

## CONTENTS

Mass protest against French tests	3
Palestine, Israel/PLO agreement is no solution	4
Bob Carr - job slasher .....	5
Blue Ribbon rip-off .....	5
Racist law and order in Western N.S.W	6
The political record of Ernst Mandel	

## Bougainville - the war continues

World attention is now on French nuclear testing in the Pacific. Their brutal disregard for the environment and the colonial peoples of the Pacific is so blatant that even John Howard joined the protest. Opposing French tests is politically easy. After all, Australia, is in alliance with imperialist rivals Japan and the USA. Opposition to French tests serves the to cover for Australian imperialist exploits. Australia wants to use its progressive image to facilitate imperialist exploitation. In no way does it oppose it. In fact it fears that France, by being so blatant, might give imperialism a bad name. That's why it is desperate to show a progressive image even to the extent of Liberals appearing in left-wing organised demos.

Australia is, at the moment, up to its neck in blood. There is a war going on at the moment on the island of Bougainville. Officially it is strictly an internal law and order issue between Papua New Guinea and North Solomons Province. In reality it is a war between the PNG government and the people of Bougainville. Australia is backing this government to the hilt. More people have died and will die from this war than will die from French nuclear testing. This war is orchestrated by Australia. Australia shares responsibility with Britain and Germany for the political circumstances which deprived the Bougainville people of their right to a nationality, twenty years ago. It bears responsibility for permitting British multinational Conzinc Rio Tinto to expropriate by force the Panguna people's land and establish a mine which pollutes the rivers, destroys fishing and the land on which they depend for their livelihood). This expropriation by force was backed up by Australian troops. It was Australia who promoted the reactionary elite committed to maintain PNG safe for imperialist exploitation. Today, it is Australia who is arming the PNG Government with helicopters and mortars. Australian military advisers are supervising the war effort. The war on Bougainville is a war made by Australia. On September,15, PNG celebrated twenty years of formal "independence". Independence has not meant freedom from imperialist domination. Recently PNG received a bad report from the World Bank and so "independence" now means mass unemployment with small farmers forced off their land as multinationals being given open slather to make super-profits. It is even illegal to protest against their rip-off.

On September 1, 1975 the island of Bougainville declared itself independent before mainland PNG did. This declaration was not recognised by the Whitlam Labor Government. This was not accidental. When Whitlam granted independence, he made sure the interests of multi-nationals such as R.W. Carpenter, Burns Philp and Conzinc Riotinto, were in safe hands. He guaranteed Conzinc Riotinto the right to make billions out of copper. Local workers were to be paid peanuts. Local landowners were only paid a bare minimum in compensation. If it wasn't for Australian unionists acting the local people would have received nothing. What PNG independence really meant for Bougainville people was an exchange of policemen. Before 1975 Australia's colonial administration who did the dirty work for CRA; after, it was the PNG state apparatus. Like the Australian government, the "independent" PNG government acts as the agent for international finance capital. In fact, it can do this more efficiently as it can make the Bougainville issue appear to be an internal "law and order" issue instead of a people fighting for its right to self-determination. Australia is willing to back up PNG and assist them in their internal "law and order". From the beginning of this war the Hawke and Keating Governments have guaranteed PNG that it would be backed to the hilt.

Australia is at war with Bougainville. This gives the Left and workers' movement in Australia obligations. With a few exceptions the record of the Left has been a disgrace. The demonstrations called in defense of Bougainville have been poorly attended. The efforts of the Left to secure working class direct action has been minimal. Rosemarie Giltespie, to her credit, gained the support of the Wollongong-based South Coast Trades and Labour Council, who enforced black bans against CRA. CRA has been active on the South Coast, attacking unionism. Unionists then realized that they had a common interest in fighting imperialism.

Rosemarie's action has been an exception. The Left occasionally dabbles in the odd demo and has the odd item in their newspaper. At the ISO conference, the Bougainville issue was downgraded to a discussion with East Timor and Burma. This hardly reflects a serious attitude. This failure to prioritise the Bougainville issue has been justified by ISO's breakaway, Socialist Alternative. Socialist Alternative was formed with minor tactical differences and in opposition to the ISO internal regime. On major questions, SA and ISO are identical. The rationale of John Minns, SA leader, is and I quote "Why distinguish between independence movements in the Pacific". The answer can be found within the pages of their very own journal Socialist Alternative. As Mick Armstrong, another SA leader points out, it is the French workers who can be most effective in fighting French imperialism in the Pacific . It therefore follows that the Australian Left and working class movement's priority must lie with solidarity with Pacific nationalist movements - where Australian working class intervention can be decisive. Australia has played a secondary role in assisting France by selling uranium. But it has played a direct role in in the repression and super-exploitation of the people of Bougainville.

The reality is that the priority of both ISO and SA and for that matter, the whole of the radical left, have their priorities determined by middle class public opinion. When an issue becomes trendy they latch on to it with their "revolutionary" intervention. Currently negotiations are going on between both sides in this war. Members of the Bougainville Interim Government are meeting with representatives of the PNG Government and its so-called "North Solomons Province". These negotiations have been prompted by the BRA's recent military victories. PNG is using an old imperialist trick: when you are losing, bog down the enemy with negotiations. Make no mistake! From PNG's (and Australia's) point of view neither independence nor control of resources is negotiable. They may concede more compensation. But this is hardly a just solution to all the misery and suffering. The Bougainville people deserve the right to self-determination which means the right to independence. CRA must be expropriated by its workforce.

A plan must be developed which allows a degree of mining but not to the extent that crops and fisheries are destroyed. Communist Left supports unity between Bougainvillean, Papuan and Nuiginian workers. This unity must be voluntary. Papua New Guinea was established without any respect for the national minorities. In 1975, apart from the struggle on Bougainville, there were also the separatist struggles of the Tclia people and a Papuan separatist movement. Whilst other national divisions appear to be reconciled, the Bougainville struggle goes on. There is no organic reason why Bougainville should be part of Papua

New Guinea. Bougainville people are, racially and culturally, Solomon Islanders. It is less than seven miles to the nearest Solomon Island and well over a thousand miles to Pt Moresby. Either joining the Solomons, or alternatively, an independent Bougainville are feasible options. The point is that the Bougainville people should have the right to choose. This choice has been consistently denied to them. Communist Left wants unity between workers internationally. But we want a unity based on mutual respect and equality. This is the only way that nationalism can become historically redundant. We raise the right of self-determination not because we want to promote nationalism but because we want to bury it.

Australia's government has engineered a brutal and bloody war for imperialist super-profit. The Australian Left and workers movement by this very fact has responsibilities it can't shirk. We must organise the maximum opposition possible within our ranks. Workers must understand that this is an imperialist war conducted for the super-exploitation of workers and the rip-off of resources, depriving the Bougainville people of their national rights. Workers in this country have an interest in opposing the Australian state especially when it's directly responsible for an imperialist war. This political education is the role of communists in this country.

When the mine at Panguna was expropriated, Australian workers acted. The question posed now is. Why is there not the same action now? The answer lies with the workers' movement's degeneration in general. Hawke and Keating have tied unions to the system through the Accord. The Communist Party, who initiated action in 1969 has degenerated to the extent of being non-existent. The far left has not been able to fill the gap. Thus Bougainville has not been the Left's priority. It's time workers were organised for direct action against the Australian sponsored war -now! Bougainville isn't fashionable, so it receives negligible attention from the radical left. Priority goes to issues such as the protest against the raceway which threatens Albert Park, the third runway and French nuclear tests in the Pacific. This is part of the reason why Australian imperialist intervention receives no consistent opposition from workers in Australia.

Workers action for Bougainville self determination - now!

## Mass protest against French tests

The peace movement has finally found the issue which has overwhelming, almost unanimous public support. Public opinion polls tell us; over ninety percent of Australians oppose French nuclear testing in the Pacific. Even John Howard can be seen marching down the street with those opposed to uranium mining. It has been trendy to oppose France. There have been many petty puerile petty "protests" that have targeted the odd French business, and even French people who have nothing to do with the decision of the government. Most French people oppose the testing. Despite the fact that protesters are at pains to point out that they oppose Chirac and not French people, there is a climate of opposition to anything French in general. This is both petty and racist. France is not the only imperialist power ripping off the Pacific. What about the USA, Britain, New Zealand and Australia? The French are merely being imperialist in a more blatant and obnoxious way.

Of course radical groups such as ISO and Resistance find this campaign to be a bonanza. The Campaign Against Nuclear Testing is uniting the popular front left in protest action. Once again Democratic Socialist Party youth group, Resistance is building peace groups in secondary schools and ISO can promote their militant credentials. The anti-uranium movement is once again flourishing.

The aim of the respectable opponents of France is not to bury imperialism but to resurrect it. Imperialist powers and many other countries have nuclear weapons. These have a purpose. They facilitate the super-exploitation of the semi-colonial and colonial "third world". The strategy of the imperialists has been to be covert about their threat of war. By testing nuclear weapons, so blatantly France has tripped over the apple cart. It has exposed just how dirty and ugly this system of imperialism is. The respectable opposition fears that by being so blatant, France may stimulate opposition to all imperialist exploits. They fear that this opposition might even challenge the Clintons, the Keatings also.

President Chirac has shown his tactical prowess at exposing the limitations of Keating's opposition. Firstly he has claimed that Australian demonstrations are not merely opposed to testing but are opposed to any French presence in the Pacific. Keating, of course, denies that he is opposed to French imperialism. For Chirac, Australia's support for the French Pacific presence is fundamental. He hopes to contain Australian opposition so it only opposes French conduct and not French right to super exploit. His next ploy is to threaten that France will abandon uranium sales to Australia. Will Australia put principle before economic interest? That is the question. Chirac counts on Keating putting the export dollar first. This he hopes will quieten Australia's opposition. He knows that Keating's opposition is token and not fundamental. He will use these maneuvers to expose Keating as a hypocrite. In fact he might even expose Keating as an accomplice of French imperialism as France requires Australian uranium for its nuclear arsenal. We hope he succeeds. Revolutionaries have every interest in showing that the Australian Government is up to its neck in maintaining French imperialist presence in the Pacific.

Unfortunately Mr. Chirac is wrong. The demonstrations don't oppose French imperialism outright. Nor unfortunately, do they oppose imperialist control and exploitation of the Pacific. They are respectable demos by respectable people who may oppose the way imperialism conducts itself but not imperialism itself. Our task as communists is to oppose the system outright.

The only way we can avoid being hypocrites is by total opposition to all imperialism -especially when Australia is involved. If we are consistent in opposing Australia's Pacific presence in Papua New Guinea, Bougainville, Fiji and Vanuatu then our opposition to France will be from a proletarian internationalist perspective and not an Australian chauvinist one.

The most serious threat to imperialism comes not from the likes of Paul Keating, nor from the radical Australian middle class. It comes from Tahitians who are using the exposure of imperialism - to fight for independence. It is this movement that we must back with working class action. Of course this movement faces a difficult task as it is up against the might of the French armed forces. Australian workers must give them the maximum assistance to give them the best possible chance of victory. It is important that French workers act also. In fact French workers action could be decisive. With an international working class in opposition the balance of forces could be altered so French imperialism is defeated. It is only the working class who can be consistently anti-imperialist. We must not rely on the moral radicalism of the middle class especially when it turns a blind eye to the other plunderers of the Pacific area such as the USA, Britain, Australia and New Zealand.

## Palestine, Israel/PLO agreement is no solution.

Once again there is talk of an agreement solving the national question for the Palestinians. Yassar Arafat and the Israeli foreign minister Shimon Peres both agree that the Palestinians should receive areas they occupy. These areas include the Gaza strip, the West Bank of the Jordan and the Golan Heights. There is reported to be strong opposition from Zionist extremists, especially those who live in or claim territory designated as Palestine. But the agreement is expected to be ratified in the Israeli Parliament.

Some will consider this to be a solution to the conflict and claim Palestinians now have self-determination. We consider the

agreement exposes the limitations of Palestinian nationalism.

Israel was established as an imperialist enclave. It was established by the imperialists and sold to liberals on the basis of the need for a Jewish homeland. Hitler's persecution of the Jews was horrific. And Jews have been kicked around from country to country being abused and persecuted by most governments, especially those of the extreme right. The Jews have always claimed Israel as their spiritual homeland. So the apparent solution was to give them Israel. The small problem in this schema has been the Palestinians who occupied the land that is now Israel. The Zionist "solution" was to chuck the Palestinians into the desert, pretend that they don't exist or alternatively that they are Jordanian. Of course Israel has been happy to exploit their labour. Palestinians in Israel do the dirty work but are not even allowed to be there without permission. Israel established a version of apartheid. Jews got the power and privileges. Palestinians did the hard labour, had no voting rights and lived in camps in the desert.

The Palestinians have fought this, guns in hand. Since its establishment Israel has remained a military garrison. It has been consistently been at war with Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan, Libya, and of course the Palestinians. Of course a small nation like Israel could not maintain a situation of permanent warfare alone. Consistently backing the Israelis from the beginning has been US imperialism. For the Americans the issues go beyond helping a warm bosom ally and providing a solution to the Jewish question. Israel is key to imperialist control of that massive oil reservoir, the Persian Gulf. Israel has given America sterling service by keeping the sheiks under control. The threat of Israel armed to the teeth has been an effective deterrent to any Arab leader who defies imperialist dictates. The US has an interest in propping up Israel. We have an interest in smashing it.

The current agreement recognises Israel's "right to exist". Therefore the police state will remain. The PLO has had no effective programme to fight it. Because they represent a minority, Palestinians have the balance of force against them. The way to change the situation is to unite Palestine proletarians with the Israeli working class. Israeli workers too have an interest in smashing the state. But to become consistently class conscious they must rescind privileges given to them by the Israeli state at the expense of Palestinians. The revolutionary programme which unites Israeli and Palestinian workers must in no way be indifferent to the national question. Israeli workers have their nation. Palestinian workers do not. Therefore we recognise bourgeois democratic demands for Palestinians not Israelis. The Israeli nation is a predator nation backed by imperialism. The nationalism of the Israelis is a bloc with imperialism. For Palestinians, on the contrary, nationalism is the response to an oppressed situation. Palestinian right to self-determination is recognised by Israeli workers. Despite the limitations of its programme, the PLO, PFLP and all Palestinian nationalists must be defended in their military struggle against the Israeli state. If there were consistent opposition from Israeli workers to imperialist repression the struggle would transcend nationalism. There would be the basis for a united Palestinian/Israeli proletarian revolution. This requires revolutionary leadership. The construction of a Trotskyist party is a matter of urgency.

The current Agreement in no way resolves the national question as far as the Palestinian people are concerned. What it does mean is the commitment of their nationalist leadership, the PLO, to defend the state of Israel. Instead of proclaiming leadership of the struggle it will police the struggle. Palestinian youths who defy their oppressive situation may find themselves jailed, not by the Zionist forces but by Palestinian nationalists who once proclaimed themselves as liberators. The PLO will show, in action, precisely which side they are on. If a Trotskyist party can be built, the agreement will be one important nail in the coffin of the PLO. The real solution to super-exploitation and oppression of Palestinian people is a united struggle for the overthrow of capitalism.

## Racist law and order in Western New South Wales

In early September there were mass demonstrations in Bourke and Gilgandra and other large country centres. They were by no means spontaneous. They were called by the National Party who decided to make a noise about "law and order". The problems there are nothing new. What is new is the Carr Labor Government. Carr was elected on a programme of "law and order" which means state repression. The Nationals are putting him to the test. They hope that if Carr comes to the party he will be out offside with poor people including Blacks who vote Labor. Alternatively if he doesn't listen to their mass protest he will be exposed to redneck racist swinging voters. Either way, the Nationals stand to gain. This is only one small part of their marginal seat strategy aimed at creating a polarisation between town and country. Their campaigning includes land clearance legislation and irrigation issues. They aim to ensure class interests are subjugated to the status quo and any opposition condemned to isolation. The Nationals are targeting Labor on both the state and federal level. They hope to pick up marginal rural seats for the coalition.

Linked to this reactionary mass movement is a hysterical press campaign. The press are screaming about vandalism, graffiti, youth unsupervised in the street at night and intimidation by minorities. All this is aimed at black youth aged between 15 and 18. These kids are suffering from a racist offensive from a system which gives them nothing. Yet there is no evidence of an increase in juvenile "crime" in Western New South Wales.

There are indeed serious problems for Black kids in Western New South Wales. They face a life with no stable accommodation, no education, no jobs and no guaranteed income. They face continued harassment from a racist police force. They have no future under this system.

Black people in country areas elsewhere have been given land grants. This doesn't solve the problem as black people, to make the land viable, must operate on the system's terms. But the black communities there have not had the benefit of even this token gain. Land rights funds have gone into acquiring property including office blocks and some housing. Traditionally there has been rural work for black labourers. However with both economic restructuring and the drought, less and less work is available. What we have is an urban poor. Unemployment is putting pressure on individuals and families. They have less and less money. It is difficult to pay the rent. So Black people get evicted from Department of Housing accommodation. They move into ATSI housing which is poorly repaired. Repairs come from rent. As rent is not usually paid, repairs are hardly ever carried out. People live with as many as fourteen others in the same house. It is no wonder that parental authority has broken down and kids are on the streets. To control and police Black people, governments, State and Federal, have promoted a Black bureaucracy. In some of the country centres this bureaucracy showed what side it's on. They joined in marching with the racist redneck marchers. The National Party and supporters put on the pressure. Fearing isolation, the bureaucracy succumbed. They too joined the campaign against Black youth.

What is emerging is a racist consensus against Black youth. The Carr Government will succumb to National Party pressure. How effective his measures will be in satisfying the reactionary upsurge remains to be seen. What is clear is that Black youth will be the big losers. This system offers them nothing. There are no jobs, no housing and no education. All that is offered is state repression. Some will no doubt join the long list of Black people who have been killed in custody.

We in the workers movement must expose and fight this situation. We must oppose this drive towards "law and order" whether it be directed at youth in the cities or Black kids in the country. This is largely a problem of Black people having no economic base. All the money from the government goes toward bureaucracy and not into creating jobs. We must demand real solutions to problems such as unemployment, poverty and homelessness and point out that the reason that governments don't provide is their

subservience to the capitalist system. Workers in Western N.S.W. must organise workers defense against racist attacks by the police force, an instrument of ruling class repression.

## The political record of Ernst Mandel

Ernst Mandel who died in July lived an exciting and fulfilling life. He fought on the barricades. He escaped from a German Nazi concentration camp partly by persuading his guards of the merits of socialism. He was an indefatigable opponent of both capitalism and the Stalinist counter-revolution in the Soviet Union. No doubt he persuaded many to oppose capitalism and many with illusions in the Soviet Union to oppose Stalinism.

Whilst his virtues were many, it has been his deficiencies that have been decisive. As leader of the so-called "Fourth International" after the Second World War he played a key and decisive role in the degeneration of Trotskyism.

When the Red Army invaded Eastern Europe, Mandel initially considered the societies, whose economies were nationalised under the gun, to be "state capitalist". When this wasn't proved true what followed was a wholesale adaptation to Stalinism by the "Fourth International". Mandel resisted the wholesale liquidationist perspective of Pablo. Pablo took the "Fourth International's" theory to its logical conclusion and argued for the outright liquidation of independent Trotskyist organisations.

Mandel's opportunism took a different form. The Mandelites hailed independent Stalinists such as Tito in Yugoslavia, Mao Tse Tung in China, Fidel Castro in Cuba and Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam. These Stalinists were hailed as "unconscious Trotskyists". No doubt Mandel would have been happy had they affiliated to the so-called United Secretariat of the Fourth International. A real Fourth International would have no room for these Stalinists at all. They had all broken from Moscow but were still following a Stalinist strategy. Theirs was a two stage theory of revolution. They fought for democratic demands as their immediate programme and they believed in socialism in one country. They followed the Stalinist strategy of liquidating the working class behind the peasantry and the national bourgeoisie. In short Mandel obliterated the fundamental class line between Stalinism and Trotskyism. He was obviously befuddled by the fact that these Stalinists fought for their programme, guns in hand, whereas the proMoscow variety were passive and respectable. But this is not decisive. What is decisive for Marxists, for Trotskyists, is the class character of organisation and its programme. This is what Mandel consistently ignored or whitewashed.

Equally as serious was his erroneous concept called "neocapitalism". Neocapitalism, apparently replaced imperialism as the highest phase of capitalism. Under neocapitalism, according to theory there was consistent technological development. No longer were the productive forces dead as argued by Lenin. Also under neocapitalism, government intervention could assist capitalism overcome contradictions by the "nationalisation of loss". This he argued (Socialist Register 1964) would prevent a great depression of the magnitude of the thirties. Such a depression was apparently not on the agenda for neocapitalism. Mandel, it must be stressed still stood for the overthrow of capitalism. He argued that no matter what reforms were introduced industry will retain its authoritarian hierarchical nature. He emphasised the need for workers control as an important demand. Mandel stressed that revolutionaries must be neither for nor against the neocapitalist reforms.

What Mandel was effectively revising was the material basis of revolution. According to his theory, workers became revolutionary not out of material interest but because of alienation.

As material interest was no longer the fundamental interest for the revolution, Mandel "discovered" all sorts of non-proletarian vanguards. There was the "new mass vanguard", student vanguard Blacks, women workers, dissidents in the post capitalist states, vanguards who fought guerilla warfare and of course the third world Stalinists. The following from their Draft Political Resolution (October 1973) exposes quite blatantly the liquidationist perspective of the Majority Tendency of the "United Secretariat of the Fourth International"

"The new mass vanguard can be characterised in the most succinct fashion as the totality of forces acting independently of the Left and traditional bureaucratic leadership of the mass movement. What is involved is a social and political phenomenon with the new vanguard including the radical layers who have gone into action, of the youth, the working class, women, the majority of which is unorganised, but the organised fraction is part of the followers of left organisations, Trotskyist, Maoist, centrist, Mao-spontaneist (etc)"

What this document denies is the politicising role of the party. Maoists (for example) independent of the bureaucracy or otherwise, still have a stagiest theory of revolution. Their immediate programme involves uniting with the national bourgeoisie for bourgeois democratic reforms under capitalism. now. Proletarian dictatorship posed in the indefinite future. For the Mandelites, the vanguard is not strictly proletarian. In no way was it suggested that class lines had to be drawn.

The vanguard included the working class but they adapted to the existing militancy of the working class and its existing politics. After the long boom there was an impressive upsurge of militancy both in European countries and in Australia. Instead of seeing the need to break this vanguard from reformism, the Mandelites adapted to this vanguard as it was.

The theory of neocapitalism did not allow for the collapse of the long boom. It therefore did not foresee the collapse of working class militancy. They therefore did not foresee the collapse of their "vanguard". Whereas in the early seventies their British section International Marxist Group proclaimed its hostility to Labour as a "bourgeois party", by the end of the seventies IMG was well and truly liquidated behind Labour's banner even to the extent of crawling to social chauvinist Tony Benn. Benn stood for Labour Party leader putting forward minimalist programmes to make British capitalism run better.

In Australia, their sympathising group known as Communist League followed a similar path before they were forced to fuse with the Australian supporters of the us Socialist Workers Party. The Communist League adapted to a layer of militants around the CPA. In the seventies the CPA promoted workers control. They gained the support of many militants who took CPA advocacy of workers control as good coin. The bureaucracy betrayed and alienated many of the militants. The Communist League sought a niche amongst this layer. In the early seventies the Communist League too proclaimed its hostility to Labor and attacked the SLL and SWL for calling for a "Labor Government pledged to socialist policies". This, they argued correctly, reinforced Labors hold over the working class instead of breaking workers away. What they put forward instead "vote Labor fight on" was inadequate also as workers with illusions in reformism do occasionally fight. But their struggles remain within the framework of reformism. The effect of the CL record was to adapt to trade union militancy. They refused to confront the reformist illusions which pervaded even the most militant struggles. Their limitations were exposed during the 1975 Constitutional crisis. When Gough Whitlam got the sack. The workers whom they hailed as the vanguard fell in behind the banner of Labor. The Communist League responded by calling for a "Labor Government pledged to socialist policies" and sounding like a pale imitation of the SLL.

In cheering on those workers, guerillas, students and others fighting the capitalist state. There can be no doubt that Mandel and supporters opposed the Stalinist bureaucracies. Yet the empiricism of Mandel and cohorts meant the liquidation of the class line between

Trotskyism and Stalinism. Stalinism adapts to the peasantry. Well so too does Mandelism. In fact Mandel's adaption to Stalinism in places like Cuba, Vietnam and Nicaragua, reinforced Stalinism in the eyes of many as a "revolutionary " tendency. For example when the Communist Party of Australia rethought Stalinism, it was clear to it that Moscow was bureaucratic. But the Vietnamese VWP was militant and fighting for its programme, guns in hand. Mandel's view that the VWP was "empirical Marxist" and "not counterrevolutionary" "despite having defects inherited from Stalinism" only reinforced the view that some types of Stalinism could play a revolutionary role.

The United Secretariat acted as pr agents for the bourgeois Sandinista regime in Nicaragua which defended private property and jailed workers and Trotskyists. On this issue Mandel broke with the Australian SWP. The SWP were at least honest to argue that if such peasant nationalist formations were revolutionary, who needs the "Fourth International"? Mandel argued that Sandinistas and other guerillas should join the Usec. This is a fundamental political attack on the class character of Fourth International. Mandel believes in a "Fourth International" which has abandoned the proletariat as the revolutionary class. He has played a key role in the liquidation of Trotskyism since the Second World War. The "United Secretariat may have many thousands of members worldwide. But politically it has been unable to challenge a Stalinist movement in its death throws. This is not primarily due to tactical errors. It is due to an erroneous method. Mandel's impressionist method has meant liquidation of fundamental lines of class principle between Trotskyism and Stalinism. Despite lifelong commitment, Mandel should be remembered not for his adherence to Trotskyism but for a method which has led to its liquidation.