionary Socialist party. The United Socialist party also supported it. The general strike was a spectacular success.

A call for a day's total general strike in the state of Maharashtra on August 12 was issued by the United Socialist party and the trade unions under its control to protest against the failure of the Congress government to solve the food problem. The strike call was backed by both the right and left factions of the Communist party and the All-India Trade Union Congress under their control as well as other left parties, including the Peasants and Workers party, the main opposition group in the state legislature.

The strike sponsors demand that the government should immediately nationalise banking and take over the trade in food grains as the only effective way to bring down prices and check the rampant hoarding among traders. They also demand that prices of agricultural products should be fixed by statute and that the import and export trade should be nationalised.

A new wave of militant action by workers and employees over the food question is evident all over the country. Prices of food grains and other essential commodities have shot up by thirty to fifty per cent during the last year while wages have remained almost static.

The bank employees have been agitating for a twenty per cent increase in wages, winning a partial victory after a "go slow cam-

paign." The big banks conceded a fifteen per cent rise in salaries.

Similar demands are being advanced by the employees of the central and state governments, who number about 6,000,000 nationally.

Under the pressure of the masses, the various central trade-union organisations and traditional left-wing parties have been compelled to combine forces in mass action. Attempts are being made, however, by the Dangeite leadership of the Communist party and by reformist leaders of the Socialist party to contain these struggles within the framework of the constitution. It is doubtful that such attempts can succeed for long. The struggles are bound to throw up a new militant leadership eventually.

Both at the centre and in the states, the Congress party governments are pleading inability to solve the present food crisis. There is an over-all shortage of 5,000,000 tons of food grains each year. Despite large sums of money spent on irrigation and other land development projects in the past fifteen years, the bourgeois state has completely failed to raise food production. The "land reform" has been confined within a capitalist framework.

The Congress government has met this situation by importing food grains from the United States. It is proposed now to increase these imports, a measure that will tie the country's economy still more securely to American imperialism.

Recently measures have been announced aimed against the hoarding of food grains by dealers. Up to now such steps have proved totally ineffective. The truth is that the Congress government has retreated under pressure from the rich merchants who in many states finance and control the Congress party apparatus.

INDIAN COMMUNISTS SCHEDULE RIVAL CONGRESSES

By A. Raheem

MADRAS -- The convention of the "left Communists," held early in July at Tenali (Andhra), decided to hold a rival Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of India [CPI] next October.

The convention elected a 50-member Central Organising Council, a 15-member Central Executive and a five-member Secretariat of the new party. M. Basavapunniah of Andhra was elected as convener of the Secretariat.

Meanwhile, the S.A.Dange leadership convened the "official" Seventh Congress of the CPI for November. It will be held in Bombay.

Both factions in the CPI claim the allegiance of the majority of the 160,000 members of the party. The leftists claim the support of 100,000 members.

The Dangeite group's version is that nearly 40,000 members dropped out during the last three years; therefore it has a majority of the "live" members.

The state units of the Communist party in West Bengal, Andhra and Kerala, which have a real mass following, are well known to be controlled by leftists who include both uncritical supporters of the Peking line as well as "centrists" like E.M.S.Namboodiripad (Kerala) and Jyoti Basu (Bengal).

These claims to a majority of the membership are used by both sides to bolster their arguments in the big debate taking place in the party ranks, for the first time in thirty years, on the two documents now in circulation representing the two conflicting points of view.

Ultimately a regroupment of members of the Communist party in India will take place around these two documents which outline two divergent and conflicting "roads to socialism" -- one, "peaceful" and parliamentary; the other, revolutionary class struggle; one, compromise with the national bourgeoisie; the other, irreconcilable struggle against the bourgeois state.

The document released by Basava Punnaiah in April on behalf of the left faction [see World Outlook June 12] will be the basis of discussion at the left CPI gathering scheduled for October.

The National Council of the CPI (the Dangeite leadership) adopted a draft programme at its June meeting for discussion in the party and this will be the basis of discussion at the congress convened by the official group in November.

How the Kerala Ministry Was Dismissed

Some hitherto unknown facts about how the Communist party in Kerala, headed by E.M.S.Namboodiripad, was dismissed by the Congress Government at the Centre and Presidential rule imposed on the state in 1960 have been revealed by Rajeswar Rao, a member of the CPI Central Secretariat.

Rajeswar Rao, who is a staunch Dangeite, a supporter of the Khrushchev line, said that "the Communist Ministry was dismissed at the request of the leadership of the CPI itself."

Rao made this disclosure in one of the rightist faction meetings held in Calcutta recently. Probably this was aimed as a factional gibe at the leftists with whom Namboodiripad is associated at present; —

but it offers another case of the traditional Stalinist technique of deceiving the masses to serve an immediate objective of the party.

He said that when the situation in Kerala got "completely out of hand," the CPI leadership "in desperation" decided to approach the then prime minister Nehru with a request to impose President's rule on the state. The Congress and other reactionary parties had launched the so-called "liberation struggle" against the CP Ministry to demand its dismissal by the Centre. The CP Ministry, instead of enlisting the support of the masses to carry out certain anticapitalist reforms, which it had promised the people, courted unpopularity by resorting to shooting at demonstrators and strikers in some parts of the state.

Nehru, according to Rajeswara Rao, was at first reluctant to dismiss the Namboodiripad Ministry as he thought it to be "undemocratic." Nehru reportedly suggested mid term elections in the state. The CPI leaders did not agree to this suggestion and they ultimately "succeeded in persuading Nehru to impose President's rule."

These behind-the-scene activities did not, however, prevent the CPI leaders, according to the same informant, from expressing their indignation at the Congress Government when the CP Ministry was dismissed. Rao goes so far as to suggest that despite some unfavourable reaction at home and abroad, Nehru chose not to disclose that he had "conferred" on the CPI a "favour" sought by its own leaders!

The decision was taken at an emergency meeting of the Central Executive meeting of the CPI which had been called to discuss the Kerala situation. According to Rao, some members had favoured the continuance of the Ministry but the majority felt that in the event of the Communist Ministry having to resort to stern police action this would incur a blot on them.

Rao's complaint was that Namboodiripad did not give an opinion on either course though he was the Chief Minister. The Central Executive Committee accepted the majority opinion and authorised the late Ajoy Ghosh, the then General Secretary of the CPI and A.K.Gopalan (leader of the "left" Communist group in the Lower House of Parliament at present) to contact Nehru.

Although this version of how the Communist Ministry in Kerala was dismissed has been published by all the newspapers in India, its authenticity has not been questioned either by the official leadership or by the leftists in the CPI.

OPPOSITION IN U.S. TO ROLE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

DETROIT -- There is widespread opposition in the United States to American involvement in South Vietnam. Fear and anger over the belligerency of Washington have touched off a number of antiwar demonstrations. The demonstrators, mostly young people, chant slogans like: "Fight Unemployment, Not Vietnamese!" "No More Koreas!" "Bring the Troops Home!"

Some of the demonstrations have involved as many as a thousand participants.

Such actions, however, remain sporadic. The great bulk of the population are not yet prepared to voice their antiwar sentiments in so militant a fashion. Nevertheless the hostility to imperialist war adventures runs deep. This is shown, among other ways, by public opinion polls and letters sent to legislators.

A poll taken by the Harris Survey in March, 1964, showed that the majority of Americans do not support administration policies in Vietnam. Fluctuations in sentiment have occurred. Immediately after the Diem dictatorship was overthrown, hopes rose that the situation would improve; U.S. government policies were viewed more favorably by most Americans. When the crisis continued, the attitude became more critical.

Criticisms of U.S. foreign policy voiced in congress, especially attacks on adventures and brinkmanship, have met with good response. On March 25 Senator Fulbright (Democrat, Arkansas) declared that the attempted boycott of Cuba was a failure, that the U.S. should re-evaluate its China policy, that the government should revise the Panama Canal treaty and that it should acknowledge that the USSR is no longer implacably hostile to the West. These opinions of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee received national publicity. On April 5, Fulbright again pressed these ideas at a symposium at the University of North Carolina.

Later Fulbright declared: "In twenty years of experience, I've never had anything like it. The volume of letters was far beyond anything I've ever had before." His mail was running four to one in favor of his criticisms.

Senator Wayne Morse (Democrat, Oregon), supported by Senator Gruening (Democrat, Alaska), has steadily denounced American policy in Vietnam. His attitude is summed up in the succinct statement: "We should never have gone in. We should never have stayed in. We should get out."

Morse labeled the Tonkin Gulf incident a "provocation" by the U.S.

On August 13 he reported to the Senate, "My mail is still

running better than 200 to one in support of my position, although one would never know it if he were to read the kept press of America."

No praise is due senators Fulbright, Gruening and Morse, since their record shows them to be as deeply committed to procapitalist, antilabor and anticivil-rights programs as their colleagues in the Democratic party. What they are really critical of is the stupidity of American foreign policy, not its imperialist aims. Their criticisms, however, are well worth paying attention to, for they have said many true things. What is most interesting is the response in the mail bag. The following are examples placed in the Congressional Record by Senator Morse:

Los Angeles, California. "We support your stand on Vietnam wholeheartedly. Your outspoken manner on this and other vital issues is refreshing in this era of repression of facts from the public."

Waterbury, Connecticut. "Yours seems to be a lone sane voice in this rather insane Vietnam situation. We would like you to know that we admire your courage and condone your stand. Keep up the good work."

Germantown, New York. "We gratefully support you on Vietnam situation."

Tacoma, Washington. "I support you in your vote against undeclared war in an area where we do not belong. Bravo for your stand on Vietnam. Thanks for speaking for me."

Long Island, New York. "We support your courageous stand against extension of war in Vietnam. Many Americans with you."

Los Angeles, California. "Can't we find some way of getting out of Vietnam? I am 50 years old & all I've ever known is wars. I'm sick of it."

Chicago, Illinois. "Thank you for defending American people. The destruction of war has not visited our country in more than a century. Is that the reason our leaders are trying to visit war's ravages on others? Instead of helping people we bring destruction and heartbreak. What madmen are these who speak in our name?"

New Ulm, Minnesota. "We do want to compliment you on your views in regard to Vietnam. We haven't yet found one person in accord with our present policy there. . . . It is too bad the American citizen has no opportunity to vote on this issue."

Pritchett, Colorado. "What we need is a third party for people who believe in peace and good will."

MISSISSIPPI'S LONG HOT SUMMER

By Evelyn Sell

Freedom Summer Project

For eight weeks some 850 white and black students and adult volunteers participated in Mississippi's Freedom Summer Project. Negro history, American government and basic school subjects were taught to more than 2,000 Negro students in 47 Freedom Schools. Community centers were established in 13 towns with programs ranging from adult literacy classes to ping-pong games. The voter registration drive, however, attracted very few Negroes.

The summer project was organized by the Council of Federated Organizations [COFO], a group of civil-rights bodies. The project was carried out despite repeated bombings, police harassment, the murder of three of the civil-rights workers and the burning of churches being used as Freedom Schools and community centers. Plans have been made to extend activities into Arkansas, Georgia and Alabama. Fall and winter projects are already underway in various Mississippi communities. Particularly hazardous is the work now being done in Neshoba County -- scene of the slaying of the three young COFO workers in June.

The dozen young black and white project workers now in Neshoba County describe a nightly reign of terror designed to scare them away. The students are determined to withstand the carloads of armed racists that ride past their headquarters and the eviction threats of the local sheriff. They plan to remain until a community center is built and functioning as a living memorial to their three murdered colleagues.

Freedom Democratic Party

One of the COFO summer projects bore dramatic fruit at the Democratic national convention held in Atlantic City, New Jersey, at the end of August. In April COFO formally launched the Mississippi Freedom Democratic party, an integrated group but predominantly Negro. During the summer 50,000 signatures were gathered on behalf of the party. Several Negroes ran on the party ticket for various offices during the primary (nominations) elections.

A sizeable delegation from the Freedom Democratic party went to the Democratic national convention determined to upset the traditionally all-white delegation. Although they directly challenged the seating of the Mississippi delegation, their arguments were directed against every Southern delegation. They asked to be seated as the legal delegation from Mississippi, arguing that the duly elected "regular" delegation was illegal since it barred Negroes from membership and thus excluded them from any active participation in the political life of the South.

These arguments were presented before the Credentials Committee before the actual opening of the convention itself. The high point of these hearings was the testimony of Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, the 46-year old wife of a Mississippi sharecropper and one of the Negro candidates sponsored by COFO earlier in the summer. Mrs. Hamer explained to a nation-wide television audience how she had been jailed and beaten for trying to help Negroes register to vote. Because of her civil-rights activities both she and her husband lost their jobs. Additional witnesses described the terror in Mississippi and the denial of voting rights, civil rights, human rights for Negro citizens of that state.

The Credentials Committee presented a compromise which was accepted by the convention: the seating of the "regulars" after they pledged their loyalty to the national Democratic ticket and the seating of two of the Freedom Democratic party delegates.

The Committee further recommended that state Democratic organizations in the South allow Negroes to join. The U.S. Constitution and the recently enacted Civil Rights Bill -- for which, please note, the Democrats take credit -- proclaim the Negroes' right to vote and participate fully in the political life of the nation. The recommendation of the Democratic party was that their Dixiecrat partners allow Negroes to exercise their constitutional rights. The Democratic party had been put to the test by the freedom delegation -- and the party failed the test.

The Northern liberals were put to the test -- and they failed miserably, too. Nine Northern and Western delegations promised to support the Freedom Democratic delegates but when the time for action came, they folded up, backed down and voted for the phony compromise. The compromise was supported by President Johnson and he sent his choice for running mate, Humphrey, to personally put the pressure on Negro leaders and the Freedom Democratic delegates to accept the compromise. Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, acclaimed as "a labor statesman" and great liberal, urged the Negro delegates to accept the compromise as "good enough." The delegation refused to let the liberals save face. They rejected the compromise, staged sit-ins within the convention itself and staged demonstrations outside the hall. The actions brought them a major portion of the news reports and television time devoted to the convention.

The confrontation at the convention exposed President Johnson, vice-presidential nominee Humphrey, the Northern liberals and the whole party apparatus. It also exposed the futility of civil-rights fighters trying to achieve their goals within the Democratic party. Northern Negroes have already achieved what the Southern Negroes were demanding so eloquently: the right to belong to the Democratic party, vote for the Democratic party and run on the party ticket. Yet the summer riots in a number of Northern cities underlined the fact that Negroes outside of Dixieland have not won their freedom, their human

dignity, their constitutional rights, decent job opportunities and fair treatment in the educational system. It was ironic that the largest group of regular and alternate Negro delegates came from the state of Michigan -- where militant civil-rights fighters have organized outside of the Democratic party and put the first all-Negro party on the ballot.

Undoubtedly, there were those within the Freedom Democratic party who sincerely meant it when they pledged themselves to work for the election of Johnson, and who honestly desire to help the Democrats win office. There were also those who conceived of their campaign at the convention as a clever means of attracting the attention of the nation to their grievances and of revealing the corruption and hypocrisy of the Democratic party. Many illusions still remain among most Negroes about the Democratic party. Many Negroes, however, are rejecting any support to either of the capitalist parties. The actions of the challengers and the party machine at the convention should help turn even more Negroes onto the road of independent political action.

JOHNSON'S STRATEGY

By Joseph Hansen

Upon the nomination of Senator Goldwater as candidate of the Republican party, fear swept the world. Three questions were asked: Did this mean the rise of fascism in the United States? Was it possible for the Arizona senator to win in November? What about the "white backlash" -- the reaction to the Negro struggle for "Freedom Now" -- could this prove to be a trump card in Goldwater's electoral gamble?

The alarm has now subsided. Reason, or at least a facsimile of reason, seems to have gained the upperhand in the American political scene, and world public opinion has relaxed. The danger of a maniac coming to power in the United States appears to have lessened . . . for the time being.

Two developments since the Republican convention in July account for this change. One was the Democratic convention at which Johnson decided to name Hubert Humphrey as his running mate. The other was the sampling of opinion in the United States indicating -- as of the moment -- a Democratic victory in November. Various polls taken by independent services, by the Democrats, and by the Republicans even indicate a landslide building up for the Democrats. According to columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novack, an "atmosphere of despair [is] now beginning to pervade the Goldwater high command." [New York Herald Tribune, European edition, Sept. 7.]

When Goldwater won the nomination at San Francisco, political analysts were faced with the problem of explaining how such a reactionary figure could win out over a liberal like Gov. Rockefeller or a conservative like Gov. Scranton. The principal reasons advanced were dissatisfaction among the middle class over a foreign policy that does not appear to be able to "win," a profound feeling of insecurity despite the prosperity, and resentment over the rise in the Negro struggle for equality. These moods played into the hands of an efficient faction in the Republican party backed by big money from the newly risen sector of the capitalist class in Texas and Southern California. It was widely speculated that the combination might give Goldwater a winning hand.

Goldwater based his campaign tactics on this combination up to and during the Republican convention and for some weeks thereafter. This is what inspired his "trigger happy" remarks about using nuclear bombs to clear away the jungles in South Vietnam, about unleashing the generals to use nuclear weapons as they saw fit, about the virtues of "extremism" -- meaning such organizations as the Ku Klux Klan and the John Birch Society -- and so on, ad nauseam.

Now Goldwater has made an abrupt shift away from this line. He has begun to talk about "peace," about ending the draft. He has made concessions to the liberal wing of the Republican party. Clearly he has been reading the results of the polls and trying to adjust his publicity handouts accordingly.

Johnson concentrated on the main problem that has faced him as a professional capitalist politician, an especially power hungry one among these sharks noted for their ravenous appetite, the problem he has faced since he fell heir to the White House; i.e., how to win the presidency for a Southerner for the first time since the Civil War. Luckily for him he has been greatly assisted -- no doubt unwittingly -- by Goldwater.

The key political forces in the United States today are not the allegedly discontented middle class (including farmers), racist-minded sectors, and protofascist formations who see Goldwater as their hero. The key forces are the working class, particularly the trade unions, a rising Negro movement, and -- the main grouping of big business, still located in the East.

From the beginning, Johnson set out to put together a combination of these contradictory forces. A really serious challenge among the capitalist politicians to this strategy could have come only from a liberal like Rockefeller. Goldwater's victory considerably simplified things for the Texas politician.

First of all, Johnson put on a well-calculated campaign to win the approval of big business, especially those who prefer to wear a Republican button in their lapel. One of his power moves was in the area of foreign policy. By his course, above all in Brazil, he

revealed with the utmost clarity his views and his capacities in relation to the major world problems facing American imperialism. The real worries of American capitalism lie here, not in "too much" federal government or in "exorbitant" taxes.

Again luck (or, more accurately, the disastrous policies of the Latin-American Communist parties) was with him. He succeeded in putting a counterrevolution in the saddle in Brazil, by far the weightiest country in the Western Hemisphere outside of the U.S. itself. Long before the California primaries in which Goldwater made his killing, big business had definitely made up its mind that Johnson had proved to be a most agreeable surprise.

While working among the upper levels of the capitalist class, Johnson did not overlook the labor movement. Here things were simple enough. The American labor czars are easily satisfied. Offering a liberal gasbag like Hubert Humphrey as vice-presidential candidate was more than sufficient to throw the labor statesmen into transports. Headed by Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers, who threatened to walk out of the 1960 Democratic convention if a reactionary like Johnson was nominated as vice-presidential candidate, these same bureaucrats now consider Johnson among the great greats. As John L. Lewis once observed of their kind, they don't have heads; when they grew up, their necks just haired over.

Big business, of course, does not have the slightest fear of a tail-wagging liberal like Humphrey. The modern tycoon understands all about the need for attractive packaging to give even the most mediocre article sales appeal. Just the same, Johnson did not miss the angle of giving big business the opportunity to veto Humphrey's candidacy if it wished.

To win the Negro vote, Johnson pushed through the well-diluted civil-rights legislation sponsored by Kennedy, doing a more efficient job of it, probably, than the Bostonian aristocrat himself could have managed. This, after all, was the trade in which Johnson spent a long apprenticeship.

As for the "white backlash" on which Goldwater staked virtually everything, Johnson himself pointed to the counter trend of what he calls the "frontlash" -- Republican voters frightened and alienated by Goldwater's rattling of nuclear bombs and appeals to hooded "extremists." Not unexpectedly, the latest Gallup poll (Sept. 6) shows that already three out of ten Republicans have decided to switch to the Democratic camp. This means a still heavier swing towards Johnson among the so-called "independents."

It should also be pointed out that the "white backlash" may have been greatly overestimated. Other issues are of concern to whites -- the spectre of unemployment due to automation, the dread of nuclear war, fear of making things worse by putting a Goldwater in

office. Moreover, even in relation to civil-rights struggles, the violent language and murderous actions of racists do not necessarily reflect a deep-going shift in the same direction among ordinary people. Their views on this very issue, in fact, may be quite the reverse.

This, of course, is not easily determined accurately in advance of the election. However, a most interesting study was made public in July by the Scientific American, the most important magazine in the United States, if not the world, devoted to popularizing developments in the field of science. This study reveals a long-range shift in views among white Americans in favor of the Negro people. This shift has been proceeding for a number of years until now an absolute majority of whites favor integration. The phenomenon is not confined to the North but includes whites in the South and even whites in the areas where violence has occurred.

Surprisingly little attention has been paid by the American press to this important study. (Ordinarily such studies in the Scientific American are widely reported.) The accuracy of the findings will undoubtedly be tested at the polls in November.

Johnson's cunning tactics have been facilitated by other factors besides Goldwater's impressive performance in assuming the role and image of the political villain who must be defeated "at all costs." The absence of a liberal opposition has already been mentioned. More important is the absence of a labor opposition. America's powerful union movement does not have its own political party. It does not have even a single representative in congress!

Among the Negro people, too, the dominant leaders remain faithful followers of the Democratic machine. A beginning has been made toward organizing independent political opposition, but only a bare beginning. This is the Freedom Now party which won a place on the ballot in Michigan.

In the absence of any threat or pressure from these areas, Johnson was quite free to move his campaign **rather** far to the right. He did not even have to promise labor and the Negro people much. Instead he could direct his demagogy toward Goldwater's following.

In addition, he was quite free to engage in the most reactionary moves on the foreign field even during his campaign. A good example was the adventure in the Gulf of Tonkin. With utter cynicism, Johnson created a foreign diversion in order to rally the public behind the U.S. government in an "hour of peril"; i.e., behind Johnson as he seeks the presidency. That this entailed the risk of world war was of small consequence to the aspiring capitalist statesman; it fit in perfectly with his blueprint for a winning combination in November against Goldwater.

The only opposition in the United States to both Johnson and Goldwater is provided by the candidates of the Socialist Workers

party. Voicing the program of revolutionary socialism, Clifton DeBerry and Edward Shaw are putting up a vigorous campaign.

The first Negro candidate for the White House, DeBerry has received a warm welcome among militant sectors of the civil-rights movement.

The American Trotskyists are, of course, greatly handicapped in face of the vast resources available to the capitalist candidates. As in previous campaigns, however, they are succeeding in bringing the message of socialism to a wide audience. Some of those who hear this message will also think it over, and among them will be found the cadres who will eventually build the party needed to overturn capitalism in its most formidable stronghold.

REPORT ON ALEXANDER CASE

[The following statement to the press was issued by Dr. Wolfgang Mueller, Assistant Secretary of the Alexander Defence Committee in West Germany, in relation with a public meeting on the case held in London on September 4. An Alexander Defence Committee is now being organized in England. Inquiries about this can be sent to Mrs. Connie Kirkby, 27 Thursley House, Holmewood Gardens, London, S.W.2.]

* * *

The Rivonia trial [of Nelson Mandela and others] has attracted so much interest in Britain that another important trial, that of Dr. Neville Alexander and 10 others in Cape Town, was hardly noticed at all. But by the UNO special committee on apartheid in its report of March 1964, it was regarded as the second major sabotage trial in 1964, and the case has also caused great interest in West Germany where a sum of £4,000 [\$11,200] was collected by students for the defence.

Alexander and his 10 co-defendants (six men and four women) were arrested in July 1963 under the 90-Day-No-Trial-Clause and tried for "sabotage" in November. On April 15, they were sentenced to prison terms ranging from 10 to 5 years though the judge himself admitted that they had neither committed nor even prepared a single act of sabotage. The men are now serving their sentences on Robben Island. An appeal was granted on certain irregularities, e.g., the instructions of Alexander to his counsel having been opened and read by the secret police, though this was refused on the general merits of the case. It is hoped that the appeal trial will take place in November, but the main problem still to be solved is the raising of the funds for the defence of about £3,000 [\$8,400]. An Alexander Defence Committee has been set up in Britain to collect contributions towards this sum.

The entire amount for the original trial was collected by West German students in a very successful campaign in the winter of 1963. Within a few weeks more than one thousand university professors and prominent persons in public life as well as all political student unions had signed a petition to the General Secretary of UNO directing his attention towards these terror trials. Together with some very prominent university professors the German Students Union organized a collection of funds at all universities and colleges which within a few months resulted in a sum of £4,000, more than double the amount originally aimed at.

Extreme right-wing student groups that were in close contact with the South African government and its agents in Germany tried to thwart the whole campaign but had no success. Their actions served to make it clear to Alexander's supporters that their support for their former fellow-student extended beyond their personal feelings for him. They realized that their compassion for Alexander could not be separated from their resistance against all forms of racial discrimination, particularly having regard to the events of only 20 years ago in their own country.

Dr. Alexander had a brilliant career as a scholar at Tübingen University where he wrote an excellent thesis on a famous German dramatist for his doctor's degree. He had a perfect command of German and impressed both professors and students by his intelligent approach to political problems; several professors, one of whom was Heisenberg, a Nobel Prize winner for physics, testified their high opinion of Dr. Alexander in written statements. He was offered posts at German and foreign universities, but decided to return to Cape Town where he refused to teach at the Coloured's College because he was not prepared to abstain from political activity as demanded from him.

His courage and high spirits have also impressed his fellow-prisoners. On Robben Island he was even brave enough to refuse to dance the infamous Tausa dance, requiring prisoners to strip naked and perform a humiliating dance exposing their sexual organs on the pretext of being searched on returning from their day's work in the quarry. Alexander was assaulted by a warder and hurt in one of his eardrums for refusing this demand. Assaults have also been made on two of his friends, Don Davis, a minister and Fikele Bam, a law student. During the trial, Marcus Solomons, a school teacher, was manhandled by a police sergeant; and other friends were intimidated by the police to act as state witnesses; one of them, Gerald Giose, went insane, supposedly from the police treatment, and is in an asylum now.

In addition to providing the financial means for the appeal, the campaign will surely have a positive influence on the treatment of these prisoners by the prison authorities and will make it clear that the outside world is closely watching their fate on Robben Island and in Worcester Prison.

SIDNEY SILVERMAN ADDRESSES ALEXANDER DEFENCE RALLY IN LONDON

"It is not often that I presume to speak for the labour movement as a whole but on this occasion I have no doubt that the Labour party is with me," said Sidney Silverman, a Member of Parliament, at a packed meeting in the Caxton Hall tonight.

The meeting was called by the Alexander Defence Committee to launch a nation-wide campaign to raise £2,500 [\$7,000] to help pay the cost of the appeal of Dr. Neville Alexander and 10 others (six men and four women) arrested in Cape Town, South Africa in July, 1963, under the infamous 90-Day-No-Trial-Clause and tried for "sabotage" in November.

An appeal was granted on certain irregularities; e.g., the instructions of Alexander to his counsel had been opened and read by the police, etc. It is hoped that the appeal will be heard in about eight weeks.

Guest speaker was Dr. Wolfgang Mueller, formerly a student friend of Alexander at Tübingen University, and Acting Secretary of the West German Alexander Defence Committee. The German campaign had raised £4,000 [\$11,200] and collected over 5,000 signatures on petitions to the United Nations to intervene, explained Dr. Mueller. He made an impassioned plea for similar action to be taken in Britain.

Barnei Desai, President of the South African Coloured Peoples Congress, said that Alexander's struggle for justice represents the struggles of thousands of unknown Africans serving heavy jail sentences under Verwoerd's tyrannical regime.

Other speakers included Raymond Kunene, representative in Britain and Europe of the African National Congress; C. Van Gelderen, Hammersmith Borough Councillor and Ellis Hillman, London County Councillor. The chairman was Chris Arthur, president of the National Association of Labour Student Organizations.

Among an impressive list of individuals and organizations who sponsored the meeting were Frank Allaun, M.P.; Bob Edwards, M.P., General Secretary of the Chemical Workers Union; Ernie Roberts, Assistant General Secretary of the Amalgamated Engineering Union and a number of Labour Party and Young Socialist branches.

Mrs. Connie Kirkby, the secretary of the Alexander Defence Committee, announced that postal orders and cheques should be made out to Defence and Aid, Alexander Appeal. The mailing address is Mrs. Connie Kirkby, 27 Thursley House, Holmewood Gardens, London, S.W.2.

The meeting closed by passing a resolution endorsing the actions and proposals of the Committee.

"I HAVE NOT FORGOTTEN. . . "

By Pierre Frank

Within a few weeks of each other, the heads of the two biggest Communist parties of western Europe died. While purely accidental, the coincidence of the two events provides a political symbol of the greatest significance. In effect, the death of the two men marks the end of an epoch.

Among the leaders of the world's Communist parties, Togliatti was the oldest, holding seniority even over Mao Tse-tung. Thorez, likewise an elder among the leaders of the Communist movement, was of working-class background; Togliatti was an intellectual. Both of them belonged to the young generation in the old socialist parties following World War I who turned toward the October Revolution to renew the workers' movement which had been defiled by the betrayal of the Social Democracy in 1914. Both of them, in the enthusiasm of their youth, were attracted by Bolshevism.

Each of them, of course, underwent different experiences for a long time. The Italian Communist party was driven underground in 1922-23 and did not begin to function openly until after the downfall of Mussolini. The French Communist party did not go through the underground experience until during the second world war. There were likewise significant differences in the character and comportment of the two men. Togliatti was more supple than Thorez, although this should not be exaggerated as has been done by many commentators. The suppleness of Thorez was evidenced often enough and Togliatti displayed his bureaucratic aptitude.

One essential characteristic brought them together, even united them: Both Thorez and Togliatti utilized their talents and their positions they had won, to place the organizations that had been created to prepare and lead the proletarian revolution in the service of the Soviet bureaucracy when, under Stalin's leadership, this bureaucracy usurped power in the Soviet state and in the Communist International. This was not an easy operation, and Thorez and Togliatti came to play their role only after hesitancy and reservations. In 1924, Thorez distributed Trotsky's New Course in the Pas-de-Calais federation of which he was secretary. Even in 1928, in the corridors of the Sixth Congress of the International he indicated his reservations on the theory of "socialism in one country." At the same congress, Togliatti supported Bukharin, and it was while the car was going full speed, it could be said, that he jumped out when, a few months later, Stalin cut down Bukharin and crushed the Right Opposition in the USSR and the Communist International.

These old leaders of the Communist movement were perfectly aware of Stalin's crimes; they were particularly cognizant of the

policy of the "third period" and how fatal it was in Germany in 1933. But both of them served as willing tools of the Soviet bureaucracy; both of them became Stalinists above all because they had lost confidence in the revolutionary capacities of the working class.

In the years following the war, differences arose between Thorez and Togliatti, but these remained within the framework of their common loyalty to the Soviet bureaucracy. (It has even been observed that there was something symbolic in the fact that both of them died not in their own country but in the Soviet Union or on the way there.)

More important than the differences which developed with regard to their positions in the Sino-Soviet conflict was the fact that they shared a fundamental point of departure -- in practice they had given up the proletarian revolution and envisaged no road to socialism except the "peaceful" one. With both of them this was not just a concept; they actually assured the bourgeoisie through their deeds that the parties they led constituted no revolutionary threat.

The working masses unfortunately have not yet understood this. That is the explanation in part for the hundreds of thousands of people who turned out for the funerals. Consequently most of the petty-bourgeois intellectuals in the periphery of the workers' movement are unable to understand the historic role of a Thorez and a Togliatti; hence the many stupidities like those uttered by Sartre with regard to both men.

But the most clear-sighted elements among the bourgeoisie of France and Italy understood this role quite accurately. They did not forget the situation at the time of the liberation from the German occupation and the immense service that Thorez and Togliatti rendered them. How strongly impressed they were can be judged from the fact that twenty years later they publicly expressed their recognition over the coffins of the two leaders.

Here is the letter which de Gaulle sent to one of the sons of Thorez, authorizing its publication:

"I offer you and your family my sincere condolences in your grief over the death of your father. For my part, I have not forgotten that at a decisive time for France, President Maurice Thorez -- whatever may have been his actions before and after that -- in response to my appeal and as a member of my government contributed to maintaining national unity. Please accept, Sir, my deepest regards."

I have not forgotten that at a decisive time. . . It is not true that Thorez responded to de Gaulle's appeal. Thorez and Togliatti were lined up with Stalin. They acted in accordance with the commitments made by Stalin to American and British imperialism at Yalta, Teheran and Potsdam. In consequence the capitalist state and economy were saved in western Europe.

De Gaulle summarizes in his letter only what he stated much more explicitly in his memoirs:

"Taking into account previous circumstances, events since then, the necessities of today, I hold that the return of Maurice Thorez as head of the Communist party can yield more advantages at present than difficulties. . . .

"Inasmuch as in place of revolution, the Communists seek preponderance in a parliamentary regime, society runs less risk. . . .

"As for Thorez, while trying to advance the affairs of Communism, on many occasions he was to serve the public interest. On his return to France, he helped put an end to the last vestiges of the 'patriotic militia' whom some of his people obstinately sought to maintain in a new underground. Insofar as the gloomy, hard rigidity of his party permitted him, he opposed the attempts at encroachment of the liberation committees and the acts of violence to which the overexcited groups turned. Among the workers -- they were numerous -- particularly the miners, who listened to his harangues, he did not stop advocating the slogan of working to the utmost and of producing, cost what it might. Was this simply a political tactic? It's not my business to figure it out. It was enough for me that France benefited." (Le Salut, pp. 100-101.)

"I have not forgotten," said de Gaulle. The Italian bourgeoisie also has not forgotten that from 1943 to 1948 Togliatti rendered similar service, that he even got his party and the workers who followed it to accept the Concordat tying the Vatican to the Italian Republic. Thus the president of the Italian Council, Moro, the Christian Democrat, did not hesitate to offer to the Italian Communist party an Italian army plane to take Togliatti's assistant to the body of the dead secretary in order to return it to Italy. De Gaulle, in most revealing terms, and Moro in a spectacular gesture, showed that they understood the essential role played by the Communist parties: created to overthrow the bourgeois order, they saved it at a crucial moment.

Thorez and Togliatti, through the role which they had their parties play, through entering the bourgeois governments, saved capitalism not only in France and Italy but, if the struggle of the Greek partisans at the time be recalled, probably the whole sector of Europe located along the Mediterranean, without mentioning the wider consequences.

The forward march of the socialist revolution took a more complicated road. Saved in the West thanks to the betrayal of the workers leaders, world capitalism still did not have sufficient forces to crush the Chinese Revolution, which in turn gave a gigantic impulse to the colonial revolution. The revolutionary thrust throughout the world in turn has tended to break the myth on which the Communist parties have lived since they were subjected to Stalinism. Currents

are appearing among them hostile to the reformist politics and seeking a revolutionary outcome.

Thorez and Togliatti have passed from the scene precisely as the crisis breaks out, after thirty years of monolithism, bringing to an end the period during which they ruled in their parties. The crisis is a world-wide one, intimately linked with the Sino-Soviet conflict. It brings to an end the domination of the Soviet bureaucracy over the sector of the workers movement linked with the Russian Revolution. The old bureaucratized leaderships are doomed. New revolutionary leaderships, after long and painful tests, will emerge. They, looking back at Togliatti and Thorez and their kind, will say, like de Gaulle, but with quite an opposite feeling, "We have not forgotten. . . "

HANDS OFF NORTH VIETNAM!

[The following declaration was issued by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International on August 5 at the height of the crisis created by the U.S. assault in the Gulf of Tonkin.]

* * *

The aggression of North American imperialism against the People's Republic of North Vietnam was not taken as a "reprisal" following a rumored naval engagement in the Gulf of Tonkin. It was deliberately and systematically prepared for a long time. Politically it represents a desperate attempt by imperialism to delay the downfall of the hated pro-imperialist Saigon government which the heroic freedom fighters are bringing closer and closer to defeat despite the enormous help in money, matériel and personnel granted by Washington since it was set up.

The aggression is being directed against the Vietnamese people and the heroic revolutionary masses, against all the peoples of Southeast Asia. Its main objective is the liquidation of the revolutionary upsurge. It could well constitute a base for aggression against the great Chinese Revolution. The Pentagon war masters seek revenge for the humiliation they suffered at the time of their military defeat in Korea.

Once again imperialism is displaying its readiness to resort to arms, if necessary, against any new success of the revolution. Once again it is showing that the slogan of "peaceful coexistence" is only a lure that creates illusions among the masses on the nature of imperialism, that diverts them from the urgent necessity of disarming imperialism; that is, defeating it in its own centers in order to save humanity from a spiral of wars that can end in a nuclear holocaust.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International appeals to the workers of all countries to express their active solidarity with the Vietnamese Revolution and the People's Republic of North Vietnam which imperialism is seeking to crush in order to again enslave the Vietnamese people and place them under the rule of the landlords and money lenders.

Organize meetings everywhere to protest the aggression of American imperialism.

Demonstrate before the American embassies and consulates to show your disapproval of the imperialist aggression.

Through warning strikes, prevent Washington's imperialist, oligarchical and bourgeois nationalist allies from joining in this aggression against the Vietnamese people.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International appeals to the governments, the Communists, the revolutionary militants and the workers of all the workers states to grant speedy, generous and unconditional aid to the Vietnamese people and the People's Republic of North Vietnam, victim of imperialist aggression. The necessary, progressive discussion within the world Communist movement must not become an obstacle to such aid. The Communists of all countries must demand that Khrushchev does not resort to the pretext of the Sino-Soviet conflict in order to evade granting elementary solidarity to North Vietnam or to dole out aid with an eye-dropper.

A hesitant attitude, or a retreat in face of the imperialist aggression, would only encourage Washington to undertake further aggressive moves.

CEYLONESE TROTSKYISTS OPPOSE COALITION PLATFORM

Text of Speech by Edmund Samarakkody

[The following has been extracted from the July 15, 1964, issue of Hansard, the official uncorrected report of the proceedings of the Ceylonese House of Representatives. It deals principally with the remarks of Edmund Samarakkody, Secretary of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Revolutionary Section) and a Member of Parliament, during the debate over the Throne Speech -- the declaration of the platform of the new coalition government in Ceylon.]

* * *

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to make the second speech on behalf of my party, the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Revolutionary Section), a unit of the Fourth International. I have to thank the hon. Members of the Opposition and the Hon. Speaker for making it possible for my party to be rightly represented in the Front Benches of the Opposition. But, I think, I will be voicing the sentiments of most hon. Members of the Opposition when I say that we are not at all happy to find the hon. Member for Galle (Dr. W. Dahanayake), a former Prime Minister of this country, relegated to the back-benches of this House. I do not want to say anything more on that matter but I trust that sooner rather than later that position will be set right.

To come to the subject before the House, I am glad I was able to listen to many hon. Members of the Government Party including my good Friend and ex-comrade the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mt. Lavinia (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva). Mr. Deputy Chairman, you know as a lawyer yourself that even the best, the most brilliant lawyer in the world, when he has a very bad case, does very little of what he could do. We know from our experience that such lawyers in certain situations go before the judge and say, "My Lord, I have nothing to say on this matter."

When the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mt. Lavinia was speaking I thought he was in a similar situation. Here is a person, who is not merely a good lawyer but one of the best speakers in this country, a brilliant orator not only in this country but, I think, in the East, and when he speaks sometimes it is possible for him to shake the very walls of this Chamber by his speech. It was to this person we were listening about half an hour ago. He is a giant of a man. What happened to him? This giant collapsed before our eyes.

He delivered a speech. What is the occasion of his speech? Is it an ordinary situation when an hon. Member gets up and makes a speech? No. Whatever may be the evaluation with regard to the change that has taken place we are in a new political situation. We are in a situation when two months ago the Lanka Sama Samaja Party, of which I am proud to be a Member -- and I am still a member because the party goes on -- was in the Opposition, in the Front Benches of the Opposition. And today we find hon. Members of that party are on the other side of the House occupying Cabinet posts.

Surely, that is a situation which demands some sort of explanation, and surely they could never have got a better advocate, a more brilliant man to defend that action than the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mt. Lavinia. But what did he say? He said that the question of a Coalition Government was freely discussed, a democratic decision was arrived at, a section of his party broke away and that this situation arose as a result of a political situation that grew in this country, an economic impulse. He then went on to explain some of the things that this Government proposes to do in order to get hold of black-marketeers, to reduce prices and so on. All that is well and good.

In their own view this is the culmination of their struggle over the last thirty years, an achievement they can be proud of. They tell the country that this is a tremendous achievement. If that was their position, the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mount Lavinia should have defended it. As a result of what they have done there has been a party split, and I am today speaking on behalf of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Revolutionary Section), a unit of the Fourth International. By and large, people are not interested in these matters, but they are matters of particular importance to those who were in the party. They have a duty to perform by their own party members who are still in the party. I am speaking not only to those who have crossed over but also to those who are still thinking about it.

(Mr. D.P.R.Gunawardena) But they are not thinking of the Fourth International now.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) That may be, but there are those who are looking up to them while they are proclaiming their achievement as a grand finale in which socialism has been achieved. A certain amount of thinking is going on. One of the earliest things that they planned to do in this House was to curb discussion because they found they could not defend themselves with regard to what they had done.

When I listened to the speech of the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mount Lavinia I thought to myself that these hon. Members have reached the end of a journey, and a picture flashed across my mind. I can look back 31 years to the time when we launched a movement. A revolutionary party was formed. What sort of a party was it? It was a party that stood for the overthrow of the capitalist system. I have got with me the programme of action of the Lanka Sama Sama Party. It is entitled, "The Lanka Sama Samaja Party, Ceylon section of the Fourth International, adopted at the unity conference, June 4, 1950." I do not want to take the time of the House in going over this programme. I see some of our Members, who are now on that side, smiling. These things mean nothing to them. The party which was formed stood for the overthrow of the capitalist class and the severance of the links with British imperialism.

(The Hon. F.R.Dias Bandaranaike) What is the hon. Member reading from?

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) The programme of action of the L.S.S.P. adopted on June 4, 1950.

(Mr. D.P.R.Gunawardena) June 1950 was after our section left.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) One section left but the other two sections remained. At page 4 of this programme it is said that fundamental aims cannot be realized through bourgeois parliaments. Some of them are there with portfolios in the Front Benches of a bourgeois parliament.

Then, Sir, they also say, "This position cannot be realized by popular front governments," it is all there. And surely the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mt. Lavinia (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) and his friends and co-thinkers are in duty bound to say what they have done.

Thirty years ago we set out on a hard and difficult road. I could picture to my mind the difficulties we faced, the struggles that were carried on. We fought against the whole world as it were; we were ostracized, looked down upon, called mad fellows, mad men, people who were against religion, trying to destroy dagabas. We fought against capitalist reaction and came up against the powers that be: police baton charges, arrests, detentions, imprisonments, shootings.

(Mr. D.P.R.Gunawardena) At Bulathkohupitiya and Homagama.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) Yes, the Bulathkohupitiya and Homagama struggles -- a hard and difficult road. And in the dark days of the way, while some of us were in jail, young people still carried on this movement under tremendous odds. They did so in the hope and in the belief that they were going forward some day to overthrow the capitalist system.

Now, Sir, that road is over. There you see him, Sir! You see him a tired man -- gamane avasanaya. He is a picture of the end of the road -- the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mt. Lavinia!

(An hon. Member) He is quite fit.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) Yes, he has started on another road.

(Mr. Roy Rajapakse-Hakmana) On the correct road. You are still there. He has gone ahead.

(Mr. Deputy Chairman of Committees) Order, please!

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) Mr. Deputy Chairman, there is this new situation. How is it that we find this party now on the other side, in the seats of power, shall I say? Is it that they have captured power? No, Sir. It is not necessary to go into this question because if they had captured power we would have seen a popular revolution in this country. There was no revolution between March and June. But we have had some discussions, visits to "Temple Trees" and somebody's bungalow, and also cricket matches at Nuwara Eliya. That is not revolution.

(Mr. D.P.R.Gunawardena) You said "somebody's bungalow." Whose bungalow?

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) Perhaps you will know.

(Mr. D.P.R.Gunawardena) I do not know.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) I have not been there, so I cannot answer that question.

(Mr. D.P.R.Gunawardena) Why does he want to know whose bungalow it is?

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) It is not necessary for me to take up the time of this House talking of these matters. The whole country knows that notwithstanding the coalition between these two parties the position is that the Sri Lanka Freedom Party remains true to their positions, their principles, the so-called Bandaranaike principles. The two parties are following the road of sustaining capitalism in this country.

(Mr. Roy Rajapakse) No, No!

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) And of course there are the ten points of the ex-revolutionists and the four points of the Non. Prime Minister. Significantly, the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mt. Lavinia talked about the fourteen points. He talked about the four points. That is curiously the crux of the matter. Within the four points, you find a rightful place for Buddhism; the language problem, accepting it on the basis of Sinhala only; citizenship on the basis of citizenship laws which they themselves condemned; --

(Mr. Roy Rajapakse) Are you against those?

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) Hold your peace; I will tell you. Lastly, a no-contest pact with the Prime Minister.

This is not the time nor the place -- nor is necessary -- to discuss the place of religion, to discuss the merits of religion. But we know, Sir, that the worst exploiters, the biggest exploiting organizations, did their exploitation in the name of religion. We know the history of imperialism. When the imperialists went out to dominate the world, they went in the name of Christianity. The missionaries went first and the guns and the cannon came behind. That is the manner in which class oppression has taken place over the centuries.

It has nothing to do with the merits or demerits of religion. There have been good religious teachers who have done great service to humanity; but the ruling classes have over the years utilized religion, with the imperialists, to maintain and spread capitalism.

What did they say when we as the members of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party set out to organize the workers and the people of this country? Their cry was, "Save Buddhism from the flames of Marxism! Save Christianity from the flames of Marxism!"

Now, Sir, members of a revolutionary party are following that same path when they decided to maintain capitalism and capitalist

exploitation in this country. They are now treading the same road that was trodden by the rulers.

(Mr. Roy Rajapakse) It has been a bloodless revolution.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) This morning the police baton-charged the Velona strikers. I have not the fullest information with me, but that is the news.

(Mrs. Vivienne Goonewardene) We are all ashamed of the police.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) The people of this country, the workers and the peasants, who put their faith in socialist parties, including the L.S.S.P., found that the leaders of this party, the L.S.S.P., were members of a Cabinet of the S.L.F.P. Government.

It is perhaps natural that in the minds of some the first feeling should be one of satisfaction and happiness at the thought that our own comrades with whom we have been associated in carrying on the fight for the last thirty years are now in the seats of power. There is also the hope: "Surely we will get something." That is perhaps the natural reaction in some minds to what has happened.

A somewhat similar situation existed in Russia in 1917, the year of the revolution. We all know, everybody knows, that the Tsarist regime was overthrown and a provisional government was set up, a bourgeois government was set up. This bourgeois government functioned under tremendous strain; and in a situation when the mass movement was growing before their very eyes, the bourgeoisie, the capitalist class, found that their only chance of survival was to link up with the leaders of the socialist parties. So they held out the hand of co-operation; they called for co-operation from the left forces.

The Bolshevik Party led by Lenin denounced the idea of any co-operation or coalition. His party categorically stated: "This is a device to fool the people, to weaken the working class movement and finally to control the movement." But the Mensheviks joined the Coalition government.

There was a similar situation here. The Government faced a crisis. The Government could not move forward as the leading members of the Government were threatening to resign. That was the situation and in that situation when the Menshevik Party and the Socialist Revolutionary Party decided to accept not four portfolios but six, there was a great deal of satisfaction and happiness among the people. They said, "If it is good to have one Kerensky, let us have many more of them," just as much as the people say such things today. If one Philip Gunawardena was there in 1956, it is much better to have many more. That looks like common sense, but, unfortunately, common sense is not always the best guide in complicated situations.

(Mr. D.P.R.Gunawardena) Two and a half months more for October.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) Yes. What happened to these socialists? These socialists had a part to play; they were called upon to join the Government. For whose sake? For their sake and for the sake of the Government, just as much as the Sirimavo Bandaranaike Government have called upon the progressive forces to join her Government.

(Mr. Roy Rajapakse) For the sake of the people.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) Yes, for the sake of the people! In a similar situation these socialists took office, and what did they do? They started white-washing the Government, and they are also doing colour-washing. The red that was painted in 1956 became a little muddy, began to pale, and now they will start painting it purple. The socialist Ministers in 1917 started promising lavishly to the people; they said they would take away 100 per cent of the profits of the capitalists.

We find the Hon. Minister of Communications, Mr. Anil Moonesinghe, saying that he will cut the necks of the capitalists. Similarly, statements were made that 100 per cent of the profits of the capitalists would be taken over. What happens? To make a long story short, the bourgeois revolution took place under what conditions? There were four coalition governments formed between March and October 1917 and the bourgeois revolution took place in the situation which arose after they had overthrown the fourth coalition government. Socialism in Russia was not a fact until they had overthrown the last coalition government. Let hon. Members remember that.

(Mr. Roy Rajapakse) You can do that here.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) The time will soon come. Now, coalition governments come into being under certain historical situations brought about by the relations of class forces, when the capitalist class cannot rule or maintain its rule in the normal way, particularly because the working class, the toiling masses and their organizations, have reached a high level of class consciousness. In such a situation it is not possible to use the army and the police, and coalition government is the only solution.

To remind hon. Members, may I read a passage from Leon Trotsky on the first coalition in Russia:

"From the crisis created by the April rehearsal of future events we have three outcomes theoretically " --

These people here talk of three outcomes. There also, there were three outcomes that were possible.

"The power might have gone wholly to the Bourgeoisie. That could have been achieved only through civil war. Miliukov made the

attempt but failed" --

They also have their Miliukovs --

"The power should have gone wholly to the Soviets, the working class. This could have been achieved without any civil war," says Trotsky, "merely by raising of hands, merely by wishing it."

That was in Soviet Russia in 1917.

"But the compromisers did not want to wish it and the masses still preserved their full faith in the compromisers although it was badly cracked. Thus both of the fundamental ways out, the bourgeois and the proletarian, were closed. There remained the third possibility, the confused, weak-hearted, cowardly, half-road of compromise. The name of that road is coalition."

It is not as if these people do not know these things. Can they say, "We are innocent, we did not know these things?"

Of course, I will not blame the Minister of Finance. How can I blame him for forgetting his Marxism? He is like the Bourbons of old who learnt no Marxism and forgot no Marxism! I do not think he will be offended. But can we say with regard to the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mt. Lavinia (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva), the hon. Member for Panadura (Mr. Leslie Goonewardene) and the hon. Second Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa), "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do?"

They have written books, they have written pamphlets and they have taught the party.

(Mr. Roy Rajapakse) But conditions in Ceylon are quite different to those in Russia.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) Hold your peace.

I have got with me a very good booklet. Leslie Goonewardene's picture is there. It is good to see him. The book is, "The Differences between Trotskyism and Stalinism."

(Mr. D.P.R. Gunawardena) He is still on this side.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) He has still not yet the courage to go. He had a seat allocated to him there -- [Interruption].

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) That is not true and he knows it -- [Interruption]. I do not mind his telling lies about me but not about Leslie.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) In this book by Mr. Leslie Goonewardene -- incidentally it has an introduction by Dr. Colvin R. de Silva --

he has got a chapter discussing the politics of the Communist Party, the Stalinists, pinpointing the fact that they have betrayed the working class by linking up with the so-called progressive capitalists. Mr. Leslie Goonewardene has got a chapter, "Why do they mislead?" I would like to entitle it, "Why have they betrayed." He has got the answer. I will give him his answer from his own book.

(Mr. Roy Rajapakse) What year?

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) If I give the year, it makes no difference to you.

(Mr. Roy Rajapakse) Views change from year to year.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) This is the answer.

"It is not an answer merely to say they receive financial assistance from Moscow. The real and fundamental reason is that these people are not revolutionists who have faith in the capacity of the masses to achieve victory by their own efforts."

Now, that is the reason why they have betrayed. I say in the words of Mr. Leslie Goonewardene --

"The real and fundamental reason is that these people are not revolutionists. . . ."

The Coalition Government is a culmination. It did not fall from the skies. Although by and large people ask: "How did this happen so suddenly?" I say that it did not take place suddenly. Over the years we who were within the movement were able to see it; we saw this coming. I do not want to go into the dim past. Maybe all of us are to blame.

In 1956 when Mr. Bandaranaike formed a Government with the M.E.P., the L.S.S.P. was in the Opposition. But the confusion within the party came out very sharply because the party attitude to the Government was defined as "responsive co-operation." The following year the hon. Member for Kottawa and I wanted the party to accept the position that this attitude was wrong. I do not want to go into details, but that year -- 1957 -- was the crucial year.

Then came 1960. After the March elections in that year the disease that had grown over the years manifested in a big way. When you are weak in body the illness comes out. What happened then? The party leader -- today the Minister of Finance -- stated boldly and categorically what he has stated today. He wanted a Coalition Government. I have got with me a document which he circulated in the party. It is a very important document. In this he outlines his case for a Coalition Government quite frankly. He started by saying:

"Ceylon is unique in the history of the revolutionary move-

ment. . . . "

He stated that there was no question of a revolution in this country. He said: "The Ceylonese workers, except for a small minority of militant and class conscious elements are overwhelmingly petty-bourgeois. . . . "

He states that an extra-Parliamentary struggle is ruled out and that the only alternative is to link up with S.F.L.P. He says:

"Concretely the party will have to take the following steps. First of all enter into a no-contest pact to fight the forthcoming elections. In the campaign itself declare our readiness to support the formation of an S.L.F.P. Government. This must not be hedged about with conditions otherwise we will weaken the forces ready to rally round an alternative government.

"Secondly, steps must be taken to bring about a programmatic agreement with the S.L.F.P. with a view to forming a joint government. The pre-election resistance through fear of the disadvantages of a Marxist-S.L.F.P. alliance will no longer obtain after the election. We will not get most of what we stand for, but a broad progressive programme should be possible, e.g., -- "

This is what he wanted; that is all that he wanted.

" -- (a) nationalization of life insurance, but not all, (b) control of banks, but not nationalization, (c) government import of all essential commodities, but not all imports and exports, (d) a ceiling on incomes, etc."

The hon. Members for Dehiwala-Mount Lavinia, Panadura and Second Colombo South, what did they do? They denounced this position as being all wrong. Yes, they said that, but their actions today are different. This is the position that he was ready to accept. The present position is nothing more, nor less than that position -- the so-called 14-point programme. That is why I say that the greatest theoretician of the party, the brilliant orator, not only in this country, but in the entire East, the world famous orator, could not, in the speech that he made, make an apologia for this Coalition Government. He cannot, he dare not.

(An hon. Member) Table that.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) Of course, I will table this. As I was saying this situation did not fall from the skies. After all, we would have had a Coalition Government in 1960 but for the fact that the S.L.F.P. was returned with a sweeping majority and they did not see, therefore, the need to take that step. But what happened? The S.L.F.P. came into power in 1960. What did the L.S.S.P. do? We sent a letter asking for permission to attend meetings of the Government

Parliamentary Group. There was a motion sponsored by the hon. Member for Gampaha, but the S.L.F.P. said: "No, we do not want you." Why? The need had not yet arisen. They are not fools; the S.L.F.P. are not fools. -- [Interruption.] Who said so? I have never said so. -- [Interruption.] There are, of course, people who said that, but I had never accepted that.

What happened then? The L.S.S.P. started its critical support; the critical part of it became less and the support part became more and more. But that could not be done, because the mass situation changed. As a result of the rising prices, the first Budget and the second Budget, the masses were moving away. Though it was impossible to give support openly, yet the support part was there very much. Of course, the Opposition was anti-Felix. I remember an article that was written by the Hon. Minister of Finance where he called it the "anti-Felix Budget" or something like that. He was against a number of Ministers; of course, against individuals, but not against the party.

Then the working-class struggles took place. Strikes started and when strikes take place leaders have to go there. That was an embarrassing situation. The position became much more embarrassing as time went on because the mass situation was going in favour of the working-class movement. Whenever there was an escape situation they rushed into it. There was the coup situation when the Government was in danger. Once again they went to save the Government. But unfortunately the situation was going from bad to worse. Towards the end of 1963, the situation was very difficult to handle.

Then came the other fraud perpetrated on this country and the working-class movement with due respect to my Friend the hon. Member for Kottawa. They said, "We have now to replace the S.L.F.P. Government; the left forces must get together and form a united front to overthrow the S.L.F.P. Government and the capitalist forces of reaction." They started with that talk and the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mt. Lavinia came to the politbureau of the party, of which I was a member. His position was that the united front we should form should include the L.S.S.P., the Communist Party, the M.E.P., the C.W.C., the D.W.C. and the working-class organizations in order to overthrow this Government and the forces of capitalist reaction. That was the picture he painted to our party.

Having painted that picture, when it came to the question of forming the United Left Front the C.W.C., the D.W.C. and the working-class organizations were omitted. The aims of the United Left Front have been very clearly stated in the agreement. Vested interests in this country were alarmed that the left forces were getting ready to overthrow them and the Government, and even the Government got alarmed at it.

This is the aim of the United Left Front. I am reading from the agreement. You will find the hon. Member for Avissawella, the hon. Member for Akuressa, the hon. Member for Yatiyantota who is now

the Minister of Finance, all on the front page. According to this document one of the aims of the United Left Front is as follows:

"In accordance with the needs of this situation and in response to this mass urge, the Ceylon Communist Party, the Lanka Sama Samaja Party and the Mahajana Eksath Peramuna have agreed to form a United Left Front in order to mobilize and lead all anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and socialist forces in Ceylon in the fight to establish a government that will give effect to the following general programme."

There was to be no fight against the S.L.F.P. Government and against the capitalist class.

Shortly after that I prepared a small document, "Whither the L.S.S.P. -- the implications of the United Left Front." This document is known to hon. Members who have now crossed over. We warned the party as best we could that the aim behind this move was a final coalition with the S.L.F.P. Government.

(Mr. D.P.R.Gunawardena) No, you are wrong!

(Mr. D.P.R.Gunawardene) That is what you did. You started it first. You say "No."

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) With all due respect to the hon. Member for Avissawella, I must say that that was the aim and they have realized it. It may be that the entire U.L.F. is not on that side. That was the aim but things did not turn out as planned. Unfortunately for them, events moved faster than they expected; otherwise, the situation would have been different. They had thought of implementing this programme after the next General Election. If this Government had come to an end in the normal course and a General Election had taken place, the L.S.S.P. would have entered into a no-contest pact with the S.L.F.P. and the result would have been a Coalition Government. Unfortunately for them, events took a different turn, and today the betrayal is much clearer. I say that that is why the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mount Lavinia has not been able to decide to take a seat in the Front Bench, to accept a ministry. He knows that the exposure of this betrayal is possible in a big way. Of course, there are large sections of the working class and many people in this country who do not understand this betrayal. That was so in Russia in 1917 when Kerensky and the coalitionists went over in their numbers. They thought it was a good thing. It was later that they understood that "coalition" was another word for "betrayal." Anyway, that was their aim.

The motivation for the coalition was very simple. We know that just before the Prorogation the Government was not sure of its position in Parliament. The working-class situation had been deteriorating from the previous year and there were disputes and differences that existed between the various trade-union organizations. A fair degree of unity had been forced around the twenty-one demands, and at

Ceylinco House the representatives of the organized working class, numbering about two million workers of this country, decided to launch a struggle for the twenty-one demands. That was the situation.

(Mr. Deputy-Chairman of Committees) Order, please! Mr. Speaker will now take the Chair.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) I was discussing the motivation for the coalition. Before the working class had even planned out a course of action, by November or December strike action was resorted to in a big way in the Port of Colombo led by the Ceylon Mercantile Union. 13,000 workers came out on strike in December and January, and despite the efforts of the Government the organized working class was able to achieve a real victory. The wage freeze was broken by the strikers in the harbour, and a major victory was won.

The next phase would have been a very serious one for the Government and the capitalist class. I am not saying that a revolution would have taken place and that a socialist government would have been placed in power. What I say is that it was a threatening situation. The Hon. Prime Minister, of course, viewed the situation with alarm. I think the capitalist class of this country, including the U.N.P., understand that in the Prime Minister they have a conscious leader of the capitalist class. That is reflected in the amendment moved by the U.N.P. On behalf of that class the Prime Minister consciously did the correct thing. She discussed the situation. A link-up with the U.N.P. would not have obtained for her the support of the working class. She knew that. There is no point in linking up with the United National Party to get the working-class support. To control the working classes you must get the support of the L.S.S.P., the Communist Party, and the M.E.P. This is what Sirimavo Bandaranaike did, and in the situation Barkis was willing, there was no difficulty.

Over the years that situation grew. In 1960 when the Cabinet was formed, they were denied admittance, but they kept on persisting. So in that situation, so far as the capitalist classes are concerned, this was the motivation and she has succeeded temporarily through the assistance of these people who have betrayed the working-class movement and the toiling people of this country, though for the moment, in putting an obstacle before the growing mass struggle of this country.

There were 21 demands. Yes, but there was another demand which pushed aside the class struggle, and instead of the class struggle there is class collaboration!

(Mr. D.P.R.Gunawardena) There in the Treasury box!

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) Of course, in that situation they cannot control the situation forever. Very soon, no even now as we are debating, the class struggle has broken out in Velona. Their police are harassing the workers and baton charging them. Their police have come to the service of the capitalist class! They are

very acceptable, Sir!

The earliest statement made by the Hon. Minister of Finance to the working class of this country was to ask them to work. He said: "I want work. Everyone should come to work at 9 a.m. I want an eight-hour day!" What have the capitalist class and the employers been saying all these days? "We want an eight-hour day!" Yes, what Sirimavo Bandaranaike could not say through her mouth, they have got the working-class leaders, the traitors, the renegades to say it. That is the situation. He can say "work hard" and he can go to work by 9 o'clock in the morning because he has got a car, while hundreds of workers have to talk ten miles, board three buses and walk another ten miles to get to their places of work.

(Mr. Speaker) Please wind up in three minutes.

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody) They have done their dirty work. Now, this is the situation we are faced with. For the present, there is the expectation and the hope that something will arise out of this coalition. The organized working class is watching, is waiting. But the situation is fast developing when the struggle will be the order of the day, and it will be the duty of the revolutionists in this situation to regroup themselves and regroup the militant elements in the working class, keep the fire of the class struggle burning round the 21 Demands of the working class, link up this struggle with the struggle of the peasants, of the rural masses, in this country, and go forward. In this situation, the L.S.S.P. (Revolutionary Section), united with the Fourth International will bend all its energies to rally round itself all the revolutionary elements -- [Interruption] -- and go forward in the struggle for the achievement of socialism in this country.

NEXT ISSUE

"The 'Testament' of Palmiro Togliatti." Pierre Frank analyzes one of the most important documents in the Sino-Soviet dispute -- the right-wing platform of Khrushchev's main adherents in Western Europe.