

The Historical and International Foundations of the Socialist Equality Party (Australia)—Part 5

4 March 2010

The World Socialist Web Site has published The Historical and International Foundations of the Socialist Equality Party (Australia). The document was adopted unanimously at the party's founding congress in Sydney on January 21–25. (See: "Socialist Equality Party (Australia) holds founding Congress"). (Click here for Parts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11)

The post-war upsurge

120. As World War II drew to a close in Europe, the bourgeoisie was economically devastated and politically discredited due to its collaboration with fascism. The British magazine *The Economist* described the forces unleashed by the defeat of Hitler's regime: "The collapse of the New Order imparted a great revolutionary momentum to Europe. It stimulated all the vague and confused but nevertheless radical and socialist impulses of the masses. Significantly, every program with which the various Resistance groups throughout Europe emerged from the Underground contained demands for nationalisation of banks and large-scale industries; and these programs bore the signatures of Christian Democrats as well as of Socialists and Communists." Pointing to widespread hostility to the bourgeoisie, it noted that, if in the 19th century the slogan of French socialism had been Proudhon's "property is theft," now it was "property is collaboration".[56] The United States had recovered from the Great Depression. Nevertheless, according to the eminent bourgeois economist Joseph Schumpeter, it was "not open to doubt that the decay of capitalist society is very far advanced." [57] In this situation, the Soviet regime and the Stalinist parties—using the political authority derived from the Soviet army's defeat of the German armed forces—played the key role in stabilising the post-war order by opposing the taking of political power by the working class.

121. The political groundwork had been laid in May 1943 with Stalin's dissolution of the Communist International—a guarantee to Britain and the US that the Soviet Union was opposed to social revolution. The post-war division of Europe, decided at conferences in Tehran, Yalta and Potsdam, established that the bourgeoisie would be kept in power in the West and that the Soviet Union would seek only a "buffer zone" in Eastern Europe.

122. The Stalinist parties explicitly opposed the taking of power by the working class and the establishment of socialism. A publication of the French Stalinists in 1943 declared that all the old political differences "are now being relegated to the background." Events leading up to the war and the collapse of France in June 1940 had demonstrated that for the French bourgeoisie the main enemy was not Hitler but the working class. However, for the French Stalinists, this was no obstacle to collaboration with the bourgeoisie. "Placing the interests of the French nation above everything else, the French Communists are closely collaborating even with those who, poisoned by a decade of Hitler propaganda, have dealt France a heavy blow by persecuting the Communists, which made

considerably easier the 58] capitulation Italy..."[political orientation was the same, while in Germany the Stalinists of the KPD (German Communist Party) came back from exile in Moscow to work for the dissolution of the anti-fascist and factory committees and replace them with administrative bodies in which the bourgeoisie was allowed to participate. During the war and in its immediate aftermath, the Stalinists supported bourgeois nationalist forces in the massive anti-colonial struggles that swept across Asia and opposed any independent struggle by the working class. This was in line with their so-called "two-stage" theory, which maintained that "national democracy" under the leadership of the bourgeoisie had to precede the taking of power by the working class. In Japan, this policy was adapted to hail General MacArthur and the American occupation force as agents of the bourgeois democratic revolution—a policy that played no small role in enabling the occupation force to suppress the powerful post-war upsurge of the Japanese working class.

