

INTERNATIONAL 15

For Workers Power Self-Management and Socialism

IN THIS ISSUE

**a critique of
the moratorium**

**a brief history
of the a.l.p.
steering committee**

**student movement
Sydney & Warwick**

Ceylon & Cyprus



August 1970

10 cents

INTERNATIONAL

For Workers' Power, Self-Management and Socialism

editorial address: A. McLean, P.O. Box 13, Balmain, N.S.W., Australia 2041

CONTENTS:

No. 5 (new series)

"TACTICS" AND STRATEGY.....	page 1
THE A.L.P. STEERING COMMITTEE.....	6
UNIVERSITY "STRUGGLE" DOCUMENT.....	12
WHAT ARE "THEIR" PLANS? comment on higher education under advanced capitalism.....	15
PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE: REVIEW OF <u>Warwick University</u> L.....	17
Note on CYPRUS.....	21
Note on CEYLON.....	23

*** * * ***** * * *** ** . *****

INTRODUCTION

THIS issue opens with a re-affirmation of our position on the anti-Vietnam War movement which we first stated in 1966. In Australia both factions of the CPA and both factions of the "Germ nist" tendency have always combined to exclude slogans of explicit solidarity with the Vietnamese Revolution as central slogans in the movement against the Vietnam War. These 4 factions at present agree on the proposition that around the slogan of "immediate withdrawal" a revolutionary leadership can be built and an independent, extra-parliamentary, mass movement of a "transitional" nature can be mobilised. Our view of this conception is that it is opportunist, and we counterpose to their opportunism and delusions the necessity of uncompromised and continuing work around slogans of solidarity with the Vietnamese Revolution, within the framework of the Labor Movement and in any manifestation against the War.

FOLLOWING is a closely-related, brief historical survey exposing the betrayals of the so-called "left wing" of the A.L.P. in the last 15 years in the largest state in Australia. This survey also touches on our justification and definition of "entrism sui generis"-a subject treated in much greater detail by a comrade of ours in the next Australian Left Review, the CPA's theoretical journal.

MAKING up the balance of this issue is further elaboration of our ideas on building a movement for student control and self-management against the capitalist university, and notes on Cyprus and Ceylon, where the immediate future of both countries depends very much on the mobilisation of the people.

INTERNATIONAL, or a pamphlet published by us, is now appearing monthly. Subs. are a DOLLAR for 10 issues. Our next publication is a report and analysis of the working class upsurge in Italy in 1969 written by a member of the Left Opposition of the Italian Communist Party and published originally in IL MANIFESTO.

published by the revolutionary marxist group in australia
affiliated to the revolutionary marxist tendency of the fourth international

"TACTICS" AND REVOLUTIONARY STRATEGY ◊

BOTH THE LEADERSHIP WING AND THE STALINIST WING OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY ARE UNITED WITH THE TWO FACTIONS OF RESISTANCE IN OPPOSING SOLIDARITY WITH THE VIET CONG (N.L.F.) AS THE ESSENTIAL AFFIRMATION REVOLUTIONARY MARXISTS MUST CONTEND FOR IN COMMITTEES ORGANISING DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST AUSTRALIAN IMPERIALISM'S INVOLVEMENT, IN SOLIDARITY WITH U.S. IMPERIALISM AND ITS VIETNAMESE PUPPET GOVERNMENT, IN ARMED INTERVENTION AGAINST THE HISTORICALLY PROGRESSIVE VIETNAMESE NATIONAL REVOLUTION.

Of course, all four of these factions will assert that they themselves are in solidarity with the Viet Cong. Why then do they unite to condemn the solidarity affirmation as inappropriate and opt for alternatives not necessarily in tune with "workers of the world, unite!" (Marx).

Marxism is nothing if not revolutionary internationalism. It is axiomatic that the revolutionary vanguard in each country has the duty to identify the contenders in a conflict in any country and to come out in support of the historically progressive side, seeking to develop understanding and support for its attitude, recognition of the extreme seriousness of the criminal activity of its own bourgeoisie (if obviously involved), and inhibitory and even stultifying action to the extent allowed by the level of political consciousness attained in the country.

Nevertheless our four factions unite to instruct the "ultras" of the left that the great exponents of revolution included revolutionary tactics as well as strategy in their curriculum.

The instruction goes like this: Large numbers of the Australian people are prepared to "buy" the proposition that Australia should not be involved in Vietnam, such an attitude being common to people of the most diverse political positions --- chauvinists, pacifists, isolationists, as well as left wingers. Even revolutionary Marxists may be included if this particular kind of involvement (i.e., supporting the wrong side) is meant by the words "Australia should not be involved in Vietnam."

Therefore, they say, first let us build the movement against involvement into a movement of action so weighty as to bring down the government operating the present policy. The alternative government will have to end involvement and thus the Viet Cong will be significantly advantaged in its struggle, and consequently the anti-imperialist revolution.

On the other hand, if there is insistence on "purism", on "solidarity with the Viet Cong" slogans, then massive demonstrative action will not be achieved because the propositions from the vanguard are above the existing level of consciousness of the masses. And for lack of the necessary action the Australian imperialist involvement will continue.

What the four factions do not appreciate is the fact of the already long-standing existence of a labor movement, a working class movement.

Its political level is the resultant of a multiplicity of factors, still predominantly negative, such as the psychology of subservience of a subject class, awareness of the power of the establishment, tradition, the relatively euphoric situation provided by the social status quo, fear of strangers (foreign nationals), the emergence years ago of a pseudo-revolutionary Communist Party (essentially reformist) to stultify all initiatives from the ranks to go beyond reformist policy and perspectives.

The resultant today is a politically backward movement owing allegiance to the Labor Party, which is explicitly anti-revolutionary and parliamentarist. This movement finds the Labor Party leadership adequate and looks to further social advancement through Labor Party victory in parliamentary elections.

Implicit in this relationship is the fact that the movement looks to the Labor Party for guidance and does not accept political directives or urgings from other sources (except in isolated cases where established Labor Party figures have been judged right by the Labor electorate against Party formations.)

Our four factions cannot discern the movement just-as-it-is. For them the real movement, the political level reached by which is one of awaiting and hoping for the electoral victory of their Party, the Labor Party, is a non-fact.

And so they propose to build a movement. As we see, it will have to surpass the real movement and force a change of policy on the bourgeoisie. And where will they get the "bodies" for this mass movement? By transforming the historically-fashioned backward elements of the real movement into the elements of an extra-parliamentary mass action movement, without this rank and file having gone through the experience of disillusionment with parliamentarism.

Such is the stuff of dreams!

Take the Moratorium in Sydney. More than half the demonstrators were students. The students today constitute the radical vanguard, but which has not yet effected a juncture with the real movement.

The unionists in Hyde Park for the demonstration numbered some 3,000, left wingers not representative of the level of the masses.

The balance of the George Street gathering would be largely people of middle class ideology, not tied traditionally to Labor.

Without detracting from the impressiveness of the demonstration it must be recognised that it remained essentially a vanguard manifestation, the big majority of participants in which would not have been deterred had solidarity been the keynote.

As for the mass movement just-as-it-is, the fact is that it does not feel constrained to adopt extra-parliamentary methods of struggle even while probably going along with the Labor Party's declaration that involvement is a mistake (e.g., "In the United States, both sides of political thought have recognised the blunder of involvement" --- Mr. T. Uren, M.P., SMH, 28/7/70) which ought to be rectified without jeopardising Australia's tie with the United States.

Even in Victoria, where the Labor Party has a more left face and the bigger number of demonstrators marshalled attests to its much greater authority for the movement than have other public figures lacking the Labor Party mantle, the emphasis on "no violence" (shamefully exonerating the real practitioners of violence, the bourgeoisie) and withdrawal does not conflict with the line of parliamentarism being represented as the main viable channel for the struggle, and inhibits the spreading of understanding of the critical question, the nature and role of imperialism. (x)

(x) The above is borne out by Dr. Cairns' latest initiatives in regard to the next proposed Moratorium. The identification of the side to be supported is still avoided by the spectacular but distracting proposal to invite representatives of both sides here, including the Indonesian butchers (obviously to continue the endless debate on who is right and who is wrong.) Continuance of the Australian alliance with US imperialism, the super-armed colossus in the van of world reaction, preoccupies the Cairns types -- requiring transforming imperialism's inevitable criminality into unfortunate blundering. Regrettably the above urges the conclusion that Mr. R. McGarvie QC, overstates the leftward position reached by the Victorian Branch of the Labor Party when he says: "The Victorian Branch has forsaken attainment of parliamentary power as its primary objective. Its present role is primarily as a component part of a direct action pressure group." (SMH, 28/7/70) and: "Most of those in the group controlling Victorian Labor display a contempt for the parliamentary process. They show a preference for demonstrations, direct action and the methods of revolutionary change." (Australian, 28/7/70)

(continued foot of next page)

The fact is that the tacticians of our four factions will not succeed in building in the next period (by smart tactics or any tactics) a mass movement or anything else outside of and in contradistinction to the mass movement just-as-it-is (under Labor Party hegemony) and consequently will not be able to introduce the solidarity affirmation at the later stage.

The workers will not abandon their traditional party in advance of convincing evidence of its bankruptcy in the matter of reforms. Continuance of a relatively euphoric conjuncture indicates that further reforms are not necessarily excluded, that the system has not yet quite exhausted its possibilities. This will have a bearing on the time interval before the movement gropes for a new direction. The differentiation among the mass party adherents will come but first they must go through the experience of Labor-in-office.

It is beside the point to claim justification of "withdraw the troops" in place of "solidarity with the Viet Cong" in Lenin's Bolshevik Party's de-facto operation on the basis of transitional demands and Trotsky's later explicit elaboration of same.

Transitional demands are to be included in the bridge it is necessary to help the masses find, in the process of the daily struggle between present demands and the socialist programme of the revolution.

Such transitional demands, according to Trotsky, must stem from today's conditions and from today's consciousness of wide layers of the working class and must inalterably lead to one final conclusion: the conquest of power by the proletariat.

The involvement of Australian imperialism militarily in support of the Vietnamese counter-revolution is not a sine qua non of capitalist rule in Australia and "withdraw the troops" does not qualify as a transitional demand. Its unambiguous anti-capitalist quality is revealed only when it accompanies the affirmation of solidarity with the Viet Cong.

In an exploitative society with class relations exacerbated to the point of civil war and external intervention, the criteria pertinent to a choice of which side is to be supported are not the tight war regime, the bestiality, terror of one side or the other, or the legitimacy of a government in terms of rules established by the class whose rule is now being challenged.

Revolutionary formations may not engage in ambiguities or be content that judgments be made on the basis of values prevailing in a stable, relatively affluent bourgeois democracy, values that lead the

(Footnote continued from previous page): But the Victorian anti-dependence-on-parliamentarism tendencies are not assisted to the necessary unequivocal anti-imperialist position by outside "revolutionaries" combatting the elevation of the solidarity affirmation.

"left" Bryants to come down on the side of the counter-revolution.

Solidarity with the revolution-on-the-march, wherever it appears, under whatever form, is the inescapable duty of revolutionaries, to be exhibited by legal or illegal means, according to the national situation.

Needless to say, where the existing movement imposes central propositions less than adequate in regard to the struggle in being, revolutionaries do not opt out of the movement, but seek to inject their own propositions and to expand the area of awareness of the latter's validity.

What needs to be thoroughly appreciated is that the revolutionary party does not exist to maintain a permanent audience with the masses, no matter what their political level may be, by adaptation to prevailing backwardness.

Rather it must be recognised that revolutionary situations present themselves quite infrequently, that in the meantime the revolutionary Marxist formation must be prepared to swim against the current, and that is cadres are educated to opportunist adaptation to the level of political consciousness of the movement at every moment with the aim of maintaining numerical strength, positions and influence --- they will not be the cadres, nor will theirs be the party capable of a revolutionary leadership role when the revolutionary situation emerges.

N. 29th July, 1970

INTERNATIONAL: A revolutionary socialist magazine for workers' power, self-management and international socialism \$1.00 for 10 issues.....

THE PALESTINIAN REVOLUTION by Michel Pablo.....10 cents

WORLD IN REVOLUTION by Michel Pablo, 20 cents

All orders and subscriptions to:--
A. McLean, P.O., Box 13,
N.S.W. 2041.

Please make cheques, postal orders, etc., payable to A. McLean.

SUBSCRIBE TO INTERNATIONAL

WHILE IT MAY BE AXIOMATIC THAT THE A.L.P. IS REFORMIST AND PARLIAMENTARIST, IT IS ALSO TRUE THAT IT WAS BORN OF A PERIOD OF MAJOR UPSURGE AND THAT IT HAS BEEN OPEN TO A GENUINE RADICAL, MILITANT APPROACH TOWARDS THE SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEMS OF THE WORKINGCLASS. WHAT IT HAS LACKED THROUGHOUT ITS HISTORY IS A FORTHRIGHT, DETERMINED LEFT WING CAPABLE OF PROPOUNDED AND CONSTANTLY PRESSING FOR THE TYPE OF POLICY, PROGRAMME AND ACTION TRANSITIONAL TO A SOCIALIST BEGINNING THAT WOULD DELINEATE AND WELD A PRINCIPLED LEFT WING WITH REALISTIC PERSPECTIVES OF LEADING SIGNIFICANT OR EVEN DECISIVE LABOR MASSES IN PERIODS OF POLITICAL UPSURGE.

