

## NATIONALISATION AND THE CRISIS OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM

The question of the nature of nationalisation in imperialist countries has been a cause of polemic since the earliest days of the Labour movement. In the current crisis of imperialism state intervention in the economy has greatly increased and right opportunist deviations on the nature and purpose of this intervention are dominant in the British Labour movement.

In bold struggle against these opportunist positions in the counter-revolutionary tendencies of reformism, revisionism and Trotskyism, the Marxist-Leninist movement in general, and the Communist Federation of Britain in particular, say boldly and forthrightly; nationalisation is STATE CAPITALISM. It is part of the desperate attempts of the British bourgeoisie, in particular its social-democratic wing in the Labour Party, to revive British imperialism.

British imperialism is probably the weakest of the western imperialist powers. British industry is out-dated, with generally obsolete means of production which are unable to compete with the other imperialist powers (1). Unprofitable British industry is unable to attract new finance capital. Recent years have seen a vast increase in the amount of finance capital invested abroad and a similar vast decrease in the amount invested at home (2).

### BOURGEOIS NATIONALISATION

Nationalisation has existed ever since the emergence of imperialism and is essentially an aspect of the principal feature of imperialism; that imperialism is moribund, decaying, parasitic capitalism. Imperialism is the epoch where capitalism has long since exhausted its progressive aspects and where it has become PARASITIC, dependent on super-profits from colonial and neo-colonial exploitation, and MORIBUND capitalism, increasingly dependent on the state for capital investment at home, as its super-profits decline with the victories of peoples' war.

Early acts of nationalisation were largely for strategic purposes (arsenals, the Post Office and telecommunications). But by the end of the nineteenth century not even

---

(1) See Notes.

(2) See Notes.

joint-stock companies could provide the capital needed for the more and more highly developed means of production; as Engles observed:

"At a certain stage of development even this form no longer suffices: the official representative of capitalist society, the state, is constrained to take over their management." (3).

The growth of state capitalism in most of Europe was fairly slow until 1945. The exceptions to this being the Fascist states of Germany and Italy where massive state intervention took place in the 1920s and 1930s. The end of the war saw a situation of severe political and economic crisis throughout Europe. British imperialism had lost its old pre-eminence and, as with the Fascists in pre-war Germany and Italy, an overtly state-capitalist party, the Labour Party, came to power. By the end of its two terms of office the party had nationalised most of British basic industry, coal, gas, power, steel and internal transport, and provided the necessary link with finance capital by nationalising the Bank of England. This massive extension of state capitalism provided the basis for a temporary stabilisation of British imperialism which lasted until the early sixties.

The crisis which has been developing since then, and which is now maturing into the final crisis of imperialism, has seen a further vast increase in government control of the economy. Significantly it is the social-imperialist Labour Party which has been in power for most of this period. (4).

The Industrial Re-Organisation Corporation of the 1964-70 Labour governments intervened massively in industry, notably the creation of GEC-AEI, and nationalised the steel industry; in both cases thousands of jobs were lost through 'rationalization'. The manifesto of the current Labour government commits it to the nationalisation of development land, oil, ship-building and aircraft, ports and cargo-handling, road-haulage and construction. (5). Although the manifesto is only partly implemented the deepening crisis has meant that a more radical programme of nationalisation and control has already

---

(3) Engels - 'Anti-Duhring'.

(4) See Notes.

(5) Labour Party Manifesto- October 1974. The struggles in the Labour Party over the implementation of the manifesto are a manifestation of the division referred to in Note 4 above. The pragmatic wing struggles against its full implementation, the 'left' wing for its implementation and extension. The realities of 1975 generally ensure that a centrist road is followed.

been carried out: government control of a firm like British Leyland would have been unthinkable only a few years ago.

As significant as the actual extension of state OWNER-SHIP is, the principle becomes more widespread in the form of state INTERVENTION. The National Enterprise Board (NEB) whatever form it eventually takes will effect an historic shift from a TRADITIONAL free-enterprise economy to a centrally owned and controlled state capitalist economy. The functions of the NEB will be:

- (a) a new source of investment capital in return for planning agreements with private industry,
- (b) a source of funds for firms in temporary financial difficulties,
- (c) to start new ventures and participate in joint ventures with private firms,
- (d) to extend nationalisation into profitable industry in certain circumstances,
- (e) to function as a holding company for government shares in private enterprise. (6).

In summary then the growth of state ownership, control and intervention is an aspect of the crisis of imperialism. It is a process whereby the state provides funds for private industry which can no longer be raised by private capital and in consequence government control of all aspects of the economy grows apace. (7). It is therefore a process which attempts to prop up a dying system and avert its eventual and inevitable doom and destruction: it is a process which has nothing whatsoever to do with socialism. In the vivid words of Lenin:

"State monopoly in capitalist society is nothing more than a means of increasing and guaranteeing the income of millionaires on the verge of bankruptcy in one branch of industry or another." (8).

#### NATIONALISATION IS STATE CAPITALISM

The CFB(M-L) makes no claim to originality in declaring that bourgeois nationalisation has nothing to do with socialism. In saying this we are but defending the science of Marxism against the various opportunists who support nationalisation. Engels dealt most explicitly with the nature of bourgeois nationalisation:

"But neither the conversion into joint-stock companies nor into state property deprives the productive forces of their character as capital. In the case of joint-stock compa-

(6) Command Paper no. 5701 - HMSO.

(7) See Notes. 4

(8) Lenin - 'Imperialism'.

nies this is obvious. And the modern state, too, is only the organization with which bourgeois society provides itself in order to maintain the general external conditions of the capitalist mode of production against encroachments either by the workers or by individual capitalists. The modern state, whatever its form, is an essentially capitalist machine; it is the state of the capitalists, THE IDEAL COLLECTIVE BODY OF ALL THE CAPITALISTS. The more productive forces it takes over as its property, the more it becomes the real collective body of all the capitalists, the more citizens it exploits. The workers remain wage-earners, proletarians. The capitalist relationship is not abolished; IT IS PUSHED TO AN EXTREME." (9). (Our emphasis).

The essential point to be grasped is that ownership by INDIVIDUAL CAPITALISTS is immaterial. The essence of capitalism is PROPERTY RELATIONSHIPS. Individual ownership of the means of production ceased to be dominant after the emergence of joint-stock companies in the nineteenth century. The vast majority of British industry is corporately owned - by banks, finance and insurance companies, by giant monopolies and by the STATE. All these are FORMS of capitalist ownership within which capitalist property relationships remain intact. Surplus value is still produced through the labour-power of the proletariat and that surplus-value is still appropriated by the bourgeoisie.

As we have seen the extent of state ownership and control increases as the crisis of imperialism deepens. At the same time the bourgeoisie are compelled to mount increasingly savage attacks on the rights and living standards of the labouring masses. (10). State ownership and control are an INDISPENSABLE WEAPON in the hands of the bourgeoisie in this attack:

"Under the conditions where private ownership of the means of production is preserved all these steps to bigger monopolies and increased nationalisation of production are accompanied by INTENSIFIED EXPLOITATION OF THE LABOURING MASSES, INTENSIFIED OPPRESSION, GREATER DIFFICULTIES IN RESISTING THE ATTACKS OF THE EXPLOITERS, the strengthening of reaction and military despotism, and at the same time lead inevitably

---

(9) Engels - 'Anti-Duhring'.

(10) See Notes. 5

to the increase of profits of the big capitalists at the expense of all the other strata of the population, to the saddling of the labouring masses for many decades with tribute to the capitalists in the form of thousands of millions in interest on loans." (11). (Our emphasis).

The absence of any individual capitalist or obvious controlling bourgeoisie in state industries is a major contributory factor to the theoretical confusion and mystification about bourgeois nationalisation that exists in the British 'left' and the working class in general. It is an understanding of the nature of the state that is the key to theoretical clarity on this question. According to Marx:

"...the state is an organ of class rule, an organ for the oppression of one class by another...". (12).

As long as the bourgeoisie holds state power then the state can, in general, only act in their interests. Trifling and petty concessions to the masses in order to maintain bourgeois rule may be made but the bourgeoisie will never make concessions which seriously threaten their state power.

The fact that an essential task of a socialist society is to take state ownership of the means of production adds further confusion and mystification to the British 'left'. Marxists have always argued that monopolisation of the means of production, particularly state monopolisation, builds the formal shell within which SOCIALISATION of the means of production can take place. Engels argued:

"State ownership of the means of production is not the solution of the conflict, but it contains within itself the formal means, the key to the solution." (13).

But what is this solution?:

"This solution can only consist in the recognition in practice of the social nature of the modern productive forces, in bringing, therefore, the mode of production, appropriation and exchange into accord with the social character of the means of production. And this can only be brought about by society,

(11) Lenin - 'The 7th National Conference of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party.'

(12) Cited in Lenin - 'The State and Revolution'.

(13) Engels - 'Anti-Duhring'.

openly and without deviation, taking possession of all the productive forces which have outgrown all control other than that of society itself." (14).

This task cannot be accomplished within the framework of bourgeois society but only after the SOCIALIST REVOLUTION has taken place:

"The proletariat seizes state power, and transforms the means of production in the first instance into state property." (15).

Note the order: first the SEIZURE OF POWER, then state ownership.

#### WHEN CAN NATIONALISATION BE SUPPORTED?

In general it is clear that state intervention, whether in the form of direct ownership or loans and subsidies, **cannot** save jobs. In fact nationalisation usually leads to 'rationalisation' - massive redundancies. The experience of the mines and railways in the past and the current demands on the part of the British Steel Corporation for 20,000 redundancies and of British Rail for 8,000 amply proves this point. Similarly the government is making it quite plain that any support for bankrupt private industry is conditional on rationalisation and will provide financial support only when it is convinced that tough measures to that end will be taken. At the October 1975 talks of the National Economic Development Council the Secretary of State for Industry made it quite clear that such support was conditional on a return to financial viability within three years (16) - a process which can only mean large-scale redundancies.

#### DEFEND THE MASSES, ADVANCE THEIR STRATEGIC INTERESTS

Communists do not refuse to support acts which maintain or improve the lot of the masses: but they put that support in the general context of the strategic aim of the eventual overthrow of the capitalist system. This relationship is best expressed in the words of 'The Communist Manifesto':

"The Communists fight for the immediate aim, for the enforcement of the momentary interests of the working class: but in the movement of the present, they also represent and take care of the future of that movement".

---

(14) Ibid.

(15) Ibid.

(16) 'Sunday Times' - 9/11/75.

Any support for a specific act of nationalisation which will save jobs is a part of the "fight for the immediate aims, for the enforcement of the momentary interests of the working class". In the same way we would support government loans, a take-over by another company or anything else which served the immediate aim of saving jobs. Which action is taken is immaterial.

Later on, in the same section of the 'Manifesto', Marx and Engels point out:

"In all these movements they (the Communists) bring to the front, as the leading question in each, the property question, no matter what its degree of development at the time."

This is why it is the most gross right opportunism not to fearlessly and consistently point out that nationalisation is state capitalism, that it cannot save jobs anymore than can private industry, except on the most temporary basis, and that only the violent overthrow of the bourgeois state and the building of socialism can guarantee work for all. More important than support for problematical government intervention is the mass struggle for the right to work and for Marxist-Leninists to struggle against the reformists, revisionists and Trotskyists from diverting that struggle into reformism. The fight for the right to work is important because the working class can, by REFUSING to accept redundancies, assert their strength. Any independent means that the working class chooses to use in this struggle - a shorter working week, work-sharing, no overtime, etc. - all develop the consciousness of the working class and make them aware of their latent strength. Factory occupations in particular are a crucial weapon in this struggle. Occupations assert the rights of labour over those of capital and FUNDAMENTALLY challenge bourgeois notions of property rights.

All these struggles develop the strength, confidence and political maturity of the working class. What is lacking at present is the leadership of Marxist-Leninists. Only that leadership can ensure that the SPONTANEOUS struggles of the working class eventually develop into a conscious awareness of the need for the overthrow of the capitalist system.

#### REVISIONISM AND NATIONALISATION

In the ideological and political struggle for a correct line on nationalisation we are struggling against revisionism. The Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) still has a significant hold on large numbers of militant workers and the defeat of the CPGB's bourgeois ideology is essential if those workers are to be won to Marxism-Leninism.

As early as 1944 they argued that a "new type of Labour

and progressive government" would have to take over significant sections of the economy:

"The government would have to own some important industries and businesses, and exercise strict control over others." (17).

It was not argued that such governments would be socialist:

"...the capitalist would still make profits and the worker would still draw wages. We have no illusions about that. But this policy will mean higher wages, shorter hours and full employment." (18).

The fundamental mistake made here is the complete misunderstanding about the nature of BOURGEOIS nationalisation; as we have already seen nationalisation in capitalist society, far from improving the lot of the masses ("higher wages, shorter hours and full employment"), means rather, to repeat Lenin: "intensified exploitation of the labouring masses, intensified oppression, greater difficulties in resisting the attacks of the exploiters".

This has been clearly seen in practice: the post-war nationalisation programme meant the loss of thousands of jobs in the mines, railways, steel industry etc. Low wages (rather than Pollit's "higher wages") are the norm in nationalised industries and productivity drives (particularly in the mines) have greatly increased the amount of surplus value screwed out of the workers by the bourgeoisie.

Revisionist policy on nationalisation is an inseparable part of the CPGB's strategy for a 'peaceful transition' to socialism. In 1944 the CPGB argued, in defence of its line on post-war policy:

"It may be argued that what we have outlined here represents a series of developments that can only lead to state capitalism. Well what is wrong with that?... (it)...enormously assists the speedy advance towards working class power and the full establishment of socialism." (20).

Note the subtle phrase "FULL establishment of socialism". The implication here is that nationalised industries are no longer fully capitalist but are in transition to socialism. Indeed this line is now CPGB policy. 'Marxism Today' of August 1974 argued that:

"...the relations of production are still capitalist because the PRINCIPAL means of production are still in private ownership." (Our emphasis).

Here the line is that once the "principal means of production"

are in state ownership then the relations of production are mysteriously changed into socialist relations.

The CPGB does argue that this process must be undertaken under the direction of a 'left' government'. But how is this government to be established?:

"...at a time of mounting class struggle... a socialist Labour and Communist majority could be returned to parliament, and a socialist government established." (21).

For the CPGB the central question is a majority in parliament. Token attention is paid to the bourgeois state, but the central question for Marxists - the VIOLENT OVERTHROW AND SMASHING OF THE STATE MACHINE is simply dismissed. The Marxist position on the nature of parliaments and the bourgeois state needs to be restated here:

"In mockery of the teachings of Marx, those gentlemen, the opportunists, including the Kautskyites, "teach" the people that: the proletariat must first win a majority by universal suffrage, then, on the basis of the voting of that majority, obtain state power, and only after that, on that basis of "consistent" (otherwise called "pure") democracy organise socialism.

But we say on the basis of the teachings of Marx and the experience of the Russian revolution:

"The proletariat must first overthrow the bourgeoisie and win for itself state power, and then use that state power, that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat, as an instrument of its class for the purpose of winning the sympathy of the majority of the toilers." (22).

And how is that state power to be achieved?

"We have already said above, and shall show more fully later, that the teachings of Marx and Engels concerning the inevitability of a violent revolution refers to the bourgeois state. The latter CANNOT be superseded by the proletarian state (the dictatorship of the proletariat) through the process of "wi-

(21) 'British Road to Socialism' - 1967 edition.

(22) Lenin - 'The Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat'.

thering away", but, as a general rule, only through a violent revolution. The panegyric Engels sang in its honour, and which fully corresponds to Marx's repeated declarations - (recall the concluding passages of 'The Poverty of Philosophy' and 'The Communist Manifesto', with their proud and open proclamation of the inevitability of a violent revolution; recall what Marx wrote nearly thirty years later, in his criticism of the Gotha Programme of 1875, when he mercilessly castigated the opportunist character of that programme) - this panegyric is by no means a mere 'impulse', a mere declamation of polemical sally. The necessity of systematically imbuing the masses with THIS and precisely this view of a violent revolution lies at the root of ALL the teachings of Marx and Engels. The betrayal of their teaching by the now predominant social-chauvinist and Kautskyite trends is expressed in striking relief by the neglect of SUCH propaganda and agitation by both these trends."(23). (Emphases in the original).

The CPGB argues that the tasks of a 'left' government will include:

"Socialist nationalisation of all monopolies and other large scale concerns in productive industry and distribution, of the banks and insurance companies, and control of foreign trade and overseas investments.

Initiation of socialist planning to cover the economy as a whole, in order to improve the working and living conditions of the people." (24).

As long as the bourgeois state remains, as long as the bourgeoisie hold state power, such a programme can only be a programme for the establishment of state monopoly capitalism of the type now existing in the social-fascist regimes of the Soviet Union and most of eastern Europe. Typically the CPGB opportunistically attempt to use Lenin as a cover for their revisionism. In 'Marxism Today' of August 1974 they argue:

"The idea that the transition between capitalism and socialism will involve various stages and take some period of time is not of course a new one. In 1918 for example, Lenin argued:

---

(23) Lenin - 'The State and Revolution'.

(24) 'The British Road to Socialism' - 1967 edition.

"If in approximately six months time state monopoly capitalism became established in our republic, this would be a great success and sure guarantee that within a year socialism will have gained a permanently firm hold...the present system contains elements ...of both capitalism and socialism." (25).

It is a characteristic of opportunists to use quotes from Lenin and other leaders of the Communist movement torn out of their political and historical context. This example of opportunism is particularly impudent. Lenin was attacking the ultra-left opponents of state-capitalism in 1918, after the Russian masses, under the leadership of the Bolsheviks, had seized state power THROUGH VIOLENT REVOLUTION and were BUILDING SOCIALISM UNDER THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT. The CPGB attempt to use the quote as a justification for their support for BOURGEOIS NATIONALISATION IN A BOURGEOIS STATE.

#### THE CPGB IS A BOURGEOIS PARTY

The CPGB is a party of state monopoly capitalism. It is a junior partner of the social-imperialist Labour Party. The CPGB equates the struggle between the Labour and Tory parties as a struggle between socialism and capitalism. The Labour government is attacked not principally because it is a party of state monopoly capitalism but because it is not carrying out all the allegedly 'progressive' policies of the Labour Party manifesto. Thus the 'left' MPs who struggle for the implementation of the manifesto are seen as being 'progressive' and fighting for 'socialism'. The following quote exactly illustrates the CPGB's interpretation of the Labour Party:

"In the 1964-70 period, the Labour government acted mainly as the means of extending state monopoly capitalism using such instruments as the Department of Economic Affairs, the Ministry of Technology, and the I.R.C. MUCH OF THE PROGRESSIVE ELEMENT THERE WAS THEN IN THE LABOUR PARTY PROGRAMME BECAME MEANINGLESS FORMALITIES. The far more comprehensive and radical Labour Party programme drafted before the recent elections UNDER LEFT PRESSURE could itself be transformed into a further strengthening of the links between big business and the state if the Labour movement itself does not act to prevent this happening." (26). (Our emphasis).

---

(25) The quote from Lenin is from 'Left Wing Childishness and the Petit-Bourgeois Mentality'. It is cited in an article entitled 'Economic Problems of a Transitional Government' by Phil Goodwin. Goodwin is the secretary of the economic committee of the CPGB and presumably his views are representative of the position of the party's leadership.

(26) Sam Aronovitch-'The Next Stage' ('Marxism Today'-August 1974)

The policies of the Benn wing of the Labour Party are presented as a real threat to capitalism and the opposition of the Tories to those policies as a struggle against socialism:

"Left unity around the type of programme I have discussed represents, under present conditions, a serious challenge to bourgeois state power. The present offensive by the CBI and the Tory leadership against the arguments presented by Benn is part of an attempt to forestall such a challenge." (27).

The policies of the Labour Party (of whatever wing) and of their ideological parasites in the CPGB are, as we have shown, not socialist policies. The choice presented to the people in the periodic charades of general elections contested by the two major bourgeois parties, is not a choice between socialism and capitalism (or as the CPGB more vaguely expresses it, between 'progress' and 'reaction'), but rather a choice which enables the masses:

"To decide once every few years which member of the ruling class is to repress and crush the people through parliament - such is the real essence of bourgeois parliamentarianism." (28).

In their support for the Labour Party and their advocacy of a government of 'left unity' the CPGB is establishing its credentials to represent state monopoly capitalism in its attempts "to repress and crush the people".

#### 'TRANSITIONAL' DEMANDS AND TROTSKYIST REFORMISM

'Transitional' demands were first invented by Trotsky in his 'Transitional Programme of the Fourth International' in 1938. Modern British Trotskyist sects, from the rigidly orthodox 'Workers' Revolutionary Party' and 'Revolutionary Socialist League' (who modestly deny their existence, and hide inside the Labour Party selling a reformist paper called the 'Militant'), to the 'revisionist' 'International Marxist Group', all use 'transitional' demands in one way or another. The essential theory of 'transitional' demands is to raise a theory which cannot be met by the bourgeois state, rally workers' support around that demand and then when the struggle fails, use its failure to 'expose' the bourgeois state for its inability to deliver the goods.

Thus the 'Red Weekly' (organ of the 'International Marxist Group') of 13/11/75, in an article on the Chrysler crisis

---

(27) Ibid.

(28) Lenin - 'The State and Revolution'.

said:

"A campaign for nationalisation without compensation based on plans drawn up by elected workers' committees opening Chrysler's books would sweep through the working class like wildfire, shattering the attempts of the Wilson government to solve the economic crisis at the workers' expense through mass unemployment".

Similarly the 'Militant' of 7/11/75, in an article entitled 'Nationalise Don't Subsidise', demanded of the Labour government:

"...nationalisation of firms which threaten sackings, under workers' control and management."

Not content with this fearless attack on the bourgeoisie our heroes of the R.S.L. take on the city itself, and further demand that the workers:

"...fight for the nationalisation of all banks insurance companies and finance institutions, and their incorporation into a state bank... to be administered by the organizations of the working class itself."

These 'transitional' demands illustrate the correctness of the thesis that Trotskyism is 'Left in Form, Right in Essence'. Firstly, Trotskyists are confused about the NATURE of nationalised industries: in some vague and undefined way they are assumed to be in transition to socialism. The fact that capitalist property relationships remain intact in nationalised industries, indeed are intensified ("pushed to an extreme" in the words of Engels), is ignored. Trotskyist confusion on capitalist and socialist property relationships is illustrated by their belief that socialist property relationships exist in the Soviet Union. The state ownership of the means of production is for the Trotskyists the decisive factor—the relationships that exist WITHIN the formal shell of state ownership are simply ignored. The SOURCE of their confusion, as with all variants of social-democracy, is that they do not really understand the nature of the STATE: that as the state is a bourgeois state it will necessarily carry out policies in the interests of the bourgeoisie.

Further the process of demoralisation which takes place when the masses are conned into campaigns around 'transitional' demands is simply not taken seriously. As in all their mass work the Trotskyists have no conception of the mass line. Demands are made of bourgeois governments, campaigns organised around hacks from the official labour movement. But as for the masses, the Trotskyists fear them, they have nothing but contempt for them. They substitute cynical and manipulative learning situations for militant leadership; for mass struggle

---

they substitute reformist reliance on the bourgeois Labour Party.

In the fight for the right to work the policy of the Trotskyists is objectively reformist. The various Trotskyist sects all raise the demand for nationalisation as part of their 'leadership' of the struggle for the right to work. The 'Red Weekly' in its issue of 1/11/75 said:

"Against the reformist non-solutions of the Labour left and Communist Party WE MUST FIGHT THE WILSON GOVERNMENT for the 35 hour week, work-sharing with no loss of pay, nationalisation of all firms creating redundancies, a programme of socially useful public works, and the opening of the books to prepare a workers' plan to defend jobs". (Our emphasis).

Similarly the 'Socialist Worker' (organ of the 'International Socialists') said (referring to workers at Plessey and ITT) in its issue of 8/11/75:

"They should occupy their factories, hold the machinery and goods and DEMAND THAT THE GOVERNMENT nationalise the companies, under shop floor control of manning levels".

The Keynesian economics of the 'Red Weekly' is interesting evidence of the continuing degeneration of British Trotskyism and both papers are making 'transitional' demands on nationalisation. But a further serious error of both lines is their outright reformism. Both the I.M.G. and I.S. claim to be revolutionary organizations and therefore opposed to reformism, but their reformism shines through in every word. Trotskyist reformism is formal only - they all pander to the reformist illusions of the British Labour movement. The emphasis of their line is to demand that THE GOVERNMENT rescue the jobs of the workers. In the words of the 'Internationale', instead of boldly saying "our own right hands the chains shall sever", the Trotskyists meekly ask for "saviours from on high deliver". Furthermore, in peddling the reformist illusion that nationalisation can significantly help in the fight for the right to work, the Trotskyists are betraying the long-term interests of the working class for momentary gains.

#### RIGHT-OPPORTUNISM IN THE MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT

The two-line struggle in Communist organizations is a struggle between proletarian and non-proletarian ideology: a struggle between the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and incorrect ideas. Right opportunism has been the principal error in the CFB(M-L) and although significant victories have been won in the struggle against right opportunism, it has not yet been decisively defeated. The adoption of the policy statement on nationalisation was a major victory in this struggle: it is therefore necessary to refute right-opportunist lines that have been argued on this question in recent issues of 'MLQ'.

DJ IN MLQ 7 (29)

This article makes several grossly right opportunist errors. DJ starts by saying that:

"The decisions of the 1973 Labour Party conference and the 1974 election manifesto were probably the most 'progressive' policies adopted by the Labour party since 1945".

Despite the disarming inverted commas around the word 'progressive', DJ certainly has illusions about the nature of Labour policy. Part of the so-called 'progressive' policies of the Labour Party are, according to DJ, its nationalisation programme. DJ lists, with evident approval, some of the 'key' decisions of the 1973 Labour Party conference, one of which is:

"This conference considers that industry will best serve the people of this country when they control it, through public ownership."

This sort of vague and pious resolution has been passed at every Labour Party conference since the Party's formation. It reflects the social base of the state monopoly capitalist Labour Party in the Labour aristocracy. It is part of the annual ritual dance between the right and 'left' wings of the party. When DJ goes on to discuss more specific proposals his opportunism becomes clearer. DJ quotes the Labour Party manifesto asserting:

"...Labour's determination to ensure not only that the North Sea and Celtic Oil and gas resources are in full public ownership, but that the operation of getting and distributing them is under full public ownership".

DJ's response to this is not to expose it as state capitalism, but to say:

"It took three Labour governments to nationalise the coal industry when the industry had so stagnated that it was no longer a viable proposition for private capital to make the necessary investments in order that coal could be an efficient prop to the rest of the privately owned manufacturing industries."

This is apparently a bad thing! DJ doesn't tell us why. He ignores the process of increased exploitation and oppression of the masses which accompanies state monopolisation of capital. More importantly he ignores the fact that nationalization is state capitalism, an expression of imperialism in

---

(29) All quotes from DJ are from his article in MLQ 7: 'Expose the Reformists of Every Stripe and Hue'.

crisis. The general agreement put (although in characteristic opportunist fashion it is nowhere made explicit) makes it evident that DJ considers that there is a QUALITATIVE DIFFERENCE between state and private capital. This becomes clearer when DJ says:

"How many Labour governments will it require before the BOOMING PROFITS of the oil companies operating in Britain are brought under "FULL PUBLIC OWNERSHIP". Are those companies who in the first few months of 1974 made larger profits than ever before...going to stand idly by whilst their 'midas touch' investments ARE TAKEN OUT OF THEIR HANDS?". (Our emphasis).

The whole point that DJ completely misses is that it is completely irrelevant to the strategic interests of the working class whether profits are in state or private hands! State or private ownership, capitalism remains! Further, in his confusion about the nature of nationalisation he actually OBJECTIVELY demands that Marxist-Leninists should campaign for the extension of state monopoly capitalism. In a passage referring to the 'pledge' to nationalise North Sea Oil he says:

"...it is imperative that the Marxist-Leninist movement is seen by the forces who have fought for the inclusion of such a clause in the Labour Party manifesto to be campaigning for the Labour government to carry out its pledge."

For DJ the central feature of Labour policy is not that the policies themselves are BOURGEOIS policies but that in some mysterious way the Labour Party is unable to compel the bourgeois state to carry out its policies:

"...central to its whole existence has been a complete adherence to the parliamentary system of government. In other words, the dependence on the monopoly capitalist state machine for any measures on which it legislates."

Of course the Labour Party relies on the state machine; THERE IS NO CONTRADICTION BETWEEN THE POLICY OF THE LABOUR PARTY AND THE INTERESTS OF CAPITALISM! DJ's outlook is the common currency of 'left' mythology. It is mythology which paints a picture of frustrated Labour politicians being thwarted at every turn by 'Tory' civil servants. Again DJ misses the central point - the Labour Party is a bourgeois party and its policies are bourgeois policies. There is nothing, nor will there ever be, in the conference decisions or manifestos of the Labour Party which in any way threaten capitalism - at their most radical these policies would lead to a massive extension of state monopoly capitalism.

DJ's misunderstanding of the nature of the struggles between the Tory and Labour parties and of that inside the Labour Party leads him on to make what are essentially 'transi-

tional' demands of the sort described elsewhere in this article. DJ is, unlike the Trotskyists, at least honest in his approach:

"These policies are not presented here as vehicles for achieving workers' power, because they are far removed from that, nor are they presented as issues around which we should campaign to make social-democracy and parliament work in the interest of the working class but as a basis from which we can show the inability of social-democratic policies and methods to make any inroads into control of state monopoly capitalism."

DJ's position on nationalisation is not a Marxist-Leninist position, but a sophisticated revisionism with Trotskyist undertones. He shares with the revisionists their opportunist formulations on the nature of nationalisation and the Labour Party. He rejects their 'parliamentary road' to socialism: that we are agreed on, but a fierce ideological struggle on DJ's right opportunism is needed if a principled unity is to be reached.

#### JB IN MLQ 10 (30)

As the crisis of imperialism deepens so the pressure of bourgeois ideology on the Marxist-Leninist movement will increase; only active ideological struggle will prevent us from succumbing to that pressure. In this context it is instructive to examine the positions taken up by JB in his article in MLQ 1 and MLQ 10. The former article, despite a certain lack of militancy and a few minor errors, is nevertheless an excellent statement on the general Marxist-Leninist position on nationalisation. In the intervening period JB has lapsed into right opportunism.

JB still has a generally correct analysis of the nature of nationalisation in bourgeois society - he recognises that it is state capitalism and that its role is to attempt to rescue imperialism from crisis. JB's opportunism takes the form of sophisticated appeals to take account of the contradictions between different sections of the bourgeoisie, a refusal to recognise the role of the Labour Party, and, as with DJ, a variant of 'transitional' demands.

JB says that: (viz. the crisis of British imperialism)

"In this situation British imperialism is certain to go to the wall, in a world of increasing capitalist competition, WITHOUT MASSIVE STATE INTERVENTION." (Our emphasis).

Amazingly enough JB then goes on to argue nationalisation

---

(30) All quotes from JB are from his article in MLQ 10: 'Spontaneity, Parliamentarianism and the Labour Party'.

should be SUPPORTED. The reason for this is that although there is general theoretical agreement about nationalisation as state capitalism, it breaks down when we look at the role of the principal agent of state capitalism - the Labour Party. JB thinks that we must support nationalisation because of its support in the organised Labour movement. In criticising an article in MLQ 8&9 (31) JB says:

"Developing a generalised account of the contradictions generating capitalist crisis enables NR to bypass its concrete expression in the POLITICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLES WITHIN THE LABOUR MOVEMENT." (Our emphasis).

JB's incorrect approach is the reverse of that which he criticises NR for: HE bypasses the principal aspect of nationalisation, that it is a result of the crisis of imperialism, and concentrates on a secondary aspect - its base in the reformist illusions of the working class. Inevitably this wrong analysis leads to a whole string of opportunist errors. Like DJ, JB makes 'transitional' demands:

"Only by being leaders of the demand for total nationalisation of major industries can we maximise political struggles of the class and destroy every kind of reformism at source."

JB also has a defeatist approach to Marxist-Leninist leadership and the mass line. He says:

"The demands for nationalisation without compensation provides us with much wider opportunities when raising fundamental questions embracing the principles of commodity production, the functioning of the bourgeois state, in stark contrast to the social-democrats' policies."

The basic approach of these 'transitional' demands is, like that of DJ, a form of MENSHEVISM. It is a defeatist and un-Leninist tactic which hands over responsibility for exposing the nature of the capitalist system to the bourgeois state and the bourgeois Labour Party. In contrast, the BOLSHEVIK method is that it is the conscious leadership of Marxist-Leninists which is the crucial factor in exposing capitalism and the bourgeois state. The whole method of the exposure tactic must be shown to be incompatible with Leninism: it is a tactic which has nothing but contempt for the masses and which imagines that they can only learn from manipulation, not from militant leadership.

JB then constructs an incredible scheme whereby the contradictions between the Tory and Labour parties can be used

---

(31) 'The Labour Party and the Crisis of British Capitalism'-  
MLQ 8&9.

to the advantage of the masses. He outlines the differences between Tory and Labour, Labour right and 'left', and then asks the ingenuous question: "Are these differences significant for Marxist-Leninists?". He uses these differences to justify the opportunist formulations quoted above and then tells us:

"The existing FORM of state capitalism obscures the laws of capital and the realities of class exploitation. The DEMAND for nationalisation creates an agenda with wide possibilities for focusing struggle towards the heart of the system - production for profit as opposed to use-creating improved conditions for building the ideas, politics, and organisation, for a real revolutionary socialist movement. It widens the fight against redundancy and rationalisation - as already noted, stepping-up exploitation is the main factor behind growing state intervention - throwing the rationale of the bourgeois state and social-democracy into very sharp relief. To those comrades who feel that this is too sophisticated, that really the differences within the bourgeoisie are of no significance, Lenin poses some difficult observations for your 'purism'."

This is followed by the well-known quote from Lenin's 'Left-Wing Communism' to the effect that Communists should take advantage of the contradictions between the "Churchills and the Lloyd Georges...on the one hand" and the "Hendersons and Lloyd Georges on the other" in order to expose the nature of the social-democratic leaders to the masses. JB really will have to do better than this if he wants to SUPPORT rather than DESTROY his arguments. Does he really imagine that the tactical arguments of Lenin in 1920, designed to demonstrate to the masses the bourgeois nature of the Labour leaders, are relevant to the current struggle inside the bourgeoisie on nationalisation? Apart from the fact that the masses can already see from their own direct experience that nationalisation means redundancies, speed-ups, low wages etc., and do not need further experience of nationalisation to confirm it, there is the MAIN point that the Labour Party is the MAIN SOCIAL PROP OF STATE-CAPITALISM. JB will have to stop equivocating - does he really believe his own statement that: "...British imperialism is certain to go to the wall...without massive state intervention?".

#### AGAINST BARGAINING OVER PRINCIPLES, CONCESSIONS ON THEORY

Considerable attention has been paid in this article to right opportunism in general and in the CFB in particular. This is because particularly in the early-stages of party-building ideological struggle against all manifestations of bourgeois and petit-bourgeois ideology is essential to guard against opportunist degeneration.

The Communist movement in Britain is in what Lenin termed a "period of theoretical chaos". It is therefore crucial that no bargaining over principles, no concessions on matters of theory are made to the opportunists. This is why it is the most gross right opportunism to say as JB does that:

"The demand for nationalisation as formulated by the conference decisions of the Labour Party present Marxist-Leninists with favourable opportunities in waging the battle against concepts of social-democracy, and for Communist ideas and policies among the best organised and most class-conscious workers."

Other comrades, active in the mass struggles of the industrial proletariat, advocate a similar line on the basis that nationalisation is supported by significant numbers of advanced workers. These comrades, and JB, are making opportunist errors because they are making unprincipled compromises on matters of crucial theoretical importance and are objectively uniting with social-democracy and its allies in the revisionist and Trotskyist movements. (32).

The principal reason that those workers who support nationalisation do so is because of the effect of decades of indoctrination with social-democratic ideology. How do those comrades who want to unite with these workers on this basis imagine that we can break the stranglehold of reformism if we make theoretical concessions to social-democracy? These comrades' rebellion on their knees against social-democracy is a teacher by negative example of how NOT to fight it. Away with unprincipled compromises! Bold and uncompromising ideological struggle for the conviction that nationalisation is state-capitalism is the principal task now! As Lenin said:

"Nothing is more important than to rally ALL Marxists who have realised the profundity of the crisis and the necessity of combatting it, for the purpose of defending the theoretical foundations of Marxism and its basic propositions, which are being distorted from diametrically opposite sides by the spread of the bourgeois influence to the various 'fellow-travellers' of Marxism." (33).

#### TAILISM

It is necessary to combat the idea, among those comrades who support nationalisation, that they are uniting with the

(32) See Notes. 6.

(33) Lenin - 'Certain Features of the Historical Development of Marxism'.

advanced workers. They are not! They are, as we have pointed out, uniting with the time-serving bureaucratic hacks of the official labour movement, with the LABOUR ARISTOCRACY, the main agents of reformist ideology in the labour movement. In the absence of Marxist-Leninist leadership the mass of the workers may well go along with these hacks: but the demands do not arise spontaneously from the working class - they arise on the contrary out of the bourgeois ideology of the official labour movement.

The mass of workers who support these demands usually do so quite unenthusiastically and because they can see no alternative. Yet these workers CAN see what little difference nationalisation makes. In not giving them leadership on this question, by not applying the method of "from the masses, to the masses", and instead uniting with social-democracy, those comrades who support nationalisation are guilty of TAILISM:

"Tailism in any type of work is also wrong, because in falling below the level of political consciousness of the masses and violating the principles of leading the masses forward it reflects the disease of dilatoriness. Our comrades must not assume that the masses have no understanding of what they themselves do not yet understand. It often happens that the masses outstrip us and are eager to advance a step when our comrades are still tailing behind certain backward elements, for instead of acting as leaders of the masses such comrades reflect the views of those backward elements and MORE-OVER MISTAKE THEM FOR THOSE OF THE BROAD MASSES." (34). (Our emphasis).

In struggling against tailism we are also struggling for a recognition that our fight against some of our comrades "tailing behind certain backward elements" is a fight to understand what stage of party-building we are at. There are two separate historical tasks in party-building. In 'Left-Wing Communism' Lenin pointed out that the first historical task is that of "winning over the class-conscious vanguard of the proletariat to Soviet power and the dictatorship of the working class" a task which "could not be accomplished without a complete victory over opportunism...". The second historical task "consists in being able to lead the MASSES to the new position that can ensure the victory of the vanguard in the revolution.". Clearly we are still very much at the first historical stage: that of winning over the 'Class-conscious vanguard'. That is why ideological struggle for proletarian po-

---

(34) Mao - 'On Coalition Government'.

licies and against the opportunists in order to win over the vanguard to a correct position, in this case that nationalisation is state-capitalism, is our PRINCIPAL task now. (35).

MARXISM-LENINISM WILL WIN!

"What is a true bastion of iron? It is the masses, the millions upon millions of people who genuinely support the revolution. That is the real iron bastion which it is impossible, for any force on earth to smash." (36).

Marxism-Leninism is weak in Britain today. We are only just emerging from the stage of anti-revisionism and entering the stage of party-building. We have learnt many lessons in past struggles - as we apply those lessons in party-building the CFB(M-L) will participate in the struggle to build a revolutionary party which will sweep away the opportunists who seek to divert the class struggle into the blind-alley of reformism and state capitalism, and, basing itself on the "bastion of iron", recognising that "the masses have a potentially inexhaustible enthusiasm for socialism"(Mao), will lead the masses in overthrowing the state machine and in SOCIALISING, not nationalising, the means of production.

---

(35) See Notes. 7.

(36) Mao - 'Be Concerned With the Well-being of the Masses, Pay attention to Methods of Work'.

NOTES

- (1) The extent to which British imperialism has been outstripped by the other imperialist powers is simply illustrated by the following tables.

A) Gross Domestic Product(base of 100 in 1961).

	<u>1961</u>	<u>1974</u>
Japan	100	325
USA	100	185
Germany	100	160
UK	100	125

(Source:Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development(OECD) National Accounts, 1975).

B) Share of World Trade (expressed as %).

	<u>1961</u>	<u>1974</u>
Germany	20%	25%
USA	22%	17.5%
Japan	7.5%	14%
UK	16%	7.5%

(Source: National Institute Economic Review, 1975).

- (2) The profits of manufacturing companies have dramatically fallen in REAL terms over the past decade or so. The following table gives the amount of capital available for investment and dividends after allowance for capital consumption, stock and tax.

<u>1961</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1973</u>
14.5%	13.5%	9.5%	3.5%

Although the method of economic calculation used here is a bourgeois method it does starkly reveal the truth of the Marxist thesis of the falling rate of profit. The general tendency for the rate of profit to fall occurs because of the changing organic composition of capital: as the ratio of constant capital(plant, machinery etc.) to variable capital(labour power) increases so the rate of profit decreases. The increased ratio of dead labour (machines) over living labour(the actual labour power expended in the course of work) inevitably leads to a falling rate of profit as it is the amount of labour expended

in the production of commodities which produces the surplus value expropriated by the bourgeoisie.

It is this process which produces an investment crisis like that which currently is crippling British industry. Capital is invested wherever it can make the maximum profit (see Note 5 ). In imperialist countries this usually means a shift in investment from domestic industry to investment in colonies and neo-colonies.

British Investment at Home and Abroad.

	<u>1968</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>
Domestic	1425	1514	1359
Abroad	350	744	1350

(Source: Financial Times, 12th Sept. 1974).

- (3) Although the Tory Party is in reality also a party of state monopoly capitalism in that it is the alternative bourgeois party in an imperialist (state monopoly capitalist) country, its close links with the industrial and commercial bourgeoisie makes it difficult for it to carry out extensive nationalisation. The Party is compelled because of its social base to periodically attempt to reverse the tide of nationalisation (e.g. the 'hiving-off' campaigns, such as the last Tory government's selling off of Thomas Cook's, British Rail Hotels and Carlisle state pubs to private enterprise). The realities of economic life in Britain make these attempts futile in contrast with the fact they are COMPELLED to intervene in industry at the same time (e.g. the same government's nationalisation of Rolls-Royce). This fact accounts for the division of the Tory Party into 'interventionist' (Heath, Barber, Carr) and 'monetarist' (Thatcher, Joseph) wings of the party.

The Labour Party is peculiarly suited for the role of expanding state monopoly capitalism. An important element of the party's ideology since its origin has been Fabian bourgeois 'socialism' like that of the Webbs, who saw in state ownership and control a means of rescuing imperialism from its doom. At the same time the social base of the Labour Party in the reformist Labour Aristocracy, and the reformist illusions of the masses generally, give it the mass base it needs to carry out its policies of state capitalism. The split between right and 'left' in the Labour Party is not a split between two wings of social-democrats and 'Marxists' as the bourgeois media would have us believe, but a split between two wings of social-democracy: a pragmatic right wing (Wilson, Healey, Jenkins) who are little different from the 'interventionist' wing of the Tories, and a 'left' wing (Benn, Foot, Heffer) who are ideologically committed to 'socialism', i.e. state capitalism.

- (4) The funds for capital investment in industry provided by the government come from taxation. State capitalism shifts the burden of the capitalist crisis from the bourgeoisie onto the backs of the working people and thus increases their already grievous exploitation and oppression. As Lenin puts it;

"Production becomes social, but appropriation remains private. The social means of production remain the private property of a few. The general framework of formally recognised free competition remains and the yoke of a few monopolists on the rest of the population becomes a hundred times heavier, more burdensome and terrible". (Imperialism-The Highest Stage of Capitalism).

Furthermore the great increase in government spending on investment in capitalist industry should be contrasted with the savage cuts in public expenditure - on schools, hospitals, housing, transport etc.. The misery of the people is increased still further to prop up an odious system, the property of the bourgeoisie.

- (5) In the crisis of imperialism profits cannot be maintained at a level sufficient to maintain the current volume of capital. Furthermore the central dynamic of capitalism is the quest to maximise profits:

"It is said that the average rate of profit might nevertheless be regarded as quite sufficient for capitalist development under modern conditions. That is not true. The average rate of profit is the lowest point of profitability, below which capitalist production become impossible. But it would be absurd to think that, in seizing colonies, subjugating peoples and engineering wars, the magnates of modern monopoly capitalism are striving only to achieve the average rate of profit. No, it is not the average of profit, nor yet a super-profit - which as a rule, represents only a slight addition to the average rate of profit - but recisely the maximum profit that is the motor of monopoly capitalism. (Stalin-'Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR').

- (6) Lenin has strong words to say on the question of uniting with the demands of the opportunists:

"But this is not the point, messrs. the Kautskyites. The point is that at the present time, in the imperialist countries of Europe, YOU ARE FAWNING on the opportunists, who are ALIEN to the proletariat as a class, who are the servants, the agents of the bourgeoisie and the vehicles of its influence, and unless

the labour movement RIDS itself of them, it will remain a BOURGEOIS LABOUR MOVEMENT. Your advocacy of 'unity' with the opportunists... is objectively a defence of the ENSLAVEMENT of the workers by the imperialist bourgeoisie with the aid of its best agents in the Labour movement. The victory of revolutionary Social-Democracy is absolutely inevitable, only it is moving and will move, is proceeding and will proceed, AGAINST you, it will be a victory OVER you. One of the necessary conditions for preparing the proletariat for its victory is a long, stubborn and ruthless struggle against opportunism, reformism, social-chauvinism, and similar bourgeois influences and trends, which are inevitable, since the proletariat is operating in a capitalist environment. If there is no such struggle, if opportunism in the working-class movement is not utterly defeated beforehand, there can be no dictatorship of the proletariat. Bolshevism would not have defeated the bourgeoisie in 1917-19 had it not learnt before that, in 1903-17, to defeat the Mensheviks, i.e., the opportunists, reformists, social-chauvinists, and ruthlessly expell them from the party of the proletarian vanguard." (From 'The Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat' (emphases in original)).

The importance of theory to combat 'activism', to strengthen our political line and to SMASH OPPORTUNIST TENDENCIES was emphasised by Lenin at a similar stage of party-building to our own:

"Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement. This thought cannot be insisted upon too strongly at a time when the fashionable preaching of opportunism goes hand in hand with an infatuation with the narrowest forms of practical activity. Yet, for Russian Social-Democrats the importance of theory is enhanced by three more circumstances, which are often forgotten: firstly, by the fact that our party is only in the process of formation, its features are only just becoming outlined, and it is yet far from having settled accounts with other trends of revolutionary thought, which threaten to divert the movement from the correct path. On the contrary, precisely the very recent past was marked by a revival of non Social-Democratic revolutionary trends... Under these circumstances, what at first sight appears to be an 'unimportant' mistake may lead to the most deplorable consequences, and only shortsighted people can consider

FACTIONAL DISPUTES AND A STRICT DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN SHADES SUPERFLUOUS. The fate of Russian Social Democracy for many, many years to come may depend on the strengthening of one or other 'shade.'" ('What is To Be Done' (our emphasis)).

In struggling for this truth we are struggling not only against right opportunism generally, but also an objectively right opportunist tendency in the Marxist-Leninist movement: a tendency which worships mass work ("the narrowest forms of practical activity") to the detriment of theory. Again to quote Lenin:

"Those who have the slightest acquaintance with our movement cannot but see that the wide spread of Marxism was accompanied by a certain lowering of the theoretical level. Quite a number of people with very little, and even a total lack of theoretical training joined the movement...We can judge from that how tactless the Rabocheye Dyelo is when, with an air of triumph, it quotes Marx's statement: 'Every step of real movement is more important than a dozen programmes.' To repeat these words in a period of theoretical chaos is like wishing mourners at a funeral 'many happy returns of the day'. Moreover these words of Marx are taken from his letter on the Gotha programme, in which he SHARPLY CONDEMNS eclecticism in the formulation of principles: if you must unite, Marx wrote to the party leaders, then enter into agreements to satisfy the practical aims of the movement, but do not allow any bargaining over principles, do not make 'concessions' in questions of theory. This was Marx's idea, and yet there are those among us who strive - in his name - to belittle the significance of theory! (What Is To Be Done' (emphasis in original)).

- (7) Who are the 'class-conscious vanguard'? Marxist-Leninists understand that the advanced workers are not necessarily those to be found most active in the official labour movement. The reformist, revisionist and Trotskyist orientation of the movement of the class struggle around the hacks of the official labour movement must be boldly struggled against. We will go to the masses for support for Marxist-Leninist policies:

"Engels draws a distinction between the bourgeois labour party of the OLD trade unions - the privileged minority - and the "LOWEST mass," the real majority and he appeals to the latter who are not infected by "bourgeois respectability".

This is the essence of Marxist tactics!...

And it is therefore our duty, if we wish to remain socialists, to go down LOWER and DEEPER, to the real masses. This is the whole meaning and whole purport of the struggle against opportunism. By exposing the fact that the opportunists and social-chauvinists are in reality betraying and selling the interests of the masses, that they are defending the temporary privileges of a minority of the workers, that they are the vehicles of bourgeois ideas and influences, that they are really allies and agents of the bourgeoisie, we teach the masses to realise their true political interests, to fight for Socialism and for the revolution...

The only Marxist line in the world labour movement is to explain to the masses the inevitability and necessity of breaking with opportunism, to educate them for revolution by waging a relentless struggle against opportunism..." ('Imperialism and the Split in the Socialist Movement' (emphasis in original)).