

WHY WE NEED A FIFTH COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Communist Tendency stands for the construction of a Fifth Communist International. This is not a position that we take lightly. It is the purpose of this article to explain the splits in the Trotskyist movement and why there is no international revolutionary movement today.

Communism without internationalism simply isn't communism: Without an international, communists will inevitably succumb to the pressures of the national bourgeoisie. An international of some sort therefore has to be built. The Second International, since the turn of the century, has been a stinking corpse – a "socialist" cover for imperialist exploitation blatantly exposed by its support for the imperialists during the First World War. In no way can principled proletarians identify with such an "international" even to the extent that it formally exists.

The Third International has been dissolved also. That International founded by internationalists such as Lenin and Luxemburg degenerated as it became an appendage of Stalin's counterrevolutionary foreign policy. "Socialism in one country" meant selling out the revolution - worldwide. In China and Indo-china Stalinists sold out the banner of the proletariat to stand behind the banner of the bourgeoisie in the form of "national liberation fronts" In Vietnam, they Stalinists, led by Ho Chi Minh smashed revolutionary working class mobilisation. In Spain, the Stalinists supported a bourgeois government smashing working class organisation. In Germany, the Stalinists allowed Adolph Hitler and the fascists to come to power at the bloody expense of the working class and millions of Jews. In France the Stalinists sabotaged a strike movement for the benefit of Charles de Gaulle. These hideous betrayals were not accidental but part and parcel of the liquidation of international communism. The whole strategy of the Stalinists amounted to a total betrayal. By dissolving the Comintern in 1947 Stalin was pursuing the logic of socialism in one country.

Under these circumstances Trotsky was not merely correct in establishing the Fourth International - he had an obligation to found the Fourth International. The subsequent demise of the F.I. does not make this decision wrong. Trotsky had this obligation even with the limited forces that he had. The Fourth International was in no way immune from degeneration or failure. On the whole, the sections of the Fourth International lacked roots in the working class

The Second World War was to put a massive strain on the F.I. Important cadre were killed either by the fascists or the Stalinists. However the fundamental failure of the F.I. was one of Marxism. Just before his death Trotsky took part in an important struggle within the U.S. section of the F.I. the Socialist Workers Party. Under the pressure of the threat of world war (it hadn't started yet) a middle class section led by Max Schachtman and Martin Abern declared that they the defence of the Soviet Union did not flow from its class character and that the Soviet Union should be defended " subject to the reality of living events" At this time Stalin's Red Army was invading Finland. Trotsky and the Fourth International defended the Red Army not because it was doing any thing progressive but because of the class character of the Soviet state. The Schachtmanites in their conditional defense broke from Marxism. They consciously rejected the Marxist method of dialectical materialism arguing that it was not related to concrete political questions.

Of course revisionism on this question has consequence regarding the class line- Marxism argues that it is in periods of economic crisis where the working class can only gain through the overthrow of the system. The Marxist theory of crisis establishes the material basis for socialism. If you remove this material basis than all you have left is the moral argument for socialism. The consequence of the theory of neo-capitalism is either to abandon the working class for subjectively more militant students. Or alternatively to argue for some other contradiction such as alienation as the mean to revolutionary workers .Either alternative is revisionist.

The aspiring Fourth International also failed to understand stalinism. The Red Army invasion of Eastern Europe posed a serious dilemma as to what type of societies would be created. The aspiring F.I argued that as stalinism was **counter-revolutionary root and branch** than these societies would be capitalist. However reality was to prove otherwise. The expropriation under the gun and the formation of bureaucratic states did not mean that stalinism was progressive. The stalinists wanted to establish capitalism. However the national bourgeoisie in those states was extremely weak. In fact it was virtually nonexistent. Creating a capitalist state was , under circumstances, difficult. Also the invasions must be looked at in a global context. The bureaucracy of Stalin counterposed invasions into Eastern Europe to spreading the revolution internationally,

A fundamental change in attitude occurred within the Fourth International when Stalin split with Tito. When Stalin denounced Tito as "Trotskyist" the so-called Fourth International sought their alliance. Tito became an "unconscious Trotskyist". It was Michel Pablo who argue that this Yugoslav process could continue throughout Eastern Europe. He also drew out the anti-Trotskyist consequences of this position. After all if Stalinists could become revolutionary shouldn't the role of Trotskyists be to influence this

direction? Pablo developed a new form of entrism where Trotskyists entered not only stalinist but also reformist and even left nationalist parties for a long period of time This was known as entrism sui generis so as to be distinguished from Trotsky's principled entrism.

The opposition from those tendencies that constituted the International Committee, the S.W.P(U.S.) the Healy group in Britain, the Lambert group in France and the Moreno group in Argentina was somewhat belated. There was no opposition within the so-called F.I. at the 1951 Congress and it was in 1953 that the split to form the LC.F.I. occurred. The split can hardly be considered to be fundamental. After all the Healy group had deeply entered the Labour Party and the Morenoites were in the bourgeois party of Peron. In 1951 Gerry Healy, had in his office a portrait of Tito!

Trotsky applied dialectical materialism not merely to the Soviet state but to the petty-bourgeois opposition as well. He argued that their deviations were a reflection of their material interest - the middle class_ He argued that this should be fought by proletarianisation of the Socialist Workers Party. This dispute exposed not merely the petty-bourgeois minority but weaknesses in the proletarian majority, led by Cannon as well.

The petty-bourgeois minority broke off to form the Workers Party. The W.P. followed its inevitable path to the right. James Burnham resigned to become a cold war right winger. For the others the path was slower. By the sixties the Schachtmanites were well entrenched in the Democratic Party. Max Schachtman died a supporter of Hubert Humphrey a right wingcr. On the way there were many split-offs. Some became cold warriors but some broke to the left against the continuing rightward direction. Some including the Forrsest Johnson Tendency joined the S.W.P. Many of those who became the Revolutionary Tendency in the S.W.P. also originated in the Schachtmanites. The Revolutionary Tendency became Healyites and Spartacists. Others to emerge from the Schachtmanite Tendency include the U.S. International Socialists, The Revolutionary Socialist League, The League For a Revolutionary Party. None of these tendencies have made an adequate materialist analysis of Schachtmanism.

The Communist Tendency does not consider the post war so-called Fourth International the continuity of Trotsky's Fourth International. Much of the leadership was killed either by the fascists or the Stalinists. The 1947 Congress was rigged by a clique led by Mandel and Pablo away from those sections with real mass roots such as the Vietnamese, Bolivian and Sri Lankan sections. However as well as the organisational breakdown The self proclaimed Fourth International failed politically. This failure was a failure to apply the Marxist method.

The self proclaimed Fourth International failed to understand the post war boom in the international world economy. It failed to understand the expansion of stalinism both through the Red Army advancing into Eastern Europe and the victory of non proletarian forces in countries such as Yugoslavia, Albania China, Cuba, North Korea, Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea. Trotsky predicted the demise of stalinism and bonapartism in the west. However he made it clear that this was just an opinion and that his views should not be taken as a blueprint. The problem was that the aspiring F.I. did take his views as a blueprint. They did so even to the extent of the U.S. S.W.P. paper the Militant declaring There is No Peace in banner headlines.

The post war boom was the greatest expansion of productive forces this century. It appeared to fly in the face of Lenins analysis that this is the epoch of capitalist decay. It was made possible by massive defeats of the working class. Today in 1991, with everyone talking about recession it is easy to see that this was a temporary phenomina. However a the time it appeared that capitalism had changed. The response to this was either to pretend that the boom didn't exist - the Healyite S.L.L. for decades shouted about depression around the corner even when the Tories won an election saying "you've never had it so good. Or alternatively to argue that we are in a new epoch of capitalism called neocapitalism. This was argued by Ernst Mandel and the United Secretariat. The International Socialists developed a new revisionist theory called permanent arms economy which argued that extra spending on arms mopped up excess surplus value and resolved the crisis. Trotsky applied dialectical materialism not merely to the Soviet state but to the petty-bourgeois opposition as well. He argued that their deviations were a reflection of their material interest - the middle class_ He argued that this should be fought by proletarianisation of the Socialist Workers Party. This dispute exposed not merely the petty-bourgeois minority but weaknesses in the proletarian majority, led by Cannon as well.