A study of the leadership of the "left" wing of the ALP over the last 30 years would undoubtedly reveal a failure to concretise its "leftism" into a systematic theory and programme. It would also show that much of this failure could be attributed to the CPA (with its appropriation of the Bolshevik revolutionary tradition.) by reason of the latter's benighted Stalinist approach to the ALP.

Thus, during the war years, the closest liaison existed between the CPA and the Labor "left" in prosecuting the "war effort", which speaks volumes for the political level of both organisations.

With a Labor Party setting the general level of thinking for the populace, with the CP failing to act as a guiding conscience for the left wing of the labor movement in a socialist direction, there existed a complete lack of socialist thought and action. This, despite a mood in the labor movement for betterment, for militant action, for progressive solutions. Throughout the war period, the leaderships of both organisations ensured that action was dampened down to a "controllable" level.

And immediately after the end of the war, when it was quite evident that a genuine left approach would not be scorned by the labor movement or, in fact, by the people in general, the ALP's Industrial Groups came on the scene with a fine militant flourish (expressed through the programme adopted by the Industrial Group Conference) that would have based the Labor Party on the rank and file in industry. Yet the "left" leadership and the CP, instead of supporting this new development, were found to be in opposition to its development.

The CPA, through its dominance in most of the big unions at the time, adopted a cynical isolationism vis a vis the ALP, expressed through its keeping to a minimum the delegations from its ALP-affiliated unions to Annual Conferences and thereby affiliation fees to the ALP.

The Industrial Groups were, in a very short period, converted from left-tending industrial liaison groups with the ALP, into a benighted

THE A.L.P. || STEERING || COMMITTEE

A HISTORY OF BETRAYAL

.....

but highly organised and dedicated reactionary "party within a party". The boycott by the "left" made them vulnerable to a takeover by Catholic Action.

Through this church-ridden organisation, the ALP became almost completely enshrined in the most abysmal reaction for a period of some eight years, during which the "left" went to ground, rarely, if ever, showing its face even at the annual conferences.

This long black night lasted until Evatt "discovered" that the Party had deteriorated to such an extent that even his bourgeois liberalism was being branded as "communist" and his position as Leader of the Party was in jeopardy.

Late 1954 found Evatt making a bold public stand against the "Groupers", a stand which called into action all the old traditionalists and centrists to oust the new reaction.

At that point, the "left" in the ALP was at such a low ebb that it was left to Dougherty of the AWU and others of his ilk to lead the pro-Evatt, anti-Grouper fight.

Thus, when the Federal Executive first moved into NSW in 1955 and deferred the June Conference until August 1955, those who represented the "rebel unions" and other anti-Groupers on the special Credentials Committee for organising the conference, were J.Ormonde and J.Williams (Builders' Labourers Federation.)

Eventually, some CP-oriented elements filtered into Dougherty's "Steering Committee", and by the time that intervention by the Federal Executive was effected for the second time in 1956, these elements could speak with some authority in anti-Grouper circles. So much so, in fact, that in 1956, when the Federal Executive decided to appoint a caretaker executive until the next conference, these people were able to advise that such an executive should be a "balanced executive": one which retained Grouper representation, right wing representation and a "touch" of "left" representation.

This curate's egg executive was empowered with organising a Party conference in 1957, and was regarded by the "left" as a great victory over the Groupers.

This failure to press for a form of control which would eliminate the reactionaries (which the Federal Executive undoubtedly would have done if pressed to it) was compounded by a worse betrayal at the 1957 conference.

At this conference, the one which was to determine the future course of the Party and which gave the opportunity of clarifying a socialist position, the "left" leaders announced to the delegates assembled, per medium of a roneoed sheet:

"We, of the Steering Committee of the Combined ALP Branches and Unions are compelled to take the course of approaching you in this

manner to explain why there are only two tickets issued at this conference, the official ticket and the yellow sheet of the Groupers.

"While we have recognised the desirability of issuing a ticket which would have been more in keeping with the mood of the rank and file, we also recognise the danger inherent in dividing the general anti-Grouper forces and possibly permitting a Grouper-dominated Executive to control our Party for the next 12 months.

We are firmly of the opinion, however, that the officers of the Party have failed to heed seriously the warning issued by the Federal President of the ALP in Brisbane concerning Groupers, and has refused to recommend to you a complete sweep-out of this insidious anti-Labor element.

"In view of the danger of more Groupers achieving positions on the Executive, we are compelled to support the official ticket rather than split the vote."

What this indicates with regard to the general approach to the conference, can be easily visualised: there was little effort made to declare a left wing position on the many and varied matters which came before the conference. In the event, the right wing had a field day, not only in the elections but essentially in the field of policy-making.

From that time, a "balanced executive" has been the central theme of the "left" leadership. And the imbalance has not only continued to weigh against the "left", but it has continued to become more uneven with each passing year, until the ALP leadership has been able to reintroduce, quite brazenly, the most reactionary Grouper elements into the Party without demur.

The right-wing leadership has not had to be unduly concerned over the "left" leadership who have assisted the right-wing process with their unending examples of what a "balanced executive" should look like and, at the same time, have shown what a "balanced" policy should look like.

When it came to leaning over backwards to "be nice to" the right wing leadership, the "left" performed anatomical impossibilities. Individuals who had been clearly recognised for years as extreme right wing or blatant Groupers, were given a place on the "left" how-to-vote ticket for the annual election of the State Executive of the Party.

In 1958, and for some years after, Mrs. K. Anderson was a darling of the "left" leaders. She repaid this sponsorship eventually by moving the infamous motion on "State Aid" which set the Party on its benighted education course --- and the "left" leaders played no part in opposing her on this subject.

Over the period since 1958, we have witnessed such bright "left"-sponsored stars as ex-Senator J. Fitzgerald, J. Coulthart, J. Southee, R. Phillips, F. Bowen, D. Nilon, K. Miller, E. Wilmot, A. Torkington, L. Ross,

J. Collins, R. Bailey, J. Morris --- all these at one time or another have been preferred to active, solid left-wing nominees such as N. Origlass, J. Sponberg, G. Mill, E. Warren, A. Fox, F. King, R. Gould, D. Holmes.

1970 found R. Davideon (FIA), P. McMahon (MEU), D. Rochfort (APWU), and C. Dolan (ETU) on the "left" ticket.

In a call to the left wing in the NSW Branch of the ALP in 1966, a document presented by the left of the "left", declared:

"Why would the 1966 State Conference, composed mainly of representatives of an ideology embracing 'all the old crap', desert the existing leaders conforming to its own image of Labor, and switch its support to an alternative leadership? In the present context to ask the question is to answer it. There is no reasonable prospect of left wing gains at this Conference, rather one of further left wing decline.