123. The betrayals by Stalinism gave the United States, the dominant imperialist power, the necessary political conditions to rebuild the shattered foundations of European and world capitalism and lay the basis for the ensuing post-war economic expansion. In later years, the capitalist restabilisation was to be used as the springboard for attacks by various petty-bourgeois groups on Trotsky's revolutionary perspective. Trotsky predicted a revolution, but it never came. Therefore the Fourth International's perspective was false. Reflecting insights derived from decades of revolutionary struggle, encompassing the most diverse conditions, Trotsky emphasised that a perspective was not some kind of promissory note that could be "cashed in" on the due date. Rather, it defined a political orientation for an entire epoch. In one of his last major statements, he wrote: "The capitalist world has no way out, unless a prolonged death agony is so considered. It is necessary to prepare for long years, if not decades, of war, uprisings, brief interludes of truce, new wars, and new uprisings. A young revolutionary party must base itself on this perspective. History will provide it with enough opportunities and possibilities to test itself, to accumulate experience, and to mature. The swifter the ranks of the vanguard are fused the more the epoch of bloody convulsions will be shortened, the less the destruction will our planet suffer. But the great historical problem will not be solved in any case until a revolutionary party stands at the head of the proletariat. The question of tempos and time intervals is of enormous importance; but it alters neither the general historical perspective nor the direction of our policy. The conclusion is a simple one: it is necessary to carry on the work of educating and organizing the proletarian vanguard with ten-fold energy. Precisely in this lies the task of the Fourth International." [59]

The betrayals of the CPA

124. At its 14th national congress in August 1945, the Communist Party

of Australia hailed the agreements of the “Big Three” at Tehran and Yalta as establishing a “great coalition of the peace and freedom loving powers, Britain, Soviet Russia and America” and set out its role in the coming peace: “Congress declares that there can be no relaxation of Australia’s war effort, even though the war in Europe has ended. Production must be maintained, strikes avoided, and disruption of national unity opposed.”[60]

125. Hundreds of thousands of Australian workers were returning from the battlefields of Europe, Asia and the Pacific determined to prevent any return to the conditions of the 1930s. Major industrial struggles for improved wages and conditions began in the concluding phase of the war and continued into the immediate post-war period. In the years 1945–47, nearly 5.5 million working days were lost as a result of industrial disputes, twice as many as in the three years immediately preceding the war. This movement was fuelled by broad-based anti-capitalist and socialist sentiments, born out of three decades of war, depression and fascism. The CPA, which now led, or had major influence over, some 40 percent of unionised workers, was determined to continue its collaboration with the Chifley Labor government and so-called “democratic” sections of the bourgeoisie. “To raise the slogan of socialism,” CPA assistant secretary Richard Dixon wrote in July 1945, “as the immediate post-war aim of the Communist Party ... would imply that we had reached the conclusion that the economic and political conditions to establish a socialist regime will exist when the war ends. We have arrived at no such conclusion as that and therefore, the raising of the slogan of socialism as our immediate post-war aim would prevent us from realistically tackling the problems of reconstruction, and would divide the progressive movement of the people and promote sectarianism.”[61]

126. During the two-year post-war industrial upsurge, the CPA maintained its so-called “united front” with the Chifley Labor government, notwithstanding the Laborites’ efforts to suppress the struggle for a 40-hour week and better wages. But in September 1947, the Stalinist regime in Moscow ordered a “left” turn. As the Cold War got underway, the founding conference of the Communist Information Bureau (Cominform) declared that the world was now being divided into two great camps, an anti-democratic, imperialist camp, led by the US and a democratic, anti-imperialist camp, led by the Soviet Union. Henceforth attacks on right-wing socialists had to be stepped up. In accordance with this “new line”, the CPA increased its criticism of the Labor Party, and claimed there was a growing break with reformism in the working class. In reality, the post-war upsurge was subsiding and the Labor reformists had strengthened their position, not least due to the support afforded them by the CPA. By the beginning of 1949, as the Cold War intensified, CPA general secretary Lance Sharkey denounced the Labor leaders as “the definite allies of warmongers and imperialist aggressors, who are just as anti-labour as Hitler and Mussolini and the Japanese imperialists were.”[62]

127. The twists and turns of the Stalinists, and the resultant political miseducation of the working class, were to have a decisive impact on the outcome of the historic miners’ strike in 1949. In June 1949, miners voted by a ten-to-one majority to press for long outstanding demands for improvements, including wage increases and a 35-hour week. The strike led to a head-on conflict with the Labor government, which was determined to break it in order to maintain the arbitration system. Within two days of its commencement, the Labor government rushed through emergency legislation prohibiting the use of any funds to assist the strike, including strike relief paid to the miners. On August 1, Chifley sent in troops to work the open-cut mines. The minister for immigration, and future Labor leader, Arthur Calwell, told a Sydney meeting that Communists should be put in concentration camps and that the government would “use all the resources of the country against them. We will use the army on them, the navy on them, and the air force on them.”

The Labor “left” Leslie Haylen declared: “The Communists in the Miners Federation have been pursuing a long sustained policy of attrition against the operation of the system of conciliation and arbitration in the coal-fields. These people are not, in the main, Australian born, or interested in Australia. Their policy is directed from overseas and they are working upon age-old hatreds that belong to another nation and another clime. ...” While there was considerable hostility to the actions of the Labor government, there was also deep mistrust, among wide sections of the working class, towards the role played by the Stalinists. Consequently, the miners could be isolated and, after seven weeks, forced to return to work.

128. The defeat of the miners brought to an end the immediate post-war upsurge of the working class. The Labor government’s attack on the strike as a foreign-inspired communist conspiracy helped foster the anti-communist Cold War climate that was to shape politics for almost two decades. This was not simply a question of ideology. The Labor government set up the security and intelligence organisation, ASIO, which initiated a program of spying and provocations against left-wing organisation and individuals. With the CPA having played a key role in enabling the Labor government to stabilise the post-war political situation, the way was opened for the return of the Liberals to power in 1949.

The post-war stabilisation and the emergence of Pabloism

129. The Australian Trotskyists anticipated a radicalisation of the working class in the aftermath of the war, as had taken place after World War I. They believed this would see the emergence of a left wing in the ALP, in opposition to the leadership, that would lead to a split. In 1941, following its banning by the government, the CLA had adopted a tactic first advocated by Trotsky for the French Trotskyists. Dubbed the “French turn”, it consisted of entering social democratic parties to develop political work among leftward moving members and winning them to the Fourth International. Origliass formed the Labor Socialist Group (LSG), which worked inside the NSW ALP. He set out his perspective in a letter to the American Trotskyists in 1942: “Labor is in office in the Federal Parliament, but all the signs are present that a split will occur any time now which may result in a coalition government developing towards Bonapartism, with a new Labor leadership in opposition in Parliament, swinging the workers behind it and using much more radical talk—a development from liberal Labor to social democracy. By the French turn we aim to be in this ...”[63] However, events did not take the same course as in the 1930s. While the last stages of the war and the immediate post-war years did see a radicalisation of the working class, this did not give rise to a conflict within the Labor Party. Rather, it led to the growth of the Communist Party, due to the political prestige it was able to win as a result of the Soviet army’s role in the military defeat of Nazi Germany.

130. Following World War II, the Fourth International faced a complex situation. By the end of the 1940s, due to the betrayals of the Stalinist parties, the bourgeoisie had been able to restabilise its rule and lay the foundations for a post-war economic expansion. The political pressures generated by the new situation found their expression inside the movement in the revisionist perspective advanced by the secretary of the Fourth International, Michel Pablo.

131. Adapting himself to the post-war settlement and the Cold War political framework, Pablo argued: “For our movement objective reality consists essentially of the capitalist regime and the Stalinist world.” Excluded was any independent role for the working class and hence for the Fourth International. In his report to the Third World Congress of the Fourth International in August 1951, Pablo drew out the liquidationist consequences of his perspective, declaring that there was not a single Trotskyist organisation that did not understand the necessity of “subordinating all organisational considerations, of formal independence

or otherwise, to real integration into the mass movement wherever it expresses itself in each country, or to integration in an important current of this movement which can be influenced.” As the ICFI drew out in its 1988 perspectives resolution, *The World Capitalist Crisis and the Tasks of the Fourth International*, Pablo, with the support of his close associate Ernest Mandel “proposed the repudiation of a central world strategy based on the independent and leading role of the proletariat. Instead, he sought the fragmentation of the Fourth International into a collection of national parties guided by opportunist tactics determined by prevailing national conditions.”[64] This perspective entailed the subordination of the sections of the Fourth International to whatever political forces—Stalinist, social democratic, bourgeois nationalist or petty-bourgeois radical—happened to dominate the labour movement of a given country.

132. In February 1952 Pablo presented his theses on *entrism sui generis* (entrism of a special type) to the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International. Previously, the Trotskyist movement had practised entry into other parties as a tactic completely subordinated to the strategy of building independent parties. Now, that perspective was being ruled out in countries where the labour movement was dominated by mass social democratic and Stalinist parties. “Before the war,” Pablo wrote, “more precisely between 1934 and 1938, after Hitler’s victory and the threat which fascism exercised over bourgeois democracy and the workers’ movement, the Social Democracy included, Trotsky conceived the tactic of entry into the Socialist parties which were obliged to struggle. But this tactic had a rather ephemeral character, of short duration, with limited objectives. What was involved was to enter into these parties, to profit from their temporary left turn, to recruit members or to court certain leftist currents which were developing there and to get out. It was not a question of facing the tasks of war and revolution by remaining inside these parties. The entire conception of carrying out the entry work and work inside these parties was determined by this perspective. Today it is not exactly the same kind of entrism which concerns us. We are not entering these parties in order to come out of them soon. We are entering them to remain there for a long time banking on the great possibility which exists of seeing these parties, placed under new conditions, develop centrist tendencies which will lead a whole stage of the radicalisation of the masses and of objective revolutionary processes in their respective countries.”[65]

133. In his book *1905*, Trotsky had characterised the psychological roots of opportunism as the inability to wait. “In periods when friendly and hostile social forces, by virtue of their antagonisms and their interactions create a total political standstill; when the molecular processes of growth, by intensifying the contradictions not only fails to disturb the political balance but actually strengthens it and, as it were, makes it permanent—in such periods opportunism, devoured by impatience, looks around for ‘new’ ways and means of putting into effect what history is not yet ready for in practice. Tired of its own inadequacy and unreliability it goes in search of ‘allies’.”[66] For those who had grown skeptical in the face of the difficulties associated with building the revolutionary party, and for impatient sections of the petty bourgeoisie who had never had much time in the first place for the patient struggle required to educate a revolutionary cadre, and who were particularly susceptible to the pressures of the national environment, Pablo’s perspective proved attractive. It offered a pathway to “integration into the real mass movement”; in other words, to rejoin the Stalinist and reformist organisations, and to concentrate on the development of their own national tactics.

134. By the early 1950s Australian capitalism was undergoing rapid growth as a result of the post-war economic boom. Living standards were among the highest in the world, second only to the United States, according to one index. The post-war strike movement had subsided, with

the number of days lost plunging in 1950 after the defeat of the miners’ strike. With the onset of the boom and the initiation of the Cold War, several well-known Australian Trotskyists had already left the movement. The most significant was Laurie Short. Short had joined as a teenager in 1933 and had played a central role in the dockyards struggle at the end of the war. But by the end of 1948 he was virtually out of the movement, claiming, as many others had before and have since, that he was guided by “realism.” “I came to see that the claim that people were inevitably radicalised by economic circumstances was at total variance from reality. It just wasn’t happening. In all the time I was a Trotskyist, no more than fifty people in Australia saw the light. I began to wonder whether the evils of capitalism and its overthrow were all that inevitable.” New opportunities were opening up and, as his biographer later noted, Short was “unusually well-equipped—by virtue of his sense of purpose as well as his years of experience on the far Left fringe of politics—to take advantage of the burgeoning anti-Communism inside the union and wider labor movement.”[67] Short seized the opportunities provided by the Cold War to become national secretary of the Federated Ironworkers Association (FIA) and a bastion of the anti-communist right-wing in the Labor Party. One of his closest associates in the Trotskyist movement, James McClelland, left around the same time. He was to build up a lucrative legal practice, pursuing workers’ compensation cases for the FIA. “Diamond Jim” later entered federal parliament and became a minister in the Whitlam government, which was sacked in 1975 by the Governor-General Sir John Kerr who had also had connections with the Trotskyist movement in the 1940s. Their evolution demonstrated, not for the first or last time, the key role played by one-time radicals and “lefts” in the service of the capitalist state.

135. The Origlass-led Labor Socialist Group adopted the Pabloite *entrism sui generis* perspective at its annual conference at Easter 1952. Origlass’s attempt to join the ALP was rejected—he was too well known as a Trotskyist. In order to gain admission, *The Socialist*, of which he was the editor, would have to be liquidated. Origlass edited its last issues in a manner that ensured it would give no offence to the Labor Party. He finally liquidated the publication in August 1952.

136. The sentiments to which Pablo appealed were articulated by his supporters in the American SWP under the slogan “Junk the old Trotskyism.” Similar opinions were voiced by an Australian supporter Winifred Bradley, daughter of a long-standing Australian Trotskyist, in a letter to the SWP’s journal *Fourth International* in October 1953: “Leon Trotsky died in 1940—13 years ago. A new generation, of which I am a member, has arisen since who will build socialism on a world scale. This new generation most probably can’t even remember when Leon Trotsky was alive. We cannot remember for we were hardly born in the days of the Moscow Trials, the days of the Popular Front and the United Front. We have only a very dim recollection of the Second World War and the only period we know is the period since the war and the only thing we’re really conscious of is that the final showdown between the old and the new orders—capitalism and socialism, will occur before we are middle-aged. To prove and to base an argument on the quotation of a man who died 12 years ago—no matter how brilliant the man, how profoundly correct his ideas, without any resort to the world since 1945 does not satisfy us. Leon Trotsky wrote for a particular period and for a particular set of circumstances ... Twelve years is a long time, particularly in this century and the period of 1933–41 is not the same as the period 1945–53...”[68]

137. On November 16, 1953 the SWP’s paper *The Militant* published James P. Cannon’s Open Letter to the World Trotskyist movement calling for the rallying of orthodox Trotskyists to defeat Pablo’s liquidationist perspective. In the course of the Letter, Cannon summarised the fundamental principles of the Trotskyist movement:

1. The death agony of the capitalist system threatens the destruction of

civilization through worsening depressions, world wars, and barbaric manifestations like fascism. The development of atomic weapons today underlines the danger in the gravest possible way.

2. The descent into the abyss can be avoided only by replacing capitalism with the planned economy of socialism on a world scale and thus resuming the spiral of progress opened up by capitalism in its early days.

3. This can be accomplished only under the leadership of the working class in society. But the working class itself faces a crisis in leadership although the world relationship of social forces was never so favorable as today for the workers to take the road to power.

4. To organize itself for carrying out this world-historic aim, the working class in each country must construct a revolutionary socialist party in the pattern developed by Lenin: that is, a combat party capable of dialectically combining democracy and centralism—democracy in arriving at decisions, centralism in carrying them out; a leadership controlled by the ranks, ranks able to carry forward under fire in disciplined fashion.

5. The main obstacle to this is Stalinism, which attracts workers through exploiting the prestige of the October 1917 Revolution in Russia, only later, as it betrays their confidence, to hurl them back into the arms of Social Democracy, into apathy, or back into illusions in capitalism. The penalty for these betrayals is paid for by the working people in the form of consolidation of fascist or monarchist forces, and new outbreaks of wars fostered and prepared by capitalism. From its inception, the Fourth International set as one of its major tasks the revolutionary overthrow of Stalinism inside and outside the USSR.

6. The need for flexible tactics facing many sections of the Fourth International, and parties or groups sympathetic to its program, makes it all the more imperative that they know how to fight imperialism and all its petty-bourgeois agencies (such as nationalist formations or trade union bureaucracies) without capitulation to Stalinism; and, conversely, know how to fight Stalinism (which in the final analysis is a petty-bourgeois agency of imperialism) without capitulating to imperialism.”[69]

138. The Open Letter provided the programmatic basis for the formation of the International Committee of the Fourth International. Because of his previous political collaboration with James P. Cannon and with Gerry Healy, the leader of the British Trotskyists, Origlass was expected to support it. But in February 1954 he wrote to the SWP declaring support for Pablo: “[T]here is no support here for Cannon’s position. Rather the Australian Section unanimously condemns the Cannonite open letter.” The LSG’s rejection of the Open Letter was rooted in a definite political orientation. Acceptance of its conclusions would require an ongoing political struggle against social democracy and Stalinism. Such a perspective, however, cut across “deep entry” into the Labor Party and accommodation to the national milieu—the basis of the Pabloite perspective.

139. The Origlass group’s decision to oppose the Open Letter marked its liquidation as a Trotskyist organisation. For more than two decades, through the most difficult circumstances, Origlass and his supporters had waged a struggle for the principles and program of Marxism. They had withstood the attacks of the Stalinists, the trade union bureaucracy and the capitalist state—none of which had been able to destroy their organisation. Its demise was the result of the opportunist perspective of Pabloism, which repudiated the conception on which the Fourth International had been founded—that, whatever the immediate conjuncture and the vicissitudes of the class struggle, the fight for a principled political line would eventually intersect with the living movement of the working class.

140. There is a bitter irony in the fact that the political liquidation of the Origlass group came on the eve of a profound crisis of Stalinism. In February 1956, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev made his “secret speech” to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party, denouncing some of Stalin’s crimes. The speech, followed by the Soviet invasion of

Hungary in November 1956, opened up a crisis in the ranks of the Stalinist parties internationally, providing an important opportunity to clarify essential historical and political questions. But that was taken forward only in Britain, where Gerry Healy, strengthened by his participation in the struggle against Pabloism, fought to establish the significance of Trotsky’s struggle against Stalinism.

141. Because the Pabloites maintained that Khrushchev’s manoeuvre was an expression of the Stalinist bureaucracy’s capacity to carry out a process of “self-reform”, the Origlass group made no intervention into the crisis of the Communist Party of Australia. Such was the impact of Pabloism that in 1958, the Communist Party Stalinists even endorsed Origlass against Laurie Short in an election for the leadership of the Federated Ironworkers Association.

142. The liquidation of the Origlass group in Australia was part of an international process. In its 1988 perspectives resolution, the ICFI explained: “Pabloite opportunism disoriented thousands of Trotskyist cadre throughout the world and ultimately destroyed a large portion of the Fourth International. The Pabloites played the crucial role in diverting the working class from a successful challenge to the open treachery of the Stalinists and social democrats.”[70] The cadres of the Trotskyist movement in Australia had always been small in number. But the movement had undertaken important struggles in the 1930s and 1940s and accumulated a wealth of historical experience. In 1954, it was liquidated, disarmed by Pabloism in the face of the pressures generated by the post-war stabilisation of world capitalism. In little more than a decade, the post-war order would begin to break up, leading to a radicalisation of young people and a renewal of struggles by the working class. Had the Origlass group been able to resist the pressures, its experiences would have played a decisive role in the education and training of new Trotskyist cadres.

143. The revisionist tendencies that attacked the Fourth International were the product, in the final analysis, of an unfavourable balance of class forces. During the post-war boom, the bourgeoisie was able to carry out policies based on class compromise and national regulation within the framework of an expanding world economy. It was this situation that found its expression in the theories of Pabloism, which rejected the conception that the establishment of socialism required the development of independent political struggle by the working class, conscious of its historic role. Other forces, from the Stalinist and social democratic apparatuses in the advanced capitalist countries to the petty-bourgeois national movements in the former colonial countries, could replace the working class in the overthrow of imperialism.

144. In 1961, during their struggle against the reunification of the American SWP with the Pabloites, the British Trotskyists of the Socialist Labour League pointed to the objective processes underpinning the emergence of revisionism within the Fourth International: “The false leaders of the working class have a role and an ideology which corresponds to the objective needs of imperialism in its present stage of development. The opportunists of all varieties now rest not only upon the labor aristocracy of a few advanced countries but upon new layers of the world’s population under modern state monopoly capitalism with its particular relation to the non-capitalist world. The advanced countries have gone through a gigantic concentration of industrial and finance capital, militarisation and bureaucratisation of the economy and of the state, and the consequent creation of a new middle caste of executives, administrators and bureaucrats of the big banks and monopolies, the state, the military and security apparatus, ‘social services’ and the means of manipulation of ‘public opinion’. The international needs of capital are faithfully administered by the middle caste. In the backward countries they find their counterpart in the nationalist petty bourgeois governing classes to which imperialism has handed over government office. There are thus objective class reasons for the persistence of opportunism in the

present critical stage of imperialism's development.”

145. Summing up this analysis in 1987, the ICFI explained: “Thus the revisionism that attacked the Fourth International after World War II was a class phenomenon which reflected the changing political needs of imperialism itself. Confronted with the emergence of proletarian revolution, imperialism had to open up possibilities for new layers of the middle class to assume the role of a buffer between its interests and that of the proletariat. Pabloite revisionism translated these basic needs of imperialism and the class interests of the petty bourgeoisie into the vital political formulae which justified the adaptation of the Trotskyist movement to these forces. It pandered to the futile illusion that the petty bourgeoisie, through its control of the state apparatus, can create socialism without the old bourgeois state being first destroyed by proletarian revolution in which the working class—not various middle class surrogates—is the principal historical actor.”[71]

To be continued

Footnotes:

56. Philip Armstrong, Andrew Glyn & John Harrison, *Capitalism since World War II*, Fontana, London, 1984, p. 23.[back]

57. *Ibid.*, p. 43.[back]

58. Robert Black, *Stalinism in Britain*, New Park, London, 1970, p. 218.[back]

59. Leon Trotsky, ‘Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Imperialist War and the Proletarian World Revolution’, *Writings of Leon Trotsky: 1939–40*, Pathfinder, New York, 1977, p. 218.[back]

60. *Betrayal: A History of the Communist Party of Australia*, op. cit., p. 95.[back]

61. “Post-War Policy and the National Congress”, *Communist Review*, no. 47, July 1945, Communist Party of Australia, Sydney, p. 540.[back]

62. “The Reformists Serve Reaction”, *Communist Review*, no. 92, April 1949, Communist Party of Australia, Sydney, p. 112.[back]

63. *Red Hot: The Life and Times of Nick Origlass*, op. cit., p. 103.[back]

64. *The World Capitalist Crisis and the Tasks of the Fourth International*, Perspectives Resolution of the International Committee of the Fourth International, August 1988, Labor Publications, Detroit, p. 14.[back]

65. Michel Pablo, ‘The Building of the Revolutionary Party’ (excerpts of report to IEC Tenth Plenum), SWP *International Information Bulletin*, June 1952, reprinted in *I.S. Documents*, vol. 1, p. 34.[back]

66. Leon Trotsky, *1905*, Penguin, Hammondsworth, 1971, p. 315.[back]

67. Susanna Short, *Laurie Short: A Political Life*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1992, pp. 88–89.[back]

68. David North, *The Heritage We Defend: A Contribution to the History of the Fourth International*, Labor Publications, Detroit, 1988, p. 221.[back]

69. *Ibid.*, pp. 231–232.[back]

70. *The World Capitalist Crisis and the Tasks of the Fourth International*, op. cit., p. 16.[back]

71. ‘Editorial’ *Fourth International*, vol. 14, no. 1, March 1987, p. iii.[back]

To contact the WSWs and the
Socialist Equality Party visit:

<http://www.wsws.org>