The petty-bourgeois minority broke off to form the Workers Party. The W.P. followed its inevitable path to the right. James Burnham resigned to become a cold war right winger. For the others the path was slower. By the sixties the Schachtmanites were well entrenched in the Democratic Party. Max Schachtman died a supporter of Hubert Humphrey a right wingcr. On the way there were many split-offs. Some became cold warriors but some broke to the left against the continuing rightward direction. Some including the Forrsest Johnson Tendency joined the S.W.P. Many of those who became the Revolutionary Tendency in the S.W.P. also originated in the Schachtmanites. The Revolutionary Tendency became Healyites and Spartacists. Others to emerge from the Schachtmanite Tendency include the U.S. International Socialists, The Revolutionary Socialist League, The League For a Revolutionary Party. None of these tendencies have

made an adequate materialist analysis of Schactmanism.

The Communist Tendency does not consider the post war so-called Fourth International the continuity of Trotsky's Fourth International. Much of the leadership was killed either by the fascists or the Stalinists. The 1947 Congress was rigged by a clique led by Mandel and Pablo away from those sections with real mass roots such as the Vietnamese, Bolivian and Sri Lankan sections. However as well as the organisational breakdown The self proclaimed Fourth International failed politically. This failure was a failure to apply the Marxist method.

The self proclaimed Fourth International failed to understand the post war boom in the international world economy. It failed to understand the expansion of stalinism both through the Red Army advancing into Eastern Europe and the victory of non proletarian forces in countries such as Yugoslavia, Albania China, Cuba, North Korea, Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea. Trotsky predicted the demise of stalinism and bonapartism in the west. However he made it clear that this was just an opinion and that his views should not be taken as a blueprint. The problem was that the aspiring F.I. did take his views as a blueprint. They did so even to the extent of the U.S. S.W.P. paper the Militant declaring There is No Peace in banner headlines.

The post war boom was the greatest expansion of productive forces this century. It appeared to fly in the face of Lenins analysis that this is the epoch of capitalist decay. It was made possible by massive defeats of the working class. Today in 1991, with everyone talking about recession it is easy to see that this was a temporary phenomina. However a the time it appeared that capitalism had changed. The response to this was either to pretend that the boom didn't exist - the Healyite S.L.L. for decades shouted about depression around the corner even when the Tories won an election saying "you've never had it so good. Or alternatively to argue that we are in a new epoch of capitalism called neocapitalism. This was argued by Ernst Mandel and the United Secretariat. The International Socialists developed a new revisionist theory called permanent arms economy which argued that extra spending on arms mopped up excess surplus value and resolved the crisis. 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 VWP. (the Communist Part) 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.) petty bourgeois parties including the Stalinists may go further than they themselves wish along the road to a break with a break with the bourgeoisie' He calls what would he 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 peasant's government is the administration of a bourgeois state. For example the Socialist Workers Part}' of the U.S.A. and their Australian affiliate called Communist League admit Nicaragua was and is capitalist but argue 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 was working hand in glove with reformists on the reformist paper Socialist Outlook Hungary. Te 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 populist. 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 who reported from Hungary. Many of these 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 Khrushchev 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 a political revolution was necessary. They established the Freedom Socialist Party which has members in Australia. The F.S.P. denies the need for political revolution even after the Tiananmen Square massacre. If the bureaucrats won't allow student protest without bloodshed, they certainly won't 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 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.

Cuba The next major for the Self-Styled "Fourth International" occurred over the victory of forces led by Fidel Castro in Cuba. Their victory led to major splits within the International Committee. Cuba, after all, posed a major theoretical dilemma for Trotskyists -non-proletarian forces had broken Cuba from imperialism and capitalism. This was not such a dilemma for the main stream United Secretariat which all sorts of Stalinists and bourgeois nationalists considered to be revolutionary. It was the International Committee who had the theoretical problems. In the United States, the Socialist Workers' Party took to Cuba like a duck to water and Cuban solidarity became all the rage. This won for them a new layer of middle class cadre. Castro was declared by them to be an "unconscious Trotskyist"

This, of course, established the basis for US S.W.P.'s reunification with the United Secretariat. If Castro could become an unconscious Trotskyist, why couldn't other Stalinists and bourgeois nationalists become "revolutionary" likewise? The "answer" of the British Socialist • Labour League, part of the International Committee, was to declare Cuba to be "state capitalist". This was also rejected in the United States by those who were to become the Spartacist League. The S.L. was bureaucratically expelled from the I. C.F.I. by Gerry Healy.

The United States S.W.P. rejoined the United Secretariat along with its many co-thinkers, notably the M.A.S. of Argentina led by Nahuel Moreno. The re-unification was not complete, however. Within the United Secretariat they constituted the Leninist Trotskyist Faction. There were, indeed, real differences between the LTF and the majority. The US S.W.P. had adapted to bourgeois respectability especially in building their anti-war movement. The Mandelite majority hailed guerrillists and nonworking class mass vanguards including students and Stalinists.

The International Committee remained a block between the supporters of Healy and Lambert. In 1973 this block exploded. Many significant issues were raised in the division. Three main ones were: the Lambertist reformist practice of calling for parliamentary ^{unity} between the Socialist Party and the Communist Party; the rejection of the importance of dialectical materialism by the Lambertists who counterposed concrete political questions; the Arab revolution which was denied by the Lambert Tendency. These differences were nothing new. They involved positions which both sides had openly expressed for the previous ten years. The International Committee was, truly, a rotten block.

The Healy tendency has been exposed for its thuggery and chauvinism. This was a feature of the Lambertists, too. Their refusal to build a workers' movement against French control of Algeria was, to say the least, disgraceful. They are also known for their thuggery against a tendency, led by the Hungarian Varga, which broke from their ranks. Now Varga is hardly a principled character. But he has not warranted the slander and violence metered out to his supporters. The Varga tendency is fundamentally an economist, syndicalist tendency.

Portugal The potentially revolutionary situation in Portugal split the unity of the so-called United Secretariat. The majority, led by Ernst Mandel, supported the Armed Forces Movement which was at the leadership of many of the struggles. The supporters of

the US S. W.P. known internationally as the LeninistTrotskyist Faction, made orthodox criticisms. They pointed out that the A.F.M. was part of the state. However what they counterposed was a parliamentary government. They also opposed revolutionary forces seizing the Republica newspaper in the name of opposing censorship. Trotskyists must defend the right of revolutionary forces and especially the working class to take over the bosses' press unconditionally.

In 1979, within the United Secretariat, the two main factions decided to bury their differences and a whole series of unions were forced internationally. Their two journals, **InterContinental Press** and **Imprecorr**, were fused into **InterContinental Press combined with Imprecorr**. In Australia it meant the forced fusion between the Socialist Workers' Party with the Majority supporters the Communist League. In reality this meant the liquidation of the Communist League. However internationally, many of the L.T.F. supporters didn't come to the party and remained as the L.T.T. These included the supporters of the Argentinian Nahuel Moreno.

Nicaragua The bourgeois revolution in Nicaragua in 1979 prompted the next split from the United Secretariat. During the revolution some L.T.T. supporters went to Nicaragua to arm the working class. These constituted the Simon Bolivar Brigade. In their bid to show their loyalty to the Sandinistas, the United Secretariat enthused over their repression. They stabbed their comrades in the back. This split off both the L.T.T. and the Bolshevik Faction. These united with the Lambert Tendency internationally and constituted the Fourth International Committee. This rotten block was to last three years. It exploded when the Morenoites and the Lambertists took different positions over the Malvinas War (when Argentina claimed them and Britain fought for them back). The Morenoites defended Argentina.

The Nicaraguan revolution was to have a significant impact on the United Secretariat. After, all if the Sandinistas were revolutionary, as they all believed, why have a Fourth International? The so-called Fourth International was struggling to establish a political basis for its existence. The Australian S.W.P. was the vanguard of liquidation and argued point blank that Trotskyists, counterposing themselves as a separate political tendency, were wrong. They pursued comradely relations with the hard line pro-Moscow stalinist SPA. They concluded that permanent revolution was wrong and rehashed stalinist arguments about Trotsky "underestimating the peasantry".

For the US S.W.P., the move in a similar direction has been slower. They too repudiate permanent revolution and the Fourth International. They are more loyal to the Labour Party than the Australians. The Australians prefer middle-class Green and stalinist allies. The majority defended their existence by pointing out that the Sandinistas and Castro did not believe in a Fourth International. But they indicated that they would welcome them in their ranks. They too liquidated the political difference between stalinism and Trotskyism. Their formal defense of the Fourth International was only organisational.

The degeneration process within the British Socialist Labour League which became Workers' Revolutionary Party has produced quite a few pseudo-Trotskyist tendencies. The most notable being the Workers' Socialist League led by Cowley shop steward Alan Thornett. The formation of this was influenced by British supporters of the O.C.I. However this was done covertly due to understandable distrust of that tendency from the W.S.L. ranks. The W.S.L. of Thornett was an economist tendency which identified with Healyite entrism into the British Labour Party. Healy's entrism was thoroughly and utterly treacherous. Their paper Socialist Outlook covered for Nye Bevan even when he became Minister for Labour and jailed workers! The W.S.L. eventually became swallowed up by the International Communist League of Sean Matgamna. Despite the name of the fused organisation, W.S.L., the politics of Matgamna dominated.

Also developing from the Workers' Revolutionary Party was the pro-stalinist grouping called the Workers' Party led by Steven Johns and Royston Bull. However the greatest number of new organisations developed with the expulsion of guru Gerry Healy from the W.R.P. Healy was expelled when allegations were made about him using his party position to pressure young women within the W.R.P. to give him sexual favours. Initially, there was merely the pro-Healy W.R.P. and the anti-Healy W.R.P. However from both sides there has been many splits. All of these have failed to make a proper analysis. One tendency led by Banda has become stalinist. The Bandaites oppose the formation of the Fourth International and defend the record of the Stalinists in Vietnam proclaiming them as revolutionaries. Healy subsequently left his wing of the W.R.P. complaining about the lack of theoretical basis within the pro-Healy W.R.P. led by Sheila Torrence. A relatively serious tendency led by Richard Price broke from the pro-Healy wing to form the Workers' International League regretting their support for Healy.

After the expulsion of Healy an important division developed between the Workers' Revolutionary Party led by Cliff Slaughter and the International Committee. The W.R.P. argued that the whole of the I.C.F.I. had degenerated. The Workers' League US led by Dave North and the Socialist Labour League of Australia (and others) defended the authority of the International Committee. In Australia they expelled the Sandford group who rejected this. How principled the I.C.F.I. is can be shown by the book by David North called *The Heritage We Defend*. This book totally whitewashes the treacherous role of Healy in the British Labour Party. Until recently the Australian Socialist Labour League resurrected a Healy slogan **DEMAND THE LEFTS EXPEL THE RIGHT WING FROM THE LABOUR PARTY**

This slogan merely reinforced the Lefts who are guilty not merely of covering for the right but for treacherous protectionist schemes such as Australia Reconstructed. In Australia those who were expelled from the S.L.L. have embraced the Morenoite tendency. This is true for both the Communist League which became Socialist Alternative and their breakaway called Communist Intervention. Whilst both these tendencies both demand that the S.L.L. account for its past, they refuse to confront serious criticisms made of the Morenoites. These criticisms are made not merely by the I.C.F.I. or the Spartacist Tendencies but many other such as Workers' Power, and the Matgamnaites. This speaks volumes for their revolutionary integrity. A whole series of pseudo-Trotskyist tendencies also developed out of the degeneration of the British International Socialists who became known as the Socialist Workers' Party. These splits stem from the collapse of the economist method of the I.S./S.W.P. In

Britain the IS. developed and grew out of the rank and file and shop steward movement. The growth of these was linked to the post-war growth of productive forces which was in Britain, linked to the growth of trade union militancy .IS/S.W.P. cashed in on this by liquidating their politics. They built rank and file groups on a very low level, based on immediate bread and butter demands. What L.S.IS.W.P. ignored was that for Marxists, class consciousness is not defined on this level, but in terms of the objective interest of the working class in opposition to the capitalist state. The I.S./S.W.P. failed to organise on the revolutionary political level. Therefore when the crisis hit it became far more difficult to fight on the trade union level and the rank and file groups collapsed. This stimulated many splits, many of the splitters identified with Trotskyism. The most significant of these being the group led by Sean Matgamna (initially called Workers' Fight), Workers' Power, and the Revolutionary Communist Group. Matgamna and comrades fundamentally identified with the Healyite Socialist Outlook which meant an orientation to the Labour Party amounting to deep enterism. The Matgamnaites eventually got swallowed up in the Labour Party framework adapting to Tony Benn and becoming chauvinist on Ireland, Palestine and the Malvinas war. Initially, after their expulsion from the I.S./S.W.P., they fused with another tendency, Workers' Power and became the International Communist League. There were, indeed, differences in direction. Although they both appeared to be formally similar, Workers' Power were and are an economist tendency whose main orientation is building rank and file groups in the trade unions. The programmes for these are more advanced than the L.S./S.W.P. Workers' Power also stress the need for a general strike to give themselves revolutionary credentials. But they don't link their demand to a revolutionary programme. By merely organising rank and file groups they are merely organising on the trade union level. By raising the question of a general strike outside of a context of a revolutionary programme they are preparing the working class to be smashed. The general strike poses the question of power without resolving it - preparing the working class for the use of force.

Another tendency which developed out of the International Socialists is the Revolutionary Communist Group which has a significant breakaway known as the Revolutionary Communist Party. The R.C.P. argues correctly that the R.C.G. has broken from its fundamental principles Our Tasks and Methods. The R.C.G., contrary to the other tendencies, made a very serious analysis of L.S. economism and argued very strongly for the need to fight chauvinism. Both the R.C.G. and the R.C.P. argue that virtually no criticism is permitted of nationalist forces fighting the British state. The R.C.G. go further by arguing that the IR.A. of Ireland, the PLO and the A.N.C. of South Africa are revolutionary tendencies. This leads logically to socialism in one country-Stalinism. And the R.C.G. have taken this path and repudiated Trotskyism. The R.C.P. on the other hand deny the importance of nationalised property relations in the Soviet Union. They even supported the reunification of Germany which strengthened German imperialism as well as selling out the nationalised property relations in the GDR. As well, their rejection of the Transitional Programme on the basis of its non-relevance to the post-war capitalist boom is in practice replaced with a minimum programme at least in relation to some of their election manifestos. They also formed a minimalist bloc called the Red Front

Afghanistan During December 1979, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. This marked the beginning of the new cold war. The imperialists were eager to take political advantage of what they promoted as "Soviet imperialism". The Chinese bureaucracy and its agents, the Maoist parties (such as the CPA[ML] in Australia), pushed this line with a vengeance. At the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow, the United States led a boycott. Using the Afghanistan invasion as moral ammunition, it stepped up its imperialist drive against Iran and Nicaragua.

For the ostensible Trotskyist movement, the invasion provided one more opportunity for division and degeneration. On the whole, "Trotskyists" opposed the invasion. This was consistent with what Trotsky argued in his book In Defence of Marxism. However, as well as opposing the invasion of Finland, Trotsky opposed those members of the Schachtman tendency who had given the Finnish army any military support. His point was that imperialism should not be aided and that the invasion should be used for revolution. This meant unity for proletarians within the Red Army and the Afghan proletariat. Those who merely told the Red Army to get out, betrayed this revolutionary struggle. So also did those who merely defended or even "hailed" the Red Army (as the Spartacist League did). The Red Army would do nothing in Afghanistan apart from propping up a bourgeois regime. At least in a concrete military struggle the Red Army supporters were not on the side of feudal imperialist-backed reactionaries as many of their opponents were. The Red Army must be militarily defended but not politically supported.

Within the "Trotskyist" movement, the main endorsers of the Red Army were the Spartacist League and the supporters of the SWP of the United States. This included the Australian SWP. In a brief historical account of the SWP of Australia, leading member Steve Painter claimed that this was the first international question on which his party was to make its own political analysis. They certainly put a lot of resources into promoting their political position. Despite this, their parent party, the SWP US changed its mind. They were more susceptible to social democratic pressures. The Australian SWP were born out of the Stalinist Anti-Vietnam war protest movement. The division has proved to be permanent.

The Spartacist League "hailed" the invasion. They even denied the prospects for proletarian revolution within the Red Army. Afghanistan has a population of thirty million with three cities of more than a million. To argue that such a country could not produce a class-conscious proletariat is absurd. During the 80's a group of ex-Spartacist League members regrouped to form the Bolshevik Tendency. The BT in Canada and the United States initially made organisational criticisms of the Spartacist League including what they claim to be bureaucratic tendencies within the "Robertson Regime". We do not have the space to evaluate these here. Their first political demarcation occurred when they reassessed the SL position on Afghanistan. In Britain, the Worker's Power tendency used the invasion to announce that their characterisation of the Soviet Union had changed.

Poland Most of the "Trotskyist" movement recognised Poland during the '80s as some form of postcapitalist society. So when the trade union Solidarity emerged the question posed was how to orientate towards it. For the Stalinists any challenge

to the PUWP whatsoever could only be considered counter-revolutionary. Many others argued to the contrary - to entertain the possibility of capitalist restoration meant historical pessimism about the revolutionary potential of the Polish working class. This is how the Socialist Labour League in Australia, the International Socialists, who argued that Poland lacked a political perspective. The Spartacist League claimed that Solidarity did indeed have one - a counter-revolutionary perspective. From this analysis it was quite prepared to support the smashing down of not merely a reactionary leadership, but the whole organised Polish working class as well. The SL was even prepared to take responsibility for any Red Army act and even opposed any action against Red Army officers which they argued would harm the proletarian cause. The Bolshevik Tendency also defended the crack-down without taking responsibility for any abuse by the Red Army.

Most of the left supported Solidarity. The Pabloite Tendencies hailed its "progressive dynamic". The differences that arose were based on how revolutionaries should relate to the Polish solidarity movement. Those who proclaimed their solidarity with Solidarity ranged from ostensible Trotskyist tendencies to extreme reactionary cold war tendencies. In Australia, the D.S.P. showed no embarrassment about any such association. Likewise in Britain, the Matgamma Tendency were quite prepared to unite with cold war solidarity supporters. Those who adapted to the cold warriors argued that these became redundant as the dynamic of the movement was progressive. Using this Pabloite rationalisation, the fake Trotskyists *adapted* to those who wanted to re-establish capitalism in Poland.

For a Fifth International So what now for the "Fourth International"? Or rather the multitude of self-styled Fourth Internationals? What we have witnessed over the past fifty years is a record of degeneration. It is a degeneration linked to the degeneration of stalinism. We have seen the once proud Soviet Union who, with its allies, occupied about one fifth of the Earth's surface, thoroughly degenerate to the extent of not even believing in its own existence. Yet Trotskyism has not been able to fill the vacuum. The reason has been fundamentally a failure of Marxist method - or rather the lack of it. Stalinism has been opposed as a bureaucratic malignant cancer, which indeed it is. But it has not been analysed in terms of its class roots. The result has been to adapt to stalinism when it appeared democratic or revolutionary.

This has been dramatically demonstrated by the attitude of many fake Trotskyists and ex-Trotskyists to the Gorbachev leadership in the Soviet Union. Gorbachev's moves towards more democracy were hailed by tendencies such as Gerry Healy's Marxist Party in Britain and the Democratic Socialist Party in Australia. Gorbachev stood for a few minor reforms but not for proletarian power. In fact he stood for promoting precisely these sectors antagonistic to the proletariat and aspiring to become the bourgeoisie. Once gain this empiricist method leads to adaptation to stalinism. It is dead clear that there is no real continuity of Trotsky's Fourth International today. The United Secretariat of Ernest Mandel will undoubtedly boast that it is as big and significant as the Fourth International was in Trotsky's day. Well! A real Fourth International would not adapt to student vanguardism. Nor would it adapt to stalinists such as Castro or the National Liberation Front of Vietnam. Or the Sandinista's bourgeois regime in Nicaragua. It even adapts to the African National Congress of South Africa. Their embracing of so many non-proletarian counter-revolutionary forces refutes their claim to be in continuity with Trotsky.

The International Committee is discredited by the adaptation of the Healy tendency to reformism in the British Labour Party. This is part of the heritage that Dave North of the U.S. Workers League leader of the I.C.F.I. defends. He does not defend most of Healy's subsequent treachery like supporting Qaddafi of Libya or Saddam Hussein of Iraq. However, a so-called International which permits these gross betrayals, cannot be called the continuity of the Fourth International.

The Militant Tendency for forty years has been entrenched in the British Labour Party. The Australian group was formed in solidarity with a deep enterist perspective into the Labor Party. Recently it has rethought this and reoriented towards an open organisation. However irrespective of whether Militant is inside or outside the Labour Party it is doubtful whether it will break from its ingrained reformism.

Another with a treacherous record is the Lambert tendency in France. This tendency has a gross record in adapting to reformism and chauvinism as well. Its "revolutionary method" amounts to getting a mass petition calling for a Socialist Party-Communist Party united parliamentary government. Its members too, like the Healyites, are known for their thuggery. The Leninist International Tendency whose leading section is the MAS of Argentina is tainted by the liquidation of the MAS into the bourgeois party of Peron.

None of the above, nor the smaller tendencies, resemble in any way organisationalty or politically, the continuity of Trotsky's Fourth International. It is time to build a Fifth Communist International. Those who talk about "reorganisation" or "rebuilding" the Fourth International deny the gross class degeneration of the contending "Fourth Internationals" away from the proletariat towards the petty bourgeoisie and the labour aristocracy.

This article does not cover all the differences between all of the groups. Many would point out that other questions are more fundamental in defining divisions and splits. The Freedom Socialist Party, for example, considers that the fundamental question dividing it from the Socialist Workers' Party of the U.S. is that of radical laborism. The F.S.P. rightly attacks the SWP for adapting to trade union struggle and therefore to the privileges of the labour aristocracy. They are fundamentally correct in this critique, although their conclusion of calling themselves feminist does not follow and is under attack on Marxism. To deal with all the splits in full requires a book. It is stressed that the reader should only use this as an overall guide, not a complete analysis. More has been written in RED on the International Committee, the International Socialist

Organisation and the Spartacist League.

But the fundamental point is this article is that if we are going to make Trotskyism a living force in the working class internationally, we must do so on the basis of Marxist method and not by selling this out. Some will say that what counts is programme. It is from the correct method that a revolutionary programme flows. Those who ignore method end up being unable to relate the programme tactically to the changing objective situation. Their programme ends up being a dead letter, a useless formalised formal orthodoxy. This ends in opportunism when forced to intervene in real class struggle. Part of the problem with the post-war Fourth International was the embracing of Trotsky's predictions as a substitute for analysing the real objective situation. The result was to grab onto schemas such as "THERE IS NO PEACE" (written after the Second World War in U.S. Militant) which flew in the face of reality. It is only on the method of Marxism - on Marxist principle - that a revolutionary International can be built. All attempts to cobble together international unity that ignore fundamental Marxist principle are destined for the historical scrap heap.