"This urges for the left wing the alternative of approaching the conference as the suitable forum for at last raising the standard of a genuinely socialist-oriented policy, consistent with which every next issue raised will receive a left wing elucidation.

"Certainly this approach is not based upon any illusions about winning this Conference, or any preoccupation with retaining the few left wing Executive seats now held because of right wing tactical considerations. Rather it is directed to the masses outside the Conference...."

In reply, the "left" wing leadership presented 25 subjects on which the left should apply itself at the Conference. The first, in pride of place, was

"Confidence in leadership team (the four Federal Leaders)"

Following this lead to militants, there were proposals for "opposition to the penal clauses", changes in the workers' compensation law, rank and file preselection for Legislative Assembly, price control, rent control, etc. etc...

And a printed leaflet distributed to the Conference opened up with

"Trade Unions Call for United Action for a Federal Labor Victory in 1966" towards which end it pleaded to "Close the Ranks".

Consistently, year in and year out, the "left" leadership has withdrawn from any display of genuine radicalism, or even the norm of militancy that might be expected to emanate from a left wing of the Party. So much so, that from year to year, radical elements have given up, disgusted, disillusioned, disgruntled. Not only that, but, at the same time, the centrists who might have been expected to moved towards the left when it displayed a genuine and bold front, have tended to move in the opposite direction, thus strengthening the right wing.

Further evidence of the abysmal failure of the "left" leadership was witnessed in 1967, when it issued its grandiose "In Defence of Labor" to the Conference which, once more whinnied to "Close the Ranks", and included,

"In recent years while some of the membership of the Central Executive has changed, its composition and nature has not.

"What was once a balanced Executive has now been unbalanced to an alarming degree.

"Last year Executive member J.Heffernan (General Secretary of the Sheet Metal Workers Union) was dropped at the insistence of the extreme right-wing lobbyists.

"This year it has been freely rumoured that the same group, emboldened by its success, is demanding that more heads should roll."

A second leaflet to the 1967 conference bravely trumpeted,

"It is our duty to elect as officers and Executive members those whom we know to be aware of current trends and possess the necessary capabilities to lead Labor to ultimate victory in both State and Federal parliamentary elections."

"Left" wing members on the Central Executive issued a third leaflet to the Conference, pleadingly,

"We ask you not to set the party on an extreme course, but to turn it from the extreme rightwing trend back to the position it occupied during the Curtin-Chifley periods of Government; to the position the party once occupied when led by men like J.A.Ferguson and F.H.Campbell."

1970 witnessed one more abject betrayal in the long descent into limbo of the "left". The how-to-vote ticket presented by the "left" leadership appeared under the following remarkable example of radicalism:

⊙ "Only a Balanced Leadership Can Win Elections.

⊙ "End the Five-Man Junta

⊙ "How to vote for

+ "Tolerance and balance

+ "Genuine Party Unity

+ "A Whitlam Labor Government

+ "Victory in the Coming Senate Elections

+ "Retention of Pre-selection Ballots."

And, in a separate leaflet, entitled "THE CASE FOR A BALANCED LEADERSHIP IN THE AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY N.S.W. BRANCH", the "left"

leadership prattled and whimpered for "tolerance" and "balance", for "harmony, tolerance, understanding and balance". It asserted that the Party "needs respect for all points of view".

Thus, the "left" leadership has progressed not one inch from its position in 1955. Year after year, the approach has remained one of pleading, almost begging, for a few seats on the Executive. And in the process, a complete sell-out on policy-making: a deliberate standing back from any challenge to the backwardness of the right wing. The whole cringing, fawning attitude of the so-called left has achieved nothing more than to deprive the Party of genuine left wing; and thereby has played a major part in isolating the left-tending Victorian Branch in the Federal sphere.

The differentiation in the Labor Party that will really develop after new experience of the inefficacy of parliamentarism is the essential basis for a socialist-oriented development in Australia.

This differentiation will be fruitful to the extent the young revolutionary cadres latch on to the facts of life and integrate now to fashion a revolutionary wing in contradistinction to the essential status quo-ism of the phoney left.

PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE (continued from page 20)

tion can be avoided is by patient preparation over the years, with whenever possible lecture class and departmental and faculty meetings deciding upon demands and actions thus prefiguring a new power structure, with the continual elaboration of an alternative model to the capitalist university, and with continuous ideological contestation in order to shake the mystifications in students' heads about academics. Such a preparation not only prepares for the insurrectional and trans-itional university, but continually limits and superintends the authorities, who act warily in such an environment.

Finally Warwick students sensed the need for outside support. What they were after was a major shift of power and in capitalist society such shifts are not achieved --- "on the debate" --- by convincing arguments put to the Privy Council, though such an illusion was allowed to flourish at Warwick and find its way into this book without criticism. It is most unlikely that the State and bourgeoisie in capitalist society would tolerate a self-managed university and even if they did in special circumstances, then such "a democratic ivory tower" is not desirable by itself. No, the way the student movement will succeed is when the workers begin to imitate and then the job of expropriating the bourgeoisie, smashing the state, and creating self-management will be on.

H. .
1.8.70

.....

Published by A.MxLean, Box 13, P.O., Balmain, 2041.

.....

THE UNIVERSITY

.....

ONE

=====

INTRODUCTION TO A "STRUGGLE DOCUMENT" FROM SYDNEY UNIVERSITY.

=====

(Contributed)

With the failure of the expulsions-boycott, the Sydney University Left is in a vacuum. There are, of course, some groups active, and there is hope for the coming Moratorium as a basis for anti-imperialist work; the term, "vacuum", must, then, be qualified. However, on a broad scale, the work is minimal. There is, too, some pessimism in the vanguard (if it can be called that) on the one hand, and apathy amongst students on the other.

The failure of the boycott has deep implications for the Left on the campus, and has revealed at least two lessons:

- i) that the vanguard is out of touch with the mood and needs of the mass of students
- ii) that "single issue" politics, as such, can only rally a transient student movement, and one with a poor consciousness at that.

The centralisation of the issue and action (front-lawn meetings, the Admin. block occupied) failed to communicate the issue to masses of students, in a physical sense. The issue, by its very nature, was hard to relate to the society and university as a whole, but most of all, hard to relate to the feelings and needs of the students. The attack on the Administration implicitly assumed that power in the university lay within the Admin. (which may ultimately be true) but the power that affects the students in an immediate sense is the power of the departmental staff.

On the basis of these brief observations, the future of the Left would seem to be in de-centralised struggles in the departments, round the felt-needs of students, which hopefully could raise the issue of power to the students; and with conscious cadres, could be related to the general struggle for self-management in the university and in society. The exposure of the bourgeois ideology in the course must be carried on at the same time as the struggle for power.

The following leaflet issued at Sydney Uni. may serve as a crude model of what action committees in the Departments may produce. The future struggle at Sydney University will, as everywhere, depend on whether the Left can analyse the failure and get off its arse.

D.M.
27.7.70

Leaflet:

NOTICE TO ALL PSYCH I STUDENTS

In conjunction with the forthcoming "Day against Repression", several Psychology I students have produced this leaflet to put the case for Psych.I students to take part in this action. The "Day against Repression" is designed to protest the vicious expulsions of two students and to explain to the mass of students the nature of the university as a degree factory serving neo-capitalism and within the very nature of its courses, supporting the "status quo". We call on all students in Psychology to boycott their lectures on next Thursday, for the reasons contained in this leaflet.

.. STRUCTURAL CRITICISM: "Subject yourself to experiment"!

1. Why should students, on pain of failure in exams, be forced to act as guinea pigs in experiments? The fact is, academics use their absolute power to create a cheap supply of labour. They say we need the practical experience.... yet isn't that the function of tutes? In all events, tutes are long, boring "practical" sessions turned into maxi-lectures.

However, the fact behind such coercion is that students do not control their own academic lives, much less are ever consulted about them.

2.....

3.....

4. The intellectual poverty of tutes reflects the course: there are "official" questions to be asked --- no free criticism and questioning (even if we were given this freedom we probably couldn't question, never having been "allowed" this before). Just as in high school, attendance at lectures and tutes is compulsory.... earlier in the year rolls were even marked!

5. Television lectures are the ultimate in the "new", "modern" way of learning. They are also the ultimate in impersonal, unfree, uncritical and unthinking boredom. They represent the type of education the bureaucrats and corporations would like us to have.... a perfect sausage-machine, the "facts" are presented, accepted and four hundred pens take down the rubbish that will get us a meal-ticket in three years.

It is worthwhile to note, when discussing freedom to speak, question and criticise, on this campus, that the main reason that Greenland was expelled (apart from occupying, which hundreds of others did and went uncharged) was that he "incited" others to take direct action in pursuing students demands --- in plain terms FREE SPEECH --- in this university they can't even allow free speech much less action to demand a say in the control of one's life... Many interesting points were raised by the "occupation", another was that our S.R.C. hasn't even got control of student fees (funds). For when the S.R.C. said they would pay Hall and Haydn's court costs, the Vice-Chancellor Williams threatened to cut off all S.R.C. funds... OUR MONEY!

(leaflet (continued))

The expulsions of Hall Greenland and Haydn Thompson should not be seen as isolated events; THE MATRICULATION-WALL round this uni., the resulting exclusion of VICKI LEE, the EXPULSIONS, and now the threat of exclusion of an entire 1st year Economics class by PROF HOGAN are all related events in this IMPERSONAL DEGREE-FACTORY.

CRITIQUE OF MODERN PSYCHOLOGY

1. Academic psychology like most other social sciences, is at present dominated by the related doctrines of positivism (behaviourism) and moral neutrality. Positivism means that psychologists can only concern themselves with measurable, observable quantities. The doctrine of moral neutrality means that academic psychology is value-free, concerned only with the "impartial accumulation of knowledge" --- use of this knowledge for good or evil purposes is held to be unrelated.
2. The true situation of course is that all psychologists (including academics) are continually meeting situations in their work where moral judgments based on speculation about such unobservable quantities as happiness are required. Such quantities cannot be dealt with adequately using positivist methodology.
3. The doctrine of moral neutrality is based on the value-judgment that scientists should concern themselves only with the "accumulation of knowledge". We reject this value-judgment since we believe that all people should and must be concerned with the purpose their work is put to. Work cannot be separated from morality.

4. POWER AND "STATUS QUO"

The university far from being the classical "ivory tower" of V-C Williams' imagination, exists to serve those in power... in our society money-power (thus government serves those with money...the business interests and corporations). Some examples:

In mechanised factory complexes the worker is adapted to his work, rarely the opposite... and if the worker is frustrated and alienated, the fault lies in the worker never in the work. Industrial psychology, using time and motion studies, tries to make the worker into a more perfect machine... the psychologist takes on the values of the capitalist system... to make money, quickly and safely.

One finds psychologists in advertising, in the myriad forms of consumer conditioning --- without thinking of the social function of advertising and consumerism.

In regard to "problem areas", racism, delinquency, violence and frustration, each psychologist seeks his specialised answer... they explain each "problem" with a partial solution without reference to the social totality which causes them. This "objectivity" implies only these partial perspectives in which phenomena are not connected and the rationality of the political and economic system is taken for granted.

(continued next page)

The study of Psychology as with all other social sciences is biased toward support for the status quo. The hypocrisy of objectivity, of non-politicism, and the innocence of study must be exposed. Psychology will find fault in an individual's make-up to account for his rebellion, frustration, alienation and aggression rather than daring to question the economic and political bases of society. The following is an extract from a French leaflet denouncing modern psychology at Nanterre uni. It was written by Daniel Cohn-Bendit who took a leading role in the worker-student struggles in Paris, May 1968:

"Considering... that psychology as such aims at the systematic subordination of individual behaviour to false social norms;

"Considering... that psychology is being increasingly forced into the mould of American psycho-sociology, aimed at perfecting the system by conditioning the workers to consume more and more rubbish while acquiescing in economic exploitation;

"Considering... that psycho-sociology is nothing but a tool to be used to subvert the workers' struggle and justify ideal norms to conceal the discrepancy between the ideal and the real... the UNEF (French NUAUS) calls on students to reject psychology as a reaffirmation of Personal Liberty, the innocence of desire and the forgotten joys of irony, creativity and happiness...."

BOYCOTT LECTURES ---- NO OPPRESSION! ---- NO EXPULSIONS!
 Authorised by Psychology Action Committee -- Box 68 Union, Sydney Uni.

TWO

WHAT ARE "THEIR PLANS" ---- A Comment

NOTHING CAN BE MORE SATISFYING THAN HAVING THE BOURGEOISIE, OR THEIR REPRESENTATIVES, THEMSELVES PROVE THE MARXIST CASE AS TO THEIR INTENTIONS.

We have often argued that capitalism, which is an irrational, authoritarian, anti-human and wasteful society, is threatened by its need to increasingly raise the cultural level of its labour force. This "intellectual", well-educated labour force has the capacity to push bosses and bureaucrats onto the rubbish heap of history and institute self-management of all institutions, at all levels, and in every sphere of society.

In order to contain that threat, universities and other spheres of higher education are geared to "mutilate" and "stunt" intellectual labour, so that people coming out of higher education are passive, quiescent, conformist specialists, not able and not desiring to take their own destinies into their own hands.

The student revolt arises from a student rejection both of this processing in the knowledge factory and the destination towards which students are headed. Students in universities are increasingly raising their intellectual level, have a great deal of free time, access to critical thought and ideas, and can see (thanks to the current struggles of the oppressed) all the crimes and inadequacies of capitalist society. Not astonishingly, students revolt against the authoritarian university in the service of capitalism.

In the short run, the sources of the student revolt can best be attenuated, and institutions of higher education better serve capitalism, if universities become "rationalised" with less critical thought and action prevailing in them, and if "colleges of advanced education" (heavily vocational-oriented outfits without bothersome traditions of criticism) play a bigger role in higher education.

Which all brings us to the point of our enemies proving our point.

In a speech on the night of 15th July, no less a bewigged servant of the bourgeoisie than Mr. Justice le Gay Brereton, Deputy Chancellor of the University of Sydney, not only spilled the beans about how authorities had intensively studied overseas university revolts and their repression, not only caricatured student militants as "advocates of disobedience, dissent and disruption" and "rabble-rousers", but pointed to the source of student discontent and outlined his solutions.

The chief support of your "troublemakers", the good judge diagnosed, was those students without a clear vocational aim in life. Those likely to listen to subversion were those doing humanities courses but unwilling to pick a future career or job, and those forced by quotas into courses they didn't want to do.

It never occurred to Mr. Justice Brereton that this unwillingness and reluctance to become a cog may reflect a deepening discontent with capitalism, with the destination students are headed for. Significant is the movement in the School of Architecture at the University of N.S.W., where students are critical, not just with the rigid set-up, but with courses which fit them only to uncritically reproduce the visually horrendous, polluted, urban environment which stunts and disturbs, rather than encourages, full growth of human beings.

But the Judge's solution to the problem of restless students was most interesting: make courses more vocational and utilitarian, and cut down on humanities. Said the Judge: "We do not seek to silence the educators, we should like to ensure that their words fall on fewer receptive ears."

Next day, an ideas man of the bourgeoisie, in the Sydney Morning Herald, wrote a leading editorial agreeing with Mr. Justice Brereton, strangely admitting that universities did not produce full human beings, and advocating much smaller universities, with more and bigger Colleges of Advanced Education, to "train" the types capitalism would

prefer and which are now undergoing rapid expansion (35,000 enrolments in 1966; 70,000 projected enrolments in 1972).

They are being very explicit and clear about it all.

H.

=====

THREE

PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE

=====

(WARWICK UNIVERSITY LTD. Edited by E.P. Thompson. Penguin. \$1.00.)

Review

The student revolt at Warwick University (near Coventry in England) in February this year was wide and deep. During the week of most feverish activity, two-thirds of the students at this small university would attend mass meetings which were often held twice a day, at what, for Australian students, are improbable times (10.30 a.m. and 5.00 p.m.), and would last for up to five hours. Rather than entrust decisions to the established, normal student bureaucrats, this mass upsurge elected its own executive: a Committee of Seven

The students attempted to roll-back the capitalist university, and even prefigured and projected the self-managed, open, critical university. The story is fully told by the contributors to this book who were amongst the leaders of the revolt.

The origins of this student revolt went back to 1967, when students first demanded a common staff-student social amenities block under democratic management. This had been omitted in the plans of this new university, but the authorities deigned "to consider" the demand. After three years of such "consideration" via innumerable study groups, liaison committees, working parties, joint inquiries and all the other paraphernalia of liberal England, after three years of having their demands ignored, sidetracked and eventually over-ruled, the students decided to occupy.

Some hours after they had occupied the Administration building, quite by accident of one student's curiosity, and despite the authorities' rushed removal of literally boxes of files prior to the occupation, the first of a number of "political" files was discovered.

What was discovered in the next 48 hours, plus what was already known, exposed the "business" university. Warwick was governed directly by really big business men and was subservient in an advanced way, to the demands of industrial capitalism. The Vice-Chancellor, the day-to-day boss, was both architect and enthusiastic collaborator in this scheme of things. According to the report of a 1966 Government inquiry, the Warwick Vice-Chancellor testified that "the University was determined to produce graduates in engineering, physics and so forth, who were well-adjusted to enter industry". Not only "well-adjusted" technologists were to be produced but managerial servants and labour manipu-

lators as well. Warwick had an incredibly well-endowed "school of 'Industrial Business Studies'; as this book puts it:

"the Institute of Directors' Professor of Business Studies, the Pressed Steel Professor of Industrial Relations, the Barclays Bank Professor of Management Information Systems, and the Clarkson Professor of Marketing, were brought together in a single Jumbo Pact as the School of Industrial and Business Studies." (p74)

Later a Professor of Business Finance was added and the school offered a degree in "Management Science". This school was lavishly endowed:

"The Pressed Steel Professor of Industrial Relations, coming to Warwick from the Prices and Incomes Board and the Donovan Commission (on 'trade union form')... landed the greatest catch of all: \$250,000 from the Ford Foundation; £100,000 from the Leverhulme Trust; and £200,000 from the (public) Social Science Research Council (an unprecedented sum from this source." (p.76)

The whole Administration was run like a "managerial operation", with the Vice-Chancellor commissioning "reputable" industrial consultants at the end of 1967 to propose "streamlining" of the whole set-up.

In accord with the dominant orientation of this university, the "liberal residue" came under surveillance and restriction. The files revealed, for instance, that Gilbert Hunt (Managing Director of ROOTES Motor Car Manufacturers and a member of the University Council) had sent his chief legal officer, security officer, and a short-hand note-taker to a Labour Party meeting addressed by a visiting U.S. radical academic staying at Warwick for a year; also revealed was the Vice Chancellor's personal barring from enrolment of a high school militant whose headmaster had reported his political activities to the V.C. A year earlier, during a one-day strike in solidarity with the locked out London School of Economics students, the authorities had circulated a memo to staff asking for the names of absent students and to departmental heads asking for reports on certain named individuals.

In its direct control by businessmen, in its subservience to industrial capitalism, in the emphasis of its curriculum, in its manner of operation, Warwick was a more conspicuous and deliberate "servant of capitalism" than is usual for universities in the Anglo-Saxon world outside the United States. Though note the Vice Chancellor's plans of subordinating this new university to the demands of capitalist industry were approved of and paid for at every step by the Government, and it is not just at university level but at the level of the State where capitalist education priorities are pushed. As this book puts it:

"In the conflict it became apparent that what was wrong was not a close relationship with 'industry' but a particular kind of subordinate relationship with industrial capitalism --- with an industrial capitalism, moreover, which exerts its influence not

only directly in the councils of the University but also within the educational organs of the State, and which, from both directions, is demanding, for its better service, an approved educational product." (pp. 17-18)

The tendency to 'rationalise' higher education into more efficient and direct service of advanced capitalism is apparent in all advanced capitalist countries; Warwick was²⁴ advanced prototype.

In response to this reality, the students demanded in addition to their original demand: the destruction and end of political files and surveillance, no victimisation, a public inquiry (according to the etiquette of English liberal politics this was an elliptic formulation which in effect would have meant --- in the event of an inquiry taking place --- the Vice Chancellor's resignation "as a gentleman" whose honour had been called into question), and finally, a new university charter providing for democratic self-government but with adequate representation for, and links with, the whole Coventry community.

Warwick students went beyond their partial, defensive demands to the full demand, went beyond aiming to roll-back the capitalist university, to aiming for its replacement. Clearly the authoritarianism and political files were only symptoms of the capitalist university, and even if they were corrected now, there was no guarantee there would not be a recurrence of these symptoms or others, and besides the reality of the capitalist university was obnoxious and cried out for abolition. As one of the contributors to this book puts it:

"Students began to realise these (political files, etc.) were not the real issues at all, but were merely symptoms. What was wrong was the whole concept and structure of the University. The ideals of academic excellence had to be reasserted over the aims of the 'Business University'. With this end in mind, the students began campaigning for a change in the structure of the Council; the oligarchic rule of the Midland industrialists would have to be ended." (p.59)

But while the logical link between the struggle for partial demands and the struggle for a full demand was grasped, the concrete link between the two struggles was not. The concrete dialectical unity between the two struggles was ignored and neglected. Warwick militants (including the contributors to this book) artificially separated the two struggles.

In any revolt for partial demands the university within the university is prefigured in a more or less embryonic way. In a situation of crisis in any institution, the majority takes its decisions in the framework of mass, direct, participatory democracy and moves to enforce its decisions, while the minority within and via its established structures and arrangements re-affirms and clings to its authority. It is the task of revolutionary socialists to develop, strengthen the power of, and deepen the confidence of 'the new power' so that it may triumph in the contest.

The Warwick militants chose to ignore this reality and this task, and instead proposed to move from the struggle for "partial" demands to the struggle for a "full" demand in a utopian manner, ignoring the embryonic alternative to the capitalist university which was emerging, and instead constructing the goal of the second struggle "out of the air". And so we are told:

"They set to work on a new democratic charter for the University, to be submitted to the Privy Council". (p.59)

And part 4 of the central motion carried by the main student meeting read:

"This meeting proposes that the students of the University intend to start a peaceful and orderly nationwide campaign to persuade the Privy Council to allow the majority membership of the University Council to consist of democratically elected staff and student representatives, and that the lay membership of the Council should represent the whole community."

And on March 5 they lobbied Parliament.

And yet on pages 52-3 we are told this happened --- the mark of a real revolt:

"News from the occupied Registry spread throughout the University the following morning. A crowd gathered in the Airport Lounge at lunchtime. The President was angry --- he had given his word... and it had been broken. The students from the Registry were also angry, because, despite the revelations, there were still many who did not feel that breaking into the files was fully justified. In the middle of the discussion, a girl rushed into the "Airport Lounge": "The French Department (so apt - Ed.) has come out on strike over the political files issue." The effect of this announcement was electrifying; the meeting broke up, people rushed down to the teaching block to convene departmental meetings. This was without precedent; never before had members of the University gathered into departments to discuss matters... The atmosphere in these joint staff-student meetings was intense; motions were passed calling on the University to destroy its political files... some even called on Butterworth to resign. News of these meetings spread rapidly across the campus, and was phoned through to the students in the Registry: the University was seething."

So much for "symmetrical" charters and "open-minded" Privy Councilors. Dual power was being created, the students and staff were creating their own unofficial, new democratic organs of power expressing their will. E.P.Thompson complains of being attacked for struggling around partial, defensive demands, but the real charge is the neglect by him and his comrades to develop this new possibility for self-management.

It is true that the authorities temporarily "recognised" these new organs and hoped (with some success) that they would be dominated by conformist, cautious, gutless staff members. The only way that domina-

(continued on page 11)

CYPRUS CORRESPONDENCE —

Today Cyprus has become the stake in an important struggle, one of the pawns which could advance American imperialism, confronting the growing influence of the U.S.S.R. in the Middle East and the radicalisation of the masses operating there, involving the political and social equilibrium of the region.

The U.S.A. objective is to make Cyprus the basic pivot of all its Mediterranean dispositions. Already numerous military installations have been put in place: a "Voice of America" transmitting station, highly perfected listening installations, a radar network, from which the Israelis have already benefited during the war of June 1967. This interest in Cyprus can be understood from the privileged geographical position of the island.

The plan of U.S. imperialism is of a double re-connection of the Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots now co-existing in the Greece of the colonels and in Turkey, both members of N.A.T.O.

The recent attempt at assassination of Prime Minister Makarios testifies to the fierceness displayed to dispel by any means the obstacles to realisation of this project: time presses. In fact Makarios refuses to agree to a division of the island. To accept it would be his political death.

A plan to overthrow the regime and its replacement by a new team directed by Kliridros, leader of the Unified National Party of the right, president of the Chamber, has thus been elaborated. It presumed the assassination of Makarios and, followed a well-established scenario of imputing responsibility for this to the left in order to physically eliminate all its leaders and cadres and justify an increased presence of U.S. troops.

Makarios Hesitates

The first stage of the plan miscarried, but the threat subsists more than ever. The present climate bears witness to this. A counter-stroke is necessary.

Will the trials in preparation be the occasion for this? Numerous members of the action groups have been arrested, and above all the names of functionaries of the American ambassador directly involved are known but it is hardly probable that the true instigator, the one responsible, will be denounced before the masses --- American imperialism. That would be contrary to Makarios' policy, who refuses to give the masses arms for their defence.

Already, profiting from the breathing-space, all those who could have made revelations are disappearing. Georgakis, former Minister for the Interior and co-leader of the Unified National Party, is only the first of a list of assassinations and "suicides" that keeps extending. All who have been in contact with members of the C.I.A. have become embarrassing witnesses: the role of the C.I.A., the affair of the

West German training camp where the Greek Cypriot killers were trained must not be disclosed.

And Makarios not only refuses to arm the masses but he has just asked in a declaration that all who possess arms hand them in, which is equivalent above all to disarming the left and his own partisans, because what difficulty would the forces of the right have in procuring them from the Greek colonels or the C.I.A.? He also refuses to recognise the rights of a national minority to the Turkish Cypriot minority (about 18% of the 600,000 Cypriots), laying himself open to the manoeuvres of the Americans. Playing on the diplomatic cover the U.S.S.R. procures for him, anxious to avoid an increased presence of the U.S. army in the Mediterranean basin, Makarios has refused, however, the arms offered as well as the opening of the ports to the Russian fleet. He strives to play between the very hypothetical dissensions between the Greek colonels, thus playing into the hands of the Americans.

The Cypriot Communist Party (A.K.E.L.) calls today for national union, including with the Unified National Party of Kliridis ... As its general secretary declared recently, "it should not be a question of playing one part of the right against another, the situation, in face of external threat, imposes a united front..." The A.K.E.L. has been for a long time completely aligned with Makarios although it leads the unions and gathers the votes of close to a quarter of the electoral body.

The other formation of the left, the E.D.E.K., the nature of which is more complex, of social-democratic origin, but the programme of which on several points is placed to the left of the A.K.E.L., also refuses to denounce the C.I.A. in clear terms, and also practices a policy of alignment, in deeds if not in declarations, with the policy of Makarios.

In these dramatic conditions, it is urgent that the revolutionaries be fully acquainted with the situation in Cyprus and bring all their support to those who are already fighting in Cyprus against the new offensive in preparation. It is that for the want of being mobilised, the masses, who already are turning away from Makarios, can sink down into discouragement. The approaching presidential elections will allow the decline of his prestige to be better evaluated.

--- Nicosia, 3 June 1970

The parliamentary elections reported (S.M.H. 18/7/70):-

Unified National Party (Kliridis).....	15 seats
A.K.E.L. (Communist).....	9 "
Progressive Front (A.K.E.L.?).....	7 "
United Democratic Centre (Dr. Lyssarides).....	2 "
Independents.....	2 "
Plus Turkish Cypriots	TOTAL 35 seats
	15 seats.

FOR WORKERS' AND PEASANTS' POWER

The United Front recently won a striking electoral victory, securing 115 seats in parliament out of 150. But, for the Ceylonese extreme left, the L.S.S.P. (R.) and for a number of revolutionaries throughout the world, this victory is without interest, the S.L.F.P.-L.S.S.P.-C.P government being a Popular Front government, thus bourgeois, thus to be combatted.

Ultra-Leftism, Accomplice of Reaction

Already in 1964 it was thanks to the two L.S.S.P. (R.) deputies, Bala Tampoe and Edmond Samarakkody, that Madame Bandaranaike's government supported by the L.S.S.P. fell following a no-confidence vote proposed by the pro-imperialist right of the U.N.P. which was opposed to the nationalisation of the reactionary press. The ultra-leftists of the L.S.S.P.(R.) mingled their votes with the U.N.P.'s and the government was overthrown by 74 votes to 73.

Once again today, the situation recurs, but with the addition of a spontaneous mobilisation of the masses, which, as the electoral results indicated, are attacking the pro-imperialist institutions. Besides, the coalition government has a more worked-out programme than in 1964 admitting of nationalisations including those of the banks and of the press, speaking of some control over the plantations. For our Ceylonese "leftists", the application of such a programme "can only be contrary to the interests of the masses"(1). Does that mean to say that the L.S.S.P.(R) will vote again against nationalisation of the reactionary press? Fortunately the masses have refused to re-elect as deputies both Samarakkody and Tampoe.

Class Nature of the S.L.F.P.

But exactly what is the class nature of this coalition, with regard to Bandaranaike's S.L.F.P.? To understand it one must put aside European schemas of social stratification. If in 1956 the S.L.F.P. in the final analysis served the class interests of the whole small and rising national bourgeoisie, very quickly it lost the support of this social layer which, frightened by the power of the workers' movement and the dynamics of the measures proposed by Madame Bandaranaike, formed a coalition with the comprador and pro-imperialist bourgeoisie represented by the U.N.P. In a way, since 1964, the alliance of the S.L.F.P. and the L.S.S.P. was the coalition of a workers' organisation with, not the national bourgeoisie, but its shadow!

At the base of the S.L.F.P. there has been a differentiation: a big part of the Buddhist clergy rejoined the U.N.P.; the majority of the doctors also; on the other hand the village teachers remain attached

(1) Manifesto of the L.S.S.P.(R) published just before the elections.

to the S.L.F.P. Thus one can speak of a radicalisation of this base, and in this sense understand the U.N.P. attacks against the village teachers "contaminated by Marxism".

There is also a differentiation at a higher level. A left wing has appeared reflecting the radicalisation of the base. On the other hand the right wing that reflected the shadow of the ridiculous national bourgeoisie adhered to the U.N.P. from 1964. As to Madame Bandaranaike, she played a Bonapartist role between these two wings of her party.

For an Independent Mobilisation of the Masses

Again today the whole bourgeois right is regrouped against the coalition, the nature of which is far from being bourgeois in the sense the Popular Front in France was bourgeois, the Radical Party being really the party of Big Capital. What is certain now is that the L.S.S.P. cannot be contented with this coalition, but must mobilise the masses for the real application of the programme of the coalition, to prevent reaction resuming the offensive. It is only this extra-parliamentary mobilisation --- and not a simple parliamentarist practice of the coalition nor a simple denunciation of the S.L.F.P.-L.S.S.P.-C.P. government and the abstract appeal to the struggle for the revolution --- that can permit the masses of Ceylon to orientate towards establishment of a genuine workers' and peasants' power.:

The Main Parties

- U.N.P. (United National Party) of Dudley Senanayake: party of the comprador and pro-imperialist bourgeoisie. Since 1964-1965 polarised all the reactionary forces of the island.
- S.L.F.P. (Sri Lanka Freedom Party) of Bandaranaike.
- L.S.S.P. (Lanka Sama Samaja Party) of Dr. Perera, Leslie Gunawardene, Colvin R. de Silva: majority workers' party of the island, up to 1964 affiliated to the 4th International. In fact a left-centrist party claiming adherence to Trotskyism and torn between an opportunist right-wing with Perera and a left-wing represented above all by the L.S.S.P. youth.
- L.S.S.P.(Revolutionary): founded in June 1964 by Bala Tampoe and Edmond Samarakkody which denies L.S.S.P. support to the S.L.F.P. Since then Samarakkody has formed his own organisation tied to the Healy-Lambert group. As to Tampoe, if he is known as a union leader by his union, the Ceylon Mercantile Union (functionaries) on the basis of his attitude during and after the second world war, it is obvious his sectarian political line was not approved by these same unionists who voted for the coalition.
- The two C.P.'s: the pro-Soviet forms part of the coalition, the pro-Chinese supports it.
- Federal Party and Tamil Congress; ethnic parties of the Tamil minority forming the bulk of the plantation workers. Classically support the right. The leader, Thoudeman, is tied to the Americans and is himself a big plantation proprietor.