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PROLETARIAN BROADSIDE No. 2

We recognize, in the present crisis of the capitalist mode of production, the role of the state in the reproduction of capitalist relations. The state, as the institutional form of class rule, represents the interests of the dominant class and its ruling political and economic interests. The state is a necessary instrument for maintaining the stability of the capitalist system and for ensuring the profitability of capital.

The state acts as a mediator between the various classes and interests, facilitating the reproduction of capitalist relations. It does this through a variety of mechanisms, including the distribution of resources, the enforcement of laws and regulations, and the provision of public goods and services. The state's role is to ensure the smooth functioning of the capitalist system, enabling the accumulation of capital and the expansion of the productive forces.

The state's actions are driven by the interests of the capitalist class, and its policies are designed to uphold the system's stability and durability. This includes measures that may appear beneficial to the broader population, such as the provision of public goods and services, but ultimately serve to maintain the status quo and protect the interests of the ruling class.

In conclusion, the state is a crucial component of the capitalist mode of production, playing a significant role in the reproduction of capitalist relations and the maintenance of the capitalist system.
The Falling Rate of Profit

Capitalist profit derives from the exploitation of the working class. This term 'exploitation' is not a mere moral precept - it designates the basic economic fact that the worker must work for a part of the day to produce subsistence addition to reproduction and beyond this part he produces values for the capitalist who receives no equivalent. What the worker produces during the working day is his surplus labour. The surplus labour is performed by the capitalist in his capacity as worker during the period in which he has surplus labour over and above his necessary labour. It is the basis of capitalist profit, as well as the other terms of issuing of the ruling class such as rent and interest.

How the process of capitalist competition means that each capital is forced to exploit the workers to the utmost extent, in order to survive. Capital must expand to survive. If capital is not increased in scale and use more productive machines, that the capitalist can know the surplus profit on the market. And the only way to do this is to gain a high rate of surplus profit, that is to increase its production and hence increase its capital. If the time required for the production of the necessary labour power is fixed by a Law of Falling-day, then exploitation may be increased by a lengthening of the working day.

The extension of the working day has here extended the period of surplus labour from 5 hours to 9 hours - with a time of 5 hours to the reproduction of the labour power. But this period of increasing exploitation, which is called Law of Falling-day, is not in the interests of capital to work the labour force so hard into the ground that the production of the product is threatened. As Marx pointed out, despite the hysterical forecasts of dose from the economists of the ruling class. The introduction of the 6-hour day in Britain, was in the basic aspects of the capitalist class. It saved many of destroying the workers who forced the workers into a situation of their ruling position.

The alternative method of increasing exploitation is by reducing the time during which the workers have to reproduce their labour power. But this time can be increased with increased wages of money, if the means of transport can be increased with a working day of a fixed length.

In this illustration the length of the working day is 9 hours, but if the time of necessary labour is reduced from 3 hours to 1 hour, then the time not free for surplus labour and the production of profit increases from 6 hours to 7 hours. How can this be done? The general way in which the period of necessary labour is reduced is through an increase in the productivity of labour, so that the worker can produce the same wage-goods in a shorter time.

This drive to increase the productivity of labour in order to augment exploitation - which has been called the 'law of rising wages' - is basic to advanced capitalism. Now in order to increase the productivity of labour the capitalist must invest more capital. The combination of these factors means that the tendency of the capital investment must change. More capital has to be laid out on means of production and raw materials in relation to that laid out on labour power of workers.

There are scientific terms which provide a precise shorthand for these two parts of capital investment. Capital laid out in raw material, capital laid out in machinery, raw materials, factory buildings, etc., is called "constant capital", it has a constant value which is transferred to the product through the labour of the workers is raw materials, or simply and in pieces of tools and machinery. The capital laid out on labour power is called "variable capital". This is because of the variation in value between what the capitalist pays out (wages, or value of labour power) and what he pockets by virtue of his ownership of the means of production - the product of the whole working day.

In this case the term "variable capital" is used in contrast to "constant capital" in any given investment we call the "organic composition of capital". Thus the argument is that the development of the productivity of labour under capitalism leads to an increasing organic composition of capital.

This tendency is a result of the pursuit of the highest possible profits by each individual capitalist, but what benefits each capitalist in the short run may have less obvious consequences for capital as a whole in the long run. This effect is that the rate of profit as a whole will fall, and this fall will affect the overall rate of profit in the long run. If C stands for constant capital, V for variable capital, the rate of profit, r, can be represented as r = (C - C')/V where C' is the surplus value divided by the total capital invested. What we want to investigate is the effect of the increasing organic composition of capital on the rate of profit. As it is labour power and not machinery which produces new values, an increase in C relative to V will tend to mean that the same surplus labour is required in excess of what was in the past. The surplus value is therefore divided by a greater amount of capital, and the rate of profit will tend to fall. Of course there is a contradiction in the assumption that the rate of profit is increasing in excess of any new capital surplus is extracted from the workers. All this is important, but as we are very short, in order to be able to analyse the relative surplus value - the increasing organic composition of capital leading to the tendency for the rate of profit to fall - with respect to one tendency counteracted by others, or will express itself in actual fall in profit, in our diagram we must be more historically specific. We must introduce into the discussion the nature of the working class and the reserve army of unemployment.

The Latent Reserve

In fact there is a long period of capitalist development during which the tendency for the rate of profit to fall remains in the background. Capitalists depend upon a pool of 'free' workers, by 'free' here we mean (a) owning no means of production (free of property) (b) legally free to sell their labour power to capital i.e. not bound by direct ties of slavery or labour service, or are considered for employment and artisans into "free' workers in this sense does not happen all at once. In Western Europe the process began with the growth of capitalism and the development of an exportation from the land, but it was continued by "more peaceful" means through the working of the market. The capitalist class, in order to lower the price of labour, the wage level, