

**INSIDE: Germain, Ceylon And The Truth**

# **Bulletin**

**OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM**

*Socialism* Vol. 2, No. 2

Jan. 25, 1965

10 Cents



## **City Turns On Welfare Workers!**

The Wagner Administration has been forced to take a somewhat harder line towards New York's striking welfare workers than in previous strikes of municipal workers. Even more than usual, the city has had to discard the "friend of labor" pose and has moved, with the support of every major New York newspaper, to invoke the Condon-Wadlin law which severely penalizes civil service employees who strike.

On the first day of the strike, January 4, the New York Times editorialized: "The city has a clear obligation under the Condon-Wadlin Act to replace the strikers -- an obligation it has shirked in past civil service walkouts...the time for evasion is over..." While not supporting the strike-breaking law directly, the self-styled liberal New York Post does support the good intentions of the city administration and calls upon welfare workers to return to work before receiving any concessions from the city. Under the law this would mean, aside from

other penalties, that the strikers would be accepting a fine of two days' pay for every day on strike, or, in other words, that they would agree to work for one month without any pay.

Since the U. S. government underwrites the major part of welfare costs, including salaries, the implications of this dispute go beyond city politics. Underlined is Johnson's State of the Union warning about the "high stake" in "keeping wages and prices within the framework of the guideposts..."

Welfare is a national problem. With increasing unemployment, 42% more people were on the welfare rolls last year than in 1954. This is 4% of the total U. S. population. As the Wall Street Journal pointed out on January 8, "From Boston to San Antonio, to San Francisco, the pattern is much the same: Over-worked, underpaid, often dispirited welfare agents toil in frustration to salve a swelling relief army that now approximates the size of the nation's largest city. Its ranks rise twice as swiftly as population in the affluent U. S...." Under these circumstances increased costs of running welfare caused by giving the welfare workers in New York big concessions would be further increased in geometric progression by rising welfare rolls and consequently greater numbers of welfare workers. This in part explains the very tough position taken by the city in this strike.

All indications are that the strike was deliberately provoked by the city. Refusing to bargain on any of the key union demands for lower case-loads and better working conditions, the city has made only a token wage offer. This departure from the city's usually at least slightly more "friendly" bargaining relations with unions is particularly significant in view of the fact that the United Federation of Teachers' contract expires at the end of this school year. Portents are for a harder line towards the city's 44,000 teachers. All of this is in turn related to expectations of a downturn in the economy by the end of the year.

For the city, welfare workers apparently represent a vulnerable segment of the municipal labor force since they are represented by two unions just recently involved in a jurisdictional dispute and since the effects of the strike are felt by the poor, mostly the workers in the Negro and Puerto Rican ghettos.

But the militancy and determination of the strikers has turned many would-be disadvantages into advantages. Morale among the workers has been high. Ten of 27 Welfare Centers have been closed down and 90% of the social investigators have supported the strike.

The Power of the Ranks

No doubt the strikers' own pressure and determination are to a large extent responsible for prodding officials of the organized labor movement into supporting the strike. Jerry Wurf, president of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, has even threatened to call a sympathy strike of municipal workers throughout the city. Members of the UFT and the Seafarers International Union have joined the picket lines. Collections to aid strikers in financial need have begun.

The leading labor bureaucrats are, however, simply responding to pressure to act. Harry Van Arsdale of the NYC Central Labor Council, as well as Wurf and Paul Hall of the SIU, can be expected to push for a "compromise settlement" such as the one proposed and rejected a few days after the strike began. The city will try to drive a hard bargain. Instead of seeking to mobilize the active support of the labor movement to force the city to give in, these "leaders" will try to sell a settlement agreeable to the city to the workers.

For many of the strikers this is their first identification with the trade union movement. Most of them belong to the Social Service Employees Union, an independent union which won a collective bargaining election in November after a 2½ year fight with the existing AFSCME local, 371, the AFL-CIO affiliate. Now the militancy of the SSEU has forced the "old" union, Local 371, which still represents the clerical and supervisory employees, into a more militant position. Thus far the two unions have worked together against the attacks of the city and the mass media.

The SSEU fought for and won the support of a large majority of the social investigators. Included in the union now are the more experienced, older employees in the Welfare Department, and many new employees, fresh from college. Many of the workers in the second category are generally suspicious of the entire labor movement, not just its bureaucratic leadership. But now they must fight inside the labor movement, working to win over allies to their struggle on a class basis.

Another key to the struggle lies among the Negro and Puerto Rican families in the ghettos, the majority of the clients of the welfare investigators. For many of the newer welfare investigators, coming straight from college, a job in welfare is their first contact with real poverty. It is not surprising that 40% of the staff quits in frustration each year. While, for the first time, New York newspapers and the city administration are "noticing" the plight of 500,000 New Yorkers on relief, the welfare workers feel the pressure from the ghetto as part

of their daily routine. Understaffed, overworked, and implementing a totally inadequate welfare budget, the workers cannot meet even the most basic of their clients' needs. Along with the police he becomes the hated personification of The City. For half the staff who are Negro this is one of the few white-collar jobs open to them and they hold it only by virtue of separating themselves to at least some extent from the workingclass in the ghetto, from which many of them came.

While welfare recipients cannot be expected to look upon the social investigators with any special affection, the welfare workers can cut across any attempts by the city to use the poverty-stricken recipients against the strike. They can raise the demands of the clients themselves as well as their own. They can show the clients that they have a common adversary who profits from antagonism between them.

The strikers should, of course, continue to work with and solicit the support of all groups in the Negro and Puerto Rican communities, as well as seeking to get support on their own. They will naturally tend to form alliances with more militant tendencies in the Negro movement. Roy Wilkins, for instance, who seems to have placed himself at the disposal of the capitalist class for "emergency" work at all times, charged the strikers with racism, although he mentioned in passing that he still "supported" the strike. Others, including Bayard Rustin, Rev. Galamison, and Jesse Gray, have strongly supported the strikers, and local CORE chapters have joined the picket lines. The union should not simply rely on support from these leaders, however, especially those like Rustin, whose kow-towing to the cops and the Democratic Party has already greatly compromised him in the Negro movement.

It is quite possible that the city may concede a bit on wages and conditions, but it will definitely try to hold the line on refusing to recognize and deal with the union as a real union with all the prerogatives of a real union. The city is not used to dealing with genuine unions, and would like to be in a position to deal harshly with the welfare workers in the future, even if it is forced to give a few concessions now. So in addition to mobilizing as much support and common action with the organized labor movement and the Negro and Puerto Rican communities as possible, a major task of the welfare workers is to smash the anti-labor Condon-Wadlin Act and force the city to deal with it as a genuine organization of the workers with all the rights which trade unions have fought for and won over the years.

DEEP RECESSION THREATENS U. S. ECONOMY

1965 Begins With Jitters Over Gold

How Will It End?

A cold chill went through the capitalist world's financial centers recently as the doldrums-ridden French economy turned in \$150 million for London gold. Behind the jitters: it is the apparent consensus of all leading U.S. and British economists that the world may be plunged into a nasty recession--or worse--by the time workers' summer vacations roll around this year. The mood of government and corporate economic advisors, trade union economists, and financial journalists is summed up by the Jan. 11 U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT: "One great fear is gnawing many economists as they study the business outlook--fear that weakness in the dollar could possibly touch off a major economic shake-out." British views, as represented by the Economist: "Care is needed to ensure that the almost inevitable slowdown in world trade does not grind expansion to a full stop." No coincidence then is LBJ's State of the Union warning to Congress to prepare for "rapid action" on emergency anti-depression programs for "immediate use if a recession threatens."

While the NY Times struggles to maintain a posture of cautious optimism, journalists such as San Francisco Chronicle's Lawrence Fertig warn of the threat of a "classic depression" coming as the logical outgrowth of the post-war period of credit-expansion. While most, like Fertig, doubt that the depression will begin in 1965, a significant number raise what US NEWS reports as "some warnings" that efforts to hold up the dollar's position "could lead to worldwide depression and great unrest."

The current semi-official line is expressed in US NEWS: "The dollar on its own, if not carrying the burdens of other nations, is a very strong dollar, more than earning its way in the world, unlikely to require tinkering." But, "When this same dollar is loaded down with the burdens of aiding other countries and supporting much of the defense of the non-Communist world, then it is found to be under real strain, and its future is open to question." Specific fear: "Let confidence in the U.S. dollar be shaken, and a worldwide 'run' from that dollar into gold could get under way with serious effects."

The danger of such a "run" is becoming very real. In late November, Britain's long-building-up financial decay broke out in the so-called seven-day Sterling Crisis. Britain was saved from a financial nosedive by \$3 billion in emergency aid by central bankers, led by the U.S. Federal Reserve System. Barely a month later, the Economist reports that Britain may have mortgaged away that \$3 billion plus \$1 billion borrowed from the shrinking

cashbox of the International Monetary Fund. With France in economic doldrums, with Italy contracting and West Germany headed into an inflationary stew, the recent \$150 million gold run touches a very jagged nerve in all financial communities.

The U.S. dollar only appears to be strong at home. As US NEWS admits: "Aid abroad...often results in orders for goods from American business. Some...aid dollars stay home and stimulate the economy...investments by U.S. companies...take the form, in part, of shipments of U.S. parts and equipment...dollars spent abroad by American troops are used by foreigners to pay for U.S. goods. Cut aid or military spending abroad or U.S. investment in foreign industry, and some U.S. exports will decline." Western Europe, Canada and Japan are the main crutches of the gutsick American economy; as go those crutches so goes U.S. prosperity. The 1964 balance of payments deficit, \$2 billion, was held down by a big trade surplus, \$8 billion. Europe, led by downward spiralling Britain, will buy much, much less from U.S. this year; this will increase the payments deficit of U.S. to at least the \$4 billion mark, and set off waves of unemployment and business contraction here.

#### Phony Prosperity?

While the Gross National Product in the U.S. has risen from the \$440 billion-rate in the first-quarter of 1957 to an expected \$660 million in 1965, unemployment has increased, together with a growing percentage of the population, led by minorities, being plunged below the "poverty line." If the real measure of national economic growth is a higher standard of living and increased employment for bigger percentages of the population, then the U.S. economy has been declining for the past eight years! Recent growth, limited to a rise in income for a shrinking percentage of population, has been phony by the generally-agreed standard: the economy must grow about 5% per year just to keep up with the needs of a growing population--this level was reached only during the peak of the 1961-64 boom. Growth of unemployment and poverty during these past eight years, together with the persisting balance of payments crises, is classical proof of what Karl Marx described as the development of a new general crisis out of a period of credit-expansion.

In the slide-rule department, experts are predicting a slower rate of growth for 1965. Typical: the National Industrial Conference Board's annual economic forum sees the rate of factory production expansion dropping from 6% in 1964 to 3.7% in 1965. NICB estimates are in line with the National Planning Association which predicted 3.8% growth in GNP; government forecasters project 3.3% rate in terms of 1964 purchasing power, after adjusting for expected 1965 inflation. In the key

steel industry, U.S. Steel Corp. economist W.H. Peterson, warns that output will drop from an estimated 127 million tons in 1964 to between 105 and 115 in 1965.

### For Your Christmas Stocking

Slide-rule specialists also predict that the official rate of unemployment will rise from 4.9% in December, 1964, to 5.5% by Christmas-cheer time this year. In unofficial, or real terms, the number of people needing jobs by next Christmas would be greater than the entire population of the eight western mountain states. The National Planning Association explains: "It would take a 4.5% gain in output merely to provide jobs for new workers entering the labor force and to compensate for gains in output per man hour." Obviously, the NPA's own predicted 3.8% increase in 1965 output is nowhere near the level necessary to keep unemployment and poverty from growing this year. Not much hope from this source for the 7.8 million people reported on relief by the Jan. 8 Wall Street Journal, or the quarter of the population below the "poverty-line."

This means human disaster for ghetto-blighted New York City. Even in a "peak" year, 1964, that city was virtually a disaster area. Since 1958 the city has lost 100,000 manufacturing jobs; in 1958-63, the rate of job increases above recession-bottom levels has been only 50% of the national average during "booms." With almost 500,000 out of 8 million residents now on welfare, and with more than 50,000 new youth seeking jobs this year, City Labor Commissioner James J. McFadden sees only 10,000 new jobs in sight.

The year-end unemployment in the city is expected to rise far above the national rate of increase. Only World's Fair construction and tourist business kept the metropolitan area as a whole from registering an actual decline in employment in 1964. With office-building construction petering out after the end of the 1965 Fair season, employment in the city is going to be very rough getting.

These slide-rule projections do not take into account the effects of deeper shocks in world financial centers. Adding those effects to the already forecast decline in employment, LBJ's "Great Society" could become as cruel and bitter a joke as the old "chicken in every pot."

### LONGSHOREMEN REBEL AGAINST SELLOUT

#### Automation Threatens Their Livelihood

The current strike of dockworkers which has



shut down maritime activity in all ports from Maine to Texas is a strike not only against the shipping bosses but also the "fink" regime of I.L.A. President Thomas Gleason and the Johnson Administration. What is noteworthy is not simply that Gleason & Co. together with officials of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. are doing their utmost to shove the boss-government contract down the throats of the dockworkers (the usual role of such "labor lieutenants of capital") but that many dockworkers are showing a militancy and consciousness which is symptomatic of a new mood of struggle beginning to develop throughout the American labor movement.

In the shipping industry, as in the forthcoming conflict in steel, the fundamental lines of battle are clear: The bosses strive to increase "flexibility" in job assignments and generally to get more production with less workers while the workers resist this drive which the bosses hope to accomplish through a combination of "attrition," layoff, partial employment and "flexibility." Also, in an industry like shipping, the employers' drive toward greater productivity is not only a process of loss of jobs through mechanization and automation, but a process of intensification of labor or "speedup" as well.

Eagerly assisted by the New York Shipowners Association, Ass't. Sec'y. of Labor Reynolds, and the New York Times, Gleason is spewing forth the phony line that the dockworkers are "ignorant," "misinformed," have made an unfortunate "mistake" and just don't realize that they have voted down the most glorious contract in the history of the labor movement (shades of Walter Reuther)! Accordingly, Gleason has organized a "truth squad" to "explain" the contract to the workers and will undoubtedly be using many of the techniques of "truth" that Madison Avenue uses to sell toothpaste. The dockworkers, however, are a lot smarter than Gleason seems to think and he may find this out when the I.L.A. election time rolls around.

Let us contrast the phony Gleason line with what is really happening on the docks. In this real world, there is a rank and file revolt against acceptance of the contract which would reduce work gangs from 20 men to 17 over a 4 year period, and pave the way for an eventual reduction to 11 man gangs as recommended in the report of the Wirtz Commission, appointed by Johnson. The "ignorant" dockworkers in the forefront of this revolt can see the handwriting on the wall. "We're closing them down exactly because we know what's in that contract," said a docker from Local 895. "We had a meeting this morning (Dec. 22)," he continued, "and all the men from these piers (51, 45, 40, 34 and 32) told those 'leaders' we're not gonna have three men knocked off the gang just like that. They're pushing us to accept but they're leaders without men." (Challenge, Dec. 29, 1964)



The revolt is against more than the contract. There is a deepgoing revolt which is taking organized form against the Gleason leadership. Rebel meetings are being held spelling out their opposition to gang size reduction and predicting that the proposed "guarantee" of 1,600 hours of work per man annually would in practice constitute a maximum rather than a minimum. Latest reports are that the bosses and the government expect the strike to last "several weeks." The entire picture of what is happening belies the story that the strike is the result of "ignorance" and "confusion."

### Seamen Offer Support

A very important by-product of the strike is the decision of the various maritime unions pledging full support and honoring the I.L.A. picket lines at all East and Gulf Coast ports. Consciously or not, all these port workers, black and white, north and south, are in this action together. The action of the maritime unions ties in with what may become a real battle by the seamen against the Johnson Administration's "new maritime policy."

While Johnson has refrained from spelling it out, it is well known what the new proposals are all about. Johnson's program is aimed at streamlining the costs of subsidies to shipbuilding companies by extending these subsidies (now totalling \$350 million annually) to foreign shipbuilding which will cost less and be more "efficient" to operate. In addition to worsening the already dismal employment situation in private shipyards (only 42% of existing capacity in these yards is currently being utilized) the new proposal is designed to help the American shipping corporations. Under the new set-up, these corporations will receive federal subsidies to buy foreign built ships "fitted with automated cargo-handling gear and the like." Maritime unions, "with reason, fear the President will ask legislation to strengthen the Maritime Association's hand in demanding reduction in the size of the crews..." on such ships. (Wall St. Journal, Jan. 11, 1965) Once again, the "Democratic" capitalist government shows its real policy in "fighting" (sic) unemployment.

The dockworkers, the merchant seamen, the steel workers, the auto workers---all have shown a willingness to make a real fight against unemployment, and to "vote with their feet" if necessary. As we have said on many occasions before, the most significant demand around which to center this struggle is the demand of "30 for 40"---for a 30 hour week with no reduction in take home pay and for a corresponding decrease in the length of the work week with every increase in productivity.

EDITORIAL

THE TRUTH AND ERNEST GERMAIN

The truth is becoming a harder and harder commodity to find in this world. Certainly the capitalists have as little to do with it as possible for they cannot face up to the basic irrationality of their system nor its limited historical future.

Sad to say, truth is not always so easy to find among socialists, among those who must know the truth in order to lead the working class to power. The problem becomes acute when dealing with socialists who no longer are really seeking to lead the working class to power but who cannot honestly admit that this is the case. Such people are called centrists. To cover up their real political character, they will resort to lies and slander. Above all they cannot tolerate a face to face political confrontation with revolutionary socialists who have a genuine perspective of leading the working class in struggle.

Ernest Germain, we are afraid, is such a centrist. For years Germain has been a leading figure in the international Trotskyist leadership. In the recent period he has emerged as the major spokesman for the "United Secretariat"--that product of the SWP in decline and the European "Pabloites" in disintegration. Germain's article printed in the January 18th Militant is an excellent example of this sad process.

The problem Germain and the Socialist Workers Party face is that they are challenged by a Trotskyist Party, the Socialist Labor League (SLL) which not only means it when it talks about the working class as a revolutionary force but has achieved important successes in building a working class revolutionary movement in Great Britain. Precisely because of its intransigence against every form of revisionism and its refusal to seek shortcuts in building a working class party, the SLL has emerged as the largest and single most important Trotskyist formation in the world.

Germain on the other hand has been incapable of building a serious working class formation in Belgium where he generally resides nor for that matter in any other country on the continent. Instead, he has sought to become a "man of influence", the editor of a left social-democratic journal, the advisor to leftish labor leaders and the like. When the pre-revolutionary crisis rocked Belgium in the General Strike of 1961 he was incapable of even trying to create an alternative leadership of the working class. Ah yes, Germain is a man of influence--everywhere but among the working class.

So today he produces slander and yet more slander of the SLL in the hope that the rank and file Trotskyists throughout the world can be kept from seeing the truth-- the complete bankruptcy of revisionism and the great potential for rebuilding the revolutionary movement on the basis of a working class perspective and an understanding of Marxism.

For his purposes Germain concentrates on one article in the SLL's paper, the Newsletter, which was admittedly disoriented over the Congo events--giving too much credence to the imperialists' horror stories about rebel massacres. In fact the January 9th issue of the Newsletter printed a statement strongly taking this particular article to task for these very formulations.

The article is removed from context and a picture is painted of the SLL turning its back on the colonial revolution in general and in fact cowering before imperialism. The truth is the exact opposite. In issue after issue of the Newsletter, the SLL has defended the colonial peoples in every corner of the globe. More important, the SLL led demonstrations and protests in England against colonialism and is today the only force in England effectively combatting the racism which seeks to divide the Indian and Jamaican workers from the working class as a whole.

The truth is that while Germain is full of "sympathy" for the colonial peoples he has been incapable of effectively struggling against the oppressor of these peoples, the ruling class in Belgium itself. On the other hand the SLL is the only force within the British labor movement to not merely oppose the Tories but to effectively struggle within the Labour Party against the Tory policies of Wilson and the Labour Party leadership which today is continuing Tory colonialism.

There is also a deeper political meaning behind these slanders of Germain. Germain has a political difference with the SLL and with us on the colonial revolution. But, being the centrist he is, he cannot put for-

### A STATEMENT

The struggle to build the Fourth International has reached a new stage. The crisis within the camp of revisionism has reached a point where slanders must be engaged in, in a futile effort to hold together what they still have by seeking to poison the rank and file against revolutionaries. It is now necessary to step up the political and theoretical struggle both here in this country and throughout the world. The American Committee for the Fourth International pledges to assist, in this task, the Socialist Labour League and the International Committee of the Fourth International in every way it can. This is an essential part of the rebuilding of the Fourth International.

-- American Committee for  
the Fourth International

ward this difference in a clearcut and honest manner. Germain tends to view the colonial peoples as an essentially homogeneous force and he identifies the construction of a revolutionary socialist party in the colonial areas with the petty bourgeois leaderships presently dominating the colonial liberation movements. Thus to him the construction of a revolutionary party in Algeria, for instance, is simply a matter of watching the evolution of Ben Bella's single ruling party.

Thus Germain equates opposition to the leaderships of the colonial revolution with opposition to the colonial revolution just as Stalin equated opposition to the bureaucracy of the USSR with opposition to the workers' state. Just as opposition to the Soviet bureaucracy is essential for the very defense of the workers' state against imperialism, so too, opposition to the disoriented petty bourgeois leaderships of the colonial revolution is an essential part of the defense of the colonial revolution as a whole.

Germain carries extensive quotations from Lenin and Trotsky in his January 18th article in order to give the impression that his policy is a continuation of theirs. The truth is the exact opposite. These quotations show clearly that Lenin and Trotsky did not view the colonial peoples as homogeneous nor did they identify the building of a revolutionary party in these regions with the evolution of petty bourgeois currents. For instance, Trotsky states, as quoted by Germain: "The workers must develop the revolutionary struggle in each colonial or imperialist country, where favorable conditions exist, and thereby give an example to workers of other countries. Only initiative and activity, resolution and temerity, can really materialize the slogan Workers of the world, unite!(emphasis ours)"

Thus for Lenin, Trotsky, the SLL and ourselves the colonial liberation struggles, to succeed, must be led by workers and these workers must be brought into a common international movement with workers in the advanced countries. The truth of the matter is that Germain and the SWP have broken completely with Leninism and Trotskyism on the colonial question and are now seeking to cover up this truth by slandering the SLL.

Germain concludes his article by claiming that the SLL has turned its back on the task of building the interantional movement and is devoting its energy solely to Great Britain. Here again it is self evident that the exact opposite is the truth. The very reason why Germain is so concerned with attacking the SLL and the SWP has given over two pages of the Militant to this attack is that the SLL, far from deserting the international, is the main challenge internationally to the revisionists. This can be seen most clearly in Ceylon where the struggles of the SLL have had a profound impact on the LSSP Revolutionary Section. (See article following)

BEHIND THE BETRAYAL IN CEYLON

The Role of the SWP and the United Secretariat

In the LSSP's Sellout of the Working Class

The demise of the coalition government in Ceylon between Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike's Sri Lanka Freedom Party (SLFP) and the renegade ex-Trotskyist Lanka Sama Samaja Party (LSSP) closes a chapter in Ceylonese politics. The parliament has been dissolved, and new elections are scheduled for early spring.

Last June, after a long period of degeneration and crisis, the LSSP split. The right wing majority, led by N.M. Perera, supported by a small center group led by Colvin R. De Silva and Leslie Goonewardena, brought the LSSP into the coalition government. The left wing, among whose leaders were Edmund Samarrakoddy and Bala Tampoe, rejected this outright class collaboration and formed the LSSP (Revolutionary).

The problems of the LSSP go back to its very origins. The LSSP never was a Marxist party. While it played the leading role in organizing the Ceylonese labor movement, and in spreading some of the ideas of Marxism, it was never able to apply Marxism in action. Middle class trends developed and grew quickly in the party. When the Fourth International split in 1953, the LSSP leadership, not much interested in internationalism of any sort, nevertheless allied itself after a short period of waiting with the revisionist Pablo-Germain leadership in Paris. Nurtured by this leadership after 1953, the LSSP leadership became more and more separated from the ranks of the party and trade unions themselves, and developed more and more a strategy for the peaceful and parliamentary road to power in Ceylon.

In 1960 the LSSP negotiated no-contest electoral agreements with the bourgeois SLFP, using the familiar argument that this was necessary to prevent the coming to power of the right wing United National Party. This first step of open class collaboration resulted in a sizeable drop in the LSSP vote. The upswing of the class struggle led to a momentary retreat by the LSSP leadership towards more militant opposition to the bourgeois government. In August 1963 the majority leadership adopted the United Left Front (ULF) Agreement with the Communist Party and the Peoples' United Front (MEP). This was in words a "united front" of working class parties but its basic aim was not to mobilize the masses but to put pressure as a "loyal opposition" on the bourgeois government. In less than a year the LSSP leadership abandoned the ULF for outright capitulation to the bourgeoisie.

At a time when the Ceylonese labor movement was

preparing to launch a massive struggle against the capitalist government around the "21 demands" put forward by 14 trade union organizations, the LSSP entered the government. N.M. Perera became Finance Minister, and the five LSSP-dominated unions withdrew from the Joint Committee of Trade Union Organizations. Soon thereafter the pro-Moscow CP unions began to equivocate more and more on the 21 demands. By the time the coalition government fell, the 21 demands had not been presented, and the entire union movement had been disoriented by the reformist LSSP's betrayal, with the eager aid of the pro-Moscow CP.

Meanwhile, a number of important strike struggles developed. Most important was the Velona textile strike, involving the fight for recognition by the Lanka Weaving Mills Workers Union, led by members of the Revolutionary LSSP. The long strike was met by brutal police and company attacks; the reformist-LSSP leaders, sitting in Parliament, refused to support the strikers.

In late October the coalition achieved one of its few "successes." It succeeded in negotiating an agreement with India to repatriate over a half million Ceylonese of Indian origin to India, and to set up and formalize a category of second class citizenship without elementary civil and political rights for those Ceylonese of Indian origin remaining in Ceylon. This shameful racist agreement, supported of course by the reformist-LSSP, was the coalition's answer to the economic crisis besetting the island. Apparently it is thought that India, having so many starving millions already, will not find 500,000 more especially noticeable. Thus the LSSP traitors busied themselves in the cynical bartering of the lives of hundreds of thousands of people, with no regard of course to a socialist solution which would enable these people to live where they pleased free of poverty and racist persecution.

#### The Infamous Coalition Falls

The LSSP renegades were unable to gain decisive support from the Ceylonese capitalists or the imperialists themselves. The coalition decided to push for government control over Lake House, headquarters for the dominant capitalist press of Ceylon. The left-wing opposition to the regime correctly attacked this move as a means of clamping down on workers' rights as well as this particular group of capitalists. Meanwhile the right, seeing an opportunity for political advantage, attacked the move and began to wage a campaign against the government, which was put on the defensive and eventually forced to drop the press takeover proposal.

At the same time, Perera himself visited Britain in quest of development loans. The British banks turned him down, just as Wilson was occupied in "rescuing the pound."

Thus in their separate ways, the Ceylonese bourgeoisie and the imperialists expressed their lack of confidence in the LSSP, just as the workers were also becoming more and more aware of the government's reactionary character. Under these circumstances, the inevitable occurred: the government fell, in classic form, under attacks from right and left.

If the right is stronger than the left at present, we have only N.M. Perera, C.R. De Silva, and company to thank for it. They chose to fight the crisis capitalism gives rise to with capitalist policies and a capitalist government. Such a government is doomed from the moment it assumes office, since it is trying to accomplish the impossible. But the disorientation of the working class movement can be reversed. If the Revolutionary LSSP breaks decisively from revisionism it can lead the working class to power.

#### The Role of

#### The International Committee

The International Committee, and particularly the Socialist Labor League of Great Britain, has been waging a constant struggle against revisionism within the world Trotskyist movement. The Unified Secretariat of the Fourth International, which originated in 1953 as the International Secretariat led by Michel Pablo and Ernest Germain, is the major center of revisionism in the world movement. Pablo himself as well as Perera has already shown the path to outright reformism along which the cen-

#### A TRANSMISSION BELT

Further confirmation of the centrist role of the Unified Secretariat is provided by a report in the Jan. 9 issue of the SLL's Newsletter. Osmund Jayaratne, one of Germain's closest collaborators and a member of the Unified Secretariat itself, was sent back to Ceylon in Aug. 1964, to struggle against the growing forces inside the Revolutionary LSSP opposed to Pabloism. At the very same time that Germain was writing an article which appeared in the Fall issue of the International Socialist Review, which explained away the degeneration of the LSSP as a result of ideas of "Ceylonese exceptionalism" and insufficient collaboration with the Unified Secretariat, this close disciple of Germain and the international leadership itself returned to Ceylon and within a short time resigned from the Revolutionary LSSP and aligned himself with the Bandaranaike-Perera coalition. This latest development tears apart all of the rationalizations of the Unified Secretariat, and shows more clearly than ever their role as a transmission belt of alien class influence, as the half-way house in which those who are headed towards anti-working class politics pause for rest and refreshment.



trist Unified Secretariat is heading at great speed. The expulsions of Pablo and Perera and their supporters by the Unified Secretariat last summer have left the "reunified" organization with less forces than it had before it reunified with the support of the Socialist Workers Party of the U.S. in 1963. But they have gained nothing from these splits, not having broken from the method of Pablo and Perera. This is the political and organizational balance sheet of the centrists just a year after the reunification they boasted of.

The International Committee has exposed the fundamental political and theoretical responsibility of the Unified Secretariat for the Ceylonese betrayal. Everything that characterized Pabloism continues to characterize the Unified Secretariat and the SWP although Pablo himself has moved on to greener pastures as a minor official in the Ben Bella regime. There is a direct tie between Bernstein and Kautsky, between Stalin, Khrushchev, and Brezhnev, and between Pablo and the present-day leaders of the Unified Secretariat. These so-called Trotskyists share the same basic method with Pablo and Perera. Impressionism and empiricism has led them to renounce a working class revolutionary perspective all over the world, especially in the colonial countries.

The adaptation to Castro and Ben Bella in particular paved the way for the Ceylonese crisis. If an international group calling itself Trotskyist can place Castro on a plane with Lenin and Trotsky, keep silent in the arrest and persecution of a Cuban Trotskyist group, ignore the pro-neutralist and conciliatory statements of Castro, and uncritically support the Ben Bella regime in Algeria as it breaks strikes and workers demonstrations, then why can't Perera join the capitalist cabinet? If these people for years refuse to make any criticism whatever of the bourgeois leaders in Africa, Asia and the Middle East who have taken anti-U.S. stands in foreign policy up to a point for their own reasons, they inevitably produce the idea that bourgeois and petty bourgeois leaderships throughout the colonial areas can be thrust onto the revolutionary path, and that coalition governments with them can push them further to the left. The Germain leadership and their SWP cothinkers went out of their way to emphasize their agreement with Pablo in relation to his role in Algeria, at the very time he took a minor position in the capitalist government. Only blind fools can fail to see the connection between this attitude and the reformism of Perera and De Silva in Ceylon.

Furthermore, in relation to their own ruling classes, the centrists have shown the beginning stage of what we see in Ceylon in its final stage. In Europe they have consistently adapted to the Social Democrats and in some cases to the Stalinists, seeking to build "broad left wings" of a centrist variety, not revolutionary left

wings capable of real struggles against the party and trade union bureaucracies. In Britain the Socialist Labor League has shown how it can be done. The revisionists have turned their back on this construction of the revolutionary party. In the U.S., the SWP allies of the Unified Secretariat have shown the same reformist tendencies in their caving in at the time of the Kennedy assassination, their slogan for federal troops to the South to protect(!) the Negro people, and most recently, the call to fire FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover!

### How Centrists 'Struggle'

The responsibility of the revisionists for the Ceylonese betrayal is also shown concretely in the way they "struggled" against the revisionism of Perera. There were plenty of opportunities to wage a sharp struggle, but Messrs. Germain et al. are not interested in this sort of struggle in the least. They slapped the wrists of the LSSP at the time of the 1960 no-contest agreement with the SLFP in the most diplomatic possible manner. In 1963 they supported the call for a United Left Front put forward by the LSSP leadership. They made some subsidiary criticisms over the lack of a clear position on the language question (right of the Tamil minority to the use of its language), and the lack of a clear criticism of the other parties in the front. They avoided making an overall indictment of the entire line of the Perera leadership. They refused to see that the united front was turned into its opposite in the hands of these people. The line of the Ceylonese leadership, it was said, was simply mistaken on a number of points, and moreover, these mistakes were being "progressively corrected." This was actually stated in the last issue of the United Secretariat's Fourth International magazine published prior to the entry into the coalition itself!! The Germain leadership "covered" itself--it saw to it that its position looked relatively "orthodox" and defensible. Meanwhile it compromised with Perera's reformism by prettifying his United Left Front proposal, and by refusing to sharply denounce him on the absurd grounds that this would constitute harsh interference from the international center. At the LSSP Congress in June the representative of the United Secretariat put forward the proposal for a United Left Front government, while the right wing majority advocated coalition, the center a U.L.F.-SLFP coalition, and the left wing independent working class mass action against the government.

Thus the Germain leadership sought to compromise wherever possible on all the basic issues. They showed once again that they are incapable of defending or developing Marxism.

### They Squirm and They Skirt

Yet now the United Secretariat and the SWP seek to disclaim all responsibility for the Ceylon events. They skirt the basic issues by injecting other ones. Both Peng Shu-tse in the Fall issue of the International Socialist

Review and Joseph Hansen in the Winter 1965 issue, seek to squirm out from under the relentless exposure they have been subjected to by resorting to all sorts of name-calling and hysteria. Both Peng Shu-tse and Hansen seek to make much of the supposed difference between the United Secretariat's position for the ULF government, and the position of the center group in the LSSP, for a ULF-SLFP coalition. This is just about their only serious argument. But they neglect to point out exactly how Perera used the ULF slogan as a cover for his reformism, and how they helped him by refusing to struggle against him and by giving the impression that he was "correcting" his mistakes, "progressively" to be sure. They also neglect to defend their own position, or to mention the position of the left wing on the ULF slogan. In July 1963 a LSSP minority resolution stated:

"The workingclass and the broader revolutionary masses of tomorrow must not be led to believe that their salvation lies in putting a so-called "Left Front" into office, but in organizing and uniting for direct mass action against the SLFP government and the other forces of capitalism in Ceylon, on the road to a workers and farmers government."

This correct position is not the one held by the Unified Secretariat. Their position represents, instead of a revolutionary Marxist approach, a bridge to the reformism of Perera and De Silva. This remains the fact, notwithstanding the obvious efforts to squirm out of it.

The shameful centrist record of the Unified Secretariat is rounded out by its refusal thus far to expel the renegades De Silva and Goonewardena, the leaders of the center group who have played such a despicable role, particularly since the coalition government was formed. De Silva himself became the right hand man of Mrs. Bandaranaike. The Revolutionary LSSP has on several occasions demanded the expulsion of De Silva and Goonewardena; thus far they have been ignored.

The Revolutionary LSSP can and must draw conclusions from the entire balance sheet of the Ceylonese events. After a careful examination and discussion of the record from a Marxist point of view, it will see the need for once and for all to break with the revisionism of the Unified Secretariat and join forces with the International Committee of the Fourth International.

SUBSCRIBE to the BULLETIN OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

\_\_\_\_\_ Special Introductory  
Sub - 10 Issues - \$.50

\_\_\_\_\_ Full Year - \$2.00

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....

State.....

Send to: BULLETIN, Box 721,  
Ansonia Sta., NYC 10023  
Make checks payable to:  
Wohlforth