

UNEMPLOYMENT!

Officially, nine percent of the workforce are recognised as unemployed. Of course these figures as collected by the Australian Bureau of Statistics do not give the complete picture. If the government used data collected from the C.E.S. the recognised number would be much higher. And of course there are hundreds of thousands who are deprived of recognition because of their limited definition of what it means to be unemployed. Many have not registered with Social Security. Some are on some other form of Benefit. The figures have been reduced by forcing many long term unemployed to do Newstart training schemes. Many migrants, including so-called illegals are not eligible for the dole and therefore not counted. However the situation is now so drastic that it can't be covered over with statistical rigging or bureaucratic measures. One in eight workers in this country expects to lose his or her job. Youth unemployment is now estimated to be about twenty two percent.

Over the past six months thousands have been made redundant. QANTAS has announced that 5,000 staff are to be retrenched. BHP has announced that 3,500 are to go. Of these 1,500 are to be retrenched from their Newcastle plant. There is no alternative work available in Newcastle. The Northern Territory Government is sacking 1,500 employees. Carrington Slipways Newcastle, is closing, laying off 1,000 workers. And on top of this the Victorian Chamber of Manufactures is demanding the Victorian Government sack 13,000 public servant to serve the cause of economic rationalisation.

These are the dramatic headlines. However, equally significant is the systematic losses throughout the workforce. In a year to February 52,000 jobs have been lost in manufacturing (sixty percent since November) 11,000 textile workers have lost their jobs, 46,000 jobs lost in construction, 22,000 in financial and property and 3,000 lost in mining. The representatives of the ruling class admit that even with "economic efficiency" many of the jobs will never come back. That is of course as long as there is capitalism.

Neither the ruling class nor the Hawke government nor the trade union bureaucracy have any answers to this. During March the Hawke government made an important statement. It announced a major reduction in tariffs to manufacturers in this country. Well tariffs and protection are reactionary. In no way can they be defended. Manufacturing developed in this country after the Second World War under the umbrella of tariffs and protection. Protection has maintained manufacturing, in a state of backwardness, undercapitalised and poorly equipped. To call for a defense of tariffs means defending jobs in Australia at the expense of workers in Asia and internationally. There is only one weapon is to fight back -- working class direct action. This includes factory occupations. **EXPROPRIATE THE BOSSES:** Begging to the government to give the bosses more money can only divert us from relying on our own strength. The Hawke government has no answers for the thousands of workers who face the sack. Revolutionaries have an answer—organise to fight the system. The union bureaucrats will no doubt beg to the government to give the bosses money and will do nothing while thousands of jobs go down the drain.

Communist leadership of the union movement is needed urgently. The more we remain "responsible" to Australian economy, the more license we give to the bosses to drive our wages and conditions down to austerity level.

The bureaucrats are also calling for a reduction in the migrant intake. This blames fellow workers. This legitimizes state repression against the migrant community when police search for "illegals". The working class has no country!! It makes no difference whether you are unemployed in England, Asia or Australia. Yet the system wants to restrict our movement from one country to another. In this way they keep workers loyal to the system and let the bosses off the hook. We must reject all immigration controls.

The call for a reduced migrant intake is a serious reactionary diversion from the fight for jobs. Social Security has just announced that more attention will be paid to test Zealanders to see that their documents are in order. The aim is, of course to remove more from the dole and save the government money.

The dole is an insult, a pittance. Yet the government aims to deprive thousands of working class people of even this meager substance. Last election, both parties, Liberal and Labor were in market competition to show who could attack the dole most efficiently. Eventually there was bipartisan agreement that long term unemployed should be cut off. There was no vocal opposition from the left. The New Left warned of the attacks of the Liberals "forgetting" about the attacks from Labor. Selling out does not lead off the ruling class offensive. On the contrary! It paves the way for the ruling class offensive to go deeper. The experience of New Zealand with Labour's Rogernomics paving the way for the Nationals shows the consequence of weak kneed capitulation. With the massive increase in unemployment Labor has been forced to mitigate its attacks a little. The six week waiting period has been declared to cause hardship. However Labor is still committed to attack. The notorious Dole Squads are still in operation. These officers harass the unemployed. They pry on them to see that they are not living in de facto relationships. They enforce a "work Test" to make the unemployed look for jobs that simply are not there. The unemployed are blamed for their poverty caused by the capitalist system.

The current outburst of unemployment exposes the Hawke government. Last October Paul Keating denied that a 1982 style recession is on the agenda. Well now we have unemployment officially past the 1982 mark. And more is to come. Totally exposed is the Accord strategy for recovery. The Hawke government appeared to show progress for a while. But many of the jobs were

makeshift temporary jobs. The unemployed forced to work at rates well below those of the award

It is vital that the unemployed be organised. The unemployed not only have power but can play a vanguard role in class struggle. Unemployed militancy and anger can be a spark which can spread like wildfire throughout the working class. However it must be linked to a revolutionary perspective. They must link their struggles to the rest of the working class through a revolutionary programme. The unemployed need a union to fight back like any union does against day to day attacks. Communist Tendency is committed to building a principled union with all unemployed committed to fighting back. However an unemployed union no matter how militant can only treat the symptoms and not cure the disease. For this we need a party which unites employed and unemployed around a revolutionary programme

**FOR OCCUPATIONS TO DEFEND EVERY JOB! BUILD FACTORY COMMITTEES!
SPREAD THE OCCUPATIONS! EXPROPRIATE THE RULING CLASS! FOR A SLIDING SCALE OF HOURS AND WAGES!
INTERNATIONAL UNITY TO FIGHT LAYOFFS EVERYWHERE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS AND SMALL
FARMERS GOVERNMENT NOT A PARLIAMENTARY BOSSES GOVERNMENT SMASH ALL IMMIGRATION
CONTROLS! NO TO TARIFFS AND PROTECTION!
BREAK WITH THE LABOR PARTY FOR A REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY!**

KURDISTAN

The whole world now claims to care for the Kurdish people. The U.S. justified its intervention against Iraq on the grounds that a brutal regime had to be stopped. The U.S. won the war and the kingdom of Kuwait is independent again. However the anger of Saddam Hussein is now being metered out on the Kurdish people. Understandably the Kurds took advantage of the weakening of the Hussein regime to push forward their claims for nationhood. The Iraqi army was, however, beaten but not smashed. The Kurds were met with brutal armed repression. Throughout the world there are calls for a U.N. protected zone for the Kurds in Iraq. For many the fact that U.S. intervened to defend Kuwait and not defend the Kurds exposes its hypocrisy. Yes it is hypocritical on this score. The problem is how these critics want to resolve this hypocrisy. They argue that the problem is that the U.S. does not intervene enough. This is an extremely dangerous conclusion IMPERIALISM NEVER INTERVENES IN THE INTEREST OF OPPRESSED PEOPLE EVER

The brutalisation of the Kurds is in fact a product of imperialism. It was the imperialists who drew up the borders in that region - depriving the Kurds of their right to a country. There are about thirty million Kurds who live in four countries - Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Lebanon. The largest number live in Turkey (about 13 million). In none of these countries are their national rights recognised. In Turkey they are known as "mountain Turks" by the Orak regime. Their villages have been blown up by the Turkish Airforce. They have been brutalised by the "Islamic republic" of Ayatollah Khomeini in Iran, as well as of course by the Baathist regime in Iraq led by Hussein. The imperialists are well aware of this. Two years ago the imperialists gave Iraq military aid whilst the Kurds were being gassed. Iraq was fighting Iran and was objectively helping them. The Imperialists are well aware of the repression by the Ozal regime also. But Turkey is a member of NATO and "security" (right to plunder) comes before Kurdish national rights. Even if the imperialists did intervene ostensibly in aid of the Kurds they would use their occupation to facilitate the plunder of the Middle East. The United Nations must be opposed also. It is only an agency of imperialism in a disguised form. It is only the working class internationally who can defend the Kurds and liberate the Middle East from imperialist plunder and local despots such as Hussein

NEW ZEALAND. SMASH THE EMPLOYMENT CONTRACTS BILL

During April, hundreds of thousands of New Zealand workers hit the street in Days of Protest against the Employment Contracts Bill. This Bill is the National Party Government's latest move to smash legal trade unionism in New Zealand. Rallies have been organised by the Council of Trade Unions. At the Auckland rally C.T.U. vice president Angela Foulkes described the Bill as the "most obnoxious legislation introduced anywhere in the world" New Zealand unionists are well aware of the mortal threat to unionism that the Bill poses. The question is what to do about it. Yet all the C.T.U. wants to do is protest. They rejected resolutions calling for a general strike coming from many unionists including the Seaman's Union. Just like their Australian counterpart the C.T.U. is the grave yard of industrial disputes. The Bill is part and parcel of a ruling class offensive. It is Labour through their right wing "Rogernomics" policies began the systematic dismantlement of the New Zealand welfare state costing thousands of jobs as well as the dramatic attack on basic services such as schooling, health and welfare. The C.T.U. had no answer to these massive attacks. It showed its utter weakness. Now the Nationals are not only continuing the spending cuts that Labour began, they are

attacking trade unionism as well. As Labour paved the way for the Nationals offensive, Workers can not rely on Labour to defend unions. Rank and file unionists are faced with the fact that the C T U will not organise effective action to smash the Bill. If a general strike was to be held its purpose would be to demobilise action and contain struggle. Therefore the working class must organise independently through rank and file committees. A political attack requires a political response. We need to not only fight the Act but the National Government as well. We need a revolutionary communist party to fight not for an alternative parliamentary government but for a workers and farmers government.

REVOLUTION IN PERU

Modern Peru's socio-economic climate which has fostered strikes, demonstrations, pickets and guerillaism. The upsurge in militancy of the Peruvian masses, combined with acute political and social crisis has posed a fundamentally important question:

Which way forward? Guerillaism versus permanent revolution

Guerilla movements have always played an active part in the volatile political landscape of Latin America. In Peru, Sendero Luminoso (Shining Path) guerillas have captured world attention in a conflict which emerged in the early '80's. Sendero Luminoso or the Partido Comunista Del Peru (Communist Party of Peru) are linked to the Maoist, Revolutionary Internationalist Movement and have spawned various solidarity committees around the world. In New Zealand they are supported by the Peruvian Liberation Support Committee.

Background

The '70's and the '80's have witnessed the emergence all over Latin America of guerilla movements. From the FMLN in El Salvador to M-19 in Columbia and the Montoneros (MPM) in Argentina, guerilla groups are active in most countries, some with several. The explosion of guerilla groups can be traced back to the '50's and '60's, and are descended from two particular strains. Leading the field were the Castroites and guerilla supreme, Che Guevara who was murdered in a Bolivian jungle by a CIA counter-insurgency unit. The Castroites successfully took state power in Cuba in 1959, inspiring a succession of like movements in Central and South America.

The other leading variety of guerillaism was developed by Mao Tse Tung in response to China's specific conditions in the 30's and '40's. Mao advocated a peasant based "peoples' war" which would "surround the cities with the countryside". Both traditions have as their strategic goal the development of guerilla warfare. Sendero Luminoso embrace the Maoist strategy.

The political landscape of Latin America, with its series of brutal military dictatorships and imperialist stooge rulers, combined with social and economic crises, have provided fertile soil for the growth of guerilla movements. Historically the continent has been a plundering ground for Spanish, Portuguese, British, French and American imperialism. Peru is no exception.

History of Peru

Peru has been exploited by foreign powers since the arrival of the Spanish in the 14th century. More recently this century it has been pulled into orbit of the powerful US economy. US imperialism has exercised hegemony and domination over much of the continent from early this century. Economically nearly all of Peru's infrastructure - of, mines, railroads, electricity and water - was predominantly U.S. owned.

Because of the reliance of Peru and much of the continent on relatively few primary products, the development of each economy was inconsistent and unstable. When the relative prices of primary products compared to the costs of capital goods fell in the '70's, these countries were obliged to import capital goods to foster development. Eventually a massive balance of payments crisis occurred and Peru like much of Latin America was forced to turn to the imperialist banks. The massive loan schemes and debt repayments were burdened on the working class and ruling peasantry, who spontaneously resisted, causing political and social upheavals.

In response to social crisis, the Latin American bourgeoisie, backed by the U.S., was more than going to install military and Bonapartist dictatorships to crush resistance and enforce stabilisation. Neither the Peruvian bourgeoisie or its military strongmen, no matter how bold their anti-imperialist rhetoric has been able to break Peru free from U.S. domination. Today, the Peruvian economy is in deep crisis, Peru's foreign debt to the imperialist banks is one of the highest in the world and maintains Peru as a subordinate semi-colony. The recent election of Fujimori who claimed to represent the poor has not changed the chronic position of the workers, unemployed and peasantry. On the contrary, it is likely to worsen, as Fujimori has committed himself to the implementation of extreme IMF austerity measures to win the favour of imperialism.

It is this historical context and socio-economic climate which has fostered strikes, demonstrations, pickets and guerillaism. The upsurge in militancy of the Peruvian masses, combined with acute political and social crisis has posed a fundamentally important question. Which way forward for the revolution in Peru?

Sendero and the Peasantry

The founding core of Sendero Luminoso was a group of lecturers at the provincial University of Ayacucho. Led by 'Comrade President Gonzales', Sendero split from another Maoist group, the *Bandera Roja* (Red Flag) in 1971, their professed ideology originating from 'Marxist-Leninist-Maoist-Gonzalez' thought.

Sendero are concentrated in the remote mountains of Peru, and are based primarily on the peasantry of these areas. They seem to have their greatest success amongst the unorganised largely illiterate and oppressed villages in these regions. Estimates of their size vary from 2,000 to 10,000, however they claim to be in control of one third of Peru.

Sendero's manifesto outlines their strategy for guerilla war: 'Ours is a peasant war, led by our party, *which is* converting the countryside into an armed bastion of the revolution.

True to Maoist orthodoxy, Sendero glorify the peasantry, handing them the historic role of leaders of the revolution. What the leadership of Sendero think, the difference between China in the '40's and Peru in the nineties are practically non-existent. In China 90% of the population lived in the countryside, in Peru today it is only 35% the peasantry are an important ally of the proletariat they are no substitute for it.

The peasantry of Peru are an atomised mass of subsistence farmers or petty commodity producers. They do not possess the collective strength or organisation nor the independent class interests of the working class. There is no separate peasant mode of production outside the capitalist mode within which the peasant occupies an historic role. They do not have the same material interest in abolishing capitalism, therefore, cannot lead the social revolution in smashing it. The thirst for land drives the Peruvian peasantry into struggle against oppressive feudal type landlordism. However, when land reform occurs or when landlordism is smashed, the role of the peasantry as a revolutionary force will be exhausted.

Only the working class has the real interest to defeat capitalism and carry the struggle through to socialism. This does not mean that the peasantry are not oppressed by capitalism and have no interest in its destruction and are therefore only passive observers. On the contrary they are an important ally of the proletariat, such an alliance however, must be led by the working class. The Peruvian proletariat must place itself at the fore of the stormy agrarian question, and fight next to the peasant for land to those who work it, for peasant communities and militias and the formation of co-operatives. Only this struggle will win the peasantry to the side of the working class, in the fight for a workers' and peasants' government and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Any revolutionary movement must be based on the working class, not the peasantry.

Guerillaism vs Workers' Revolution

Although Sendero claims to be forging an alliance with the working class, their strategy of guerilla war stands in sharp contradiction to any such alliance. Guerillaism, unlike marxism, does not recognise the necessity of a workers party and workers councils to workers' insurrection.

Objectively the Peruvian working class has proven time and again its readiness to fight. What is lacking is the subjective intervention of a revolutionary party to give direction to the struggle. Behind the ultra-left posturing of Sendero is a tremendous lack of confidence in the masses.

Sendero's strategy downgrades economic and political struggle in favour of episodic and often desunary military action. Sendero is committed to isolated acts of destruction and terror tactics: they openly admit to bombing factories, shooting bosses and destroying infrastructure. Such actions are a mere hindrance to capitalism and do not threaten its existence, its effect on the working class such as unemployment, intensified exploitation and lack of vital resources can be worse.

Against Marx's dictum that the emancipation of the workers can only be carried out by themselves, Sendero claim that liberation will be the act of external saviours, that is, them. By its undemocratic and elitist attitude towards the masses Sendero claim to represent, and their isolated episodic military action, the guerillas often leave the masses defenseless in the face of army and vigilante group reprisals to their actions. The repression dished out by the army has often caught workers and peasants in its 'dirty war' against Sendero. Vicious army repression only plays into the hands of Sendero who gain most of its recruits when peasants are forced to take sides.

The elitist attitude of Sendero is a reflection of their Maoist petty bourgeois morality, summed up by their Commandments' or code of living. This is a backward step to the dark ages, not an indication of a new type of society they claim to be building. True to this morality, Sendero claim to have 'cleaned up' towns and villages, closing brothels and bars and shooting prostitutes and homosexuals. This reactionary Maoist morality previously played out by the Khmer Rouge is little cover for their ruthlessness. Sendero also shares with the Khmer Rouge the same sectarian hatred for cities.

Not only Sendero left the masses defenseless against state repression and attacked the more marginalised elements of the proletariat, they have also attacked directly the working class and the left. Left-wing activists, trade unionists and leading working class militants opposed to Sendero have been murdered for their opposition. Their opposition is derived from Sendero provocation and disruption in working class organisations. As Sendero do not base themselves and have no roots in the working class and Unions their method is to declare strikes by decree, rather than by mandate or democratic vote. Those who refuse or oppose are Sendero targets. Sendero Luminoso's nonproletarian orientation reflects, among other things, their acceptance of the necessary tasks of the Peruvian revolution.

Stageism versus Permanent Revolution

Sendero are committed to the 'two stage' theory for revolution in Peru. This theory was developed by Stalin and the Comintern during the degeneration of the Russian revolution. The two stage theory proclaiming that socialist revolution has two distinct stages. The first stage is to complete the unfinished bourgeois democratic tasks, of national unification, independence and proletarian democracy. The second stage of socialist revolution can only be realised on the first stage is completed. The strategy to achieve the first stage maintains that it is necessary for the working class to ally with progressive sections of the national bourgeoisie to form a popular front. The essence of the popular front is class collaboration which subordinates the interests of the working class to the programme of the bourgeois.

The strategy Sendero advocate is the same popular front which was put in practice in the 30's with disastrous results in Spain and France. More recently it was played out in Indonesia 1965-6 and Chile in 1971-3 in both cases the working class and its organisations were drowned in a bloody counter-revolution. The logical conclusion of the popular front is the defeat of the working class, demonstrated with the victory of imperialism over the Sandinistas in Nicaragua earlier this year. The lessons of the popular front are vital to the question: which way forward for the revolution in Peru.

The classical popular front which the Stalinists and Maoists call a 'united front' is a result of the adherence to the stageist theory for revolution.

The strategy... Roughly is to develop a united front which includes many strata in society, but *whose core is* an alliance of the peasants and workers, led by the vanguard of the proletariat. The revolution is itself a prelude to the socialist stage of revolution.' (Revolution in Peru, 1985)

The goal of Sendero is to take power in the name of this popular front to achieve a democratic capitalist Peru. Their talk of liquidating

only 'bureaucratic capitalism (whatever that is) is mere rhetoric. If capitalist relations of production are left intact the masses will still be exploited by capitalism, bureaucratic or non-bureaucratic. Stalinism will only lead to disaster in Peru.

Counterpoised to this strategy is the theory and program for permanent revolution, developed by Trotsky and passed into practice by the Bolsheviks in the first imperialist epoch the weak national bourgeois semi-colonial countries are unwilling and unable to carry out the democratic tasks of the bourgeois revolution. The military, political and economic semi colonies are fundamental to the imperialist world order. There can be no separate stage of development; which capitalist policies and traditions are maintained while democratic tasks are fully achieved.

The Peruvian bourgeoisie's immediate ties to imperialism and domestic reaction, from the church, the army and vigilante squads, makes them a treacherous ally. Combined with their fear of a mobilised working class and land-hungry peasantry places them firmly in the camp of counter-revolution. It is with this 'progressive' bourgeoisie that Sendero seeks a strategic alliance to tie the Peruvian masses to its agenda to achieve the first stage.

Lenin, Trotsky and the Bolsheviks proved that the democratic stage is unnecessary in the epoch of imperialism. Only the working class in alliance with the peasantry organised independently of the bourgeoisie can complete the democratic tasks as part of the socialist revolution, thereby giving the revolutionary upsurge a permanent character. This requires the construction of workers' militias, workers' councils and committees, and above all a revolutionary workers' party it was the decisive factor of revolutionary leadership which made the Russian revolution successful in establishing the first workers state

Today in Peru, no such revolutionary leadership exists. Sendero, are certainly not fit. This reflects the inability of the revolutionary left so far to provide adequate leadership in the stormy struggles erupting in Peru. This vacuum is undoubtedly a strong ally of Sendero.

The violent state repression in Peru culminated in Lima in 1986 when 250 Senderistas were massacred by the army in a prison revolt. At the same time Lima was hosting a conference of all the social democratic parties of the Second International, including the NZ Labour Party, all of whom approved the slaughter. Sendero should be defended against state repression and army attack. This includes defense against the phoney US 'war on drugs', the CIA and OEA units and their offspring death squads such as the Sinchis. Revolutionaries do not call on the ruling class and state to judge those fighting against it. Revolutionaries should demand the right of prisoner of war status for captured Senderistas and their release.

The working class must organise independently of the Peruvian state to defend itself from both state repression and Sendero attack. The formation of workers' defense squads is a burning question which is tied to the resolution of the crisis of proletarian leadership. The answer to the original question and a successful revolution, is the formation of a Trotskyist party, organised from the vanguard of the Peruvian working class which can fight the betrayal of Sendero and its popular frontist strategy. Only such a party armed with the perspective of permanent revolution can lead the workers and peasants of Peru to their victory.

Reprinted from Redletter publication of Communist Left New Zealand

WHY WE NEED A FIFTH COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL (Continued from RED no 13)

In China, Yugoslavia, North Korea, Albania, Cuba, Vietnam Laos and Kampuchea non-proletarian forces went further than their stated programme and established states which had clearly broken from capitalism. Of course these victories posed a theoretical dilemma. In all these countries the Stalinists pursued the strategy of liquidating the working class behind the peasantry behind the banner of the national bourgeoisie. In Vietnam the Stalinists formed their National Liberation Front. They denied vigorously that this was in any way a communist front. As Malcolm Salmon a veteran Tribune correspondent noted V.W.P. (the Communist Party) members would only wait to the most private of moments before declaring to him their V.W.P. membership. And Salmon represented the C.P.A. a close ally of the V.W.P. Such a formation could not of course establish proletarian power. Some such as the pabloites argued they did so that pressure made them revolutionary. However pressure can not liquidate alien class forces such as the peasantry. Nor can it make nonproletarian forces committed to proletarian dictatorship. Non-proletarian forces can at best create societies transitional to the dictatorship of the proletariat

In the Transitional Programme Trotsky noted that one cannot deny in advance the theoretical possibility that under completely exceptional circumstances (war, defeat, financial crash, mass revolutionary pressure etc.): the petty bourgeois parties including the Stalinists may go further than they themselves wish along the road to a break with the bourgeoisie. He calls what would be formed a workers and peasants government. We think that he is terminologically inaccurate. A government is generally understood to be an administration of a state. When revolutionaries talk about a workers and peasants government we mean a form of proletarian dictatorship. However Trotsky is talking, about a short episode on the road to the dictatorship of the proletariat not something the same with it. The alternative understanding for the term workers and peasants' government is the administration of a bourgeois state. For example the Socialist Workers Party of the U.S.A. and their Australian affiliate called Communist League admit Nicaragua was and is capitalist but argue that the Sandinistas formed a workers and peasants government which could have implemented socialism. They attack it for not doing so. This is a sought of left variant of the parliamentary road to socialism. A parliamentary government can not be a short episode along the road to the dictatorship of the proletariat unless a party within it organises the workers with peasants in alliance to smash the capitalist state. It is only the analysis of the Communist Left Programme that can explain the post capitalist states such as China, Yugoslavia, Albania, Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, Kampuchea and North Korea Now it is revealing to look at the response of the Trotskyist movement to post war expansion and divisions within the Stalinist movement This shows a record of splits and disorientation

Yugoslavia As has been showing the first part of this article Yugoslavia was key to the development of Pablo's liquidationist theory that Stalinist bureaucracies could be reformed. Pablo drew out the liquidationist consequence that is the Trotskyist movement became redundant except to pressure Stalinism, reformism or

even left nationalism to the left. The International Committee developed in response to this. But it was somewhat of a belated response. The ICFI rejected liquidation into Stalinism but they didn't reject liquidation into reformism. In Britain Gerry Healy and his Club were working hand in glove with reformists on the reformist paper Socialist Outlook. Hungary. The mass upsurge in Hungary led to the United Secretariat assessing that sections of the bureaucracy could play a progressive role. In the United States the Socialist Workers Party split. A group around Sam Marcy defending the invasion by the Warsaw Pact on the grounds that it was fighting capitalist restoration. This tendency known as the Workers World Party was of course a serious adaptation to stalinism. it also, as a consequence, softened and became blatantly popular frontist. This softening led to further splits including a group called Communist Cadre. In Britain the Soviet invasion led to a mass desertion from the Communist Party of Great Britain including their newspaper correspondent Peter Fryer. Many of the splitters joined the Healy group.

China. The victory of the Maoists in China was instrumental in developing the split between Mandel and Pablo within the United Secretariat. Mandel considered the Maoists a revolutionary current. They considered the Maoists identification with Stalin to be merely an ideological blemish. They considered that the division between Mao and Krusschev amounted to a qualitative break from the framework of international class collaboration. Pablo considered the Maoists to be stalinists and not qualitatively different. Whilst Pablo was to the left on this question he was of course more liquidationist. Mandel, Frank and supporters at least believed in the "Fourth international" in some organisational form. China was also a significant issue regarding the split of the Possadas Tendency. Possadas considered the Maoists to be proletarian revolutionaries also.

In the United States many split away considering the Maoists to be revolutionaries. A most notable split occurred with the Seattle branch. These comrades agreed that what Mao established was a bureaucracy. However, they denied that apolitical revolution was necessary. They established the Freedom Socialist Party. They have members in Australia. The F.S.P. deny the need for political revolution even after the Tienanmen Square massacre. If the bureaucrats wont allow student protest without bloodshed. they certainly wont allow working class power.

North Korea The Korean War sparked a split in Britain between the majority and those who considered the Soviet Union to be state capitalist. The latter led by Tony Cliff and Duncan Hallas refused to defend the North Koreans. This was the beginning of the International Socialists. This group blocked for a while with the Schachtmanites. They split with Schachtman over whether the stalinists were part of the workers movement, the Cliff group said that they were. However the essence of the politics of this group was and is economism. They grew rapidly by adapting to the trade union militancy of the long boom. With the collapse of this boom and the collapse of the militancy various splits occurred. Groups formed from the breakup include Workers Power, the Revolutionary Communist Group the Revolutionary Communist Party (who split from the R.C.G.) Socialist Organiser. the Workers League and Big Flame.

TO BE CONTINUED

DEFEND ARTHUR MURRAY AND SONNY BATES!

Arthur Murray and Sonny Bates are Black. They are political prisoners. They are victims of a provocation by the Tactical Response Squad against a funeral march in honour of Lloyd Boney who was a young Black who died in custody. The Black community consider his death to be murder. Just like South Africa this funeral march was provoked by racist so that the Police could frame Black activists. Arthur Murray and Sonny Bates face charges that could lead to years of imprisonment. That is if they are found "guilty by the standards of white ruling class racist "justice". The Communist Tendency urges all unionist and working class people to take a stand in defence of victims of the racist Australian state. An injury to one means an injury to all count doubly for a Black people degraded and impoverished and deprived of their national identity. Their defense should be the start of a systematic campaign for a defence against racist police attacks.

COMMUNIST TENDENCY PO Box 119 Erskineville 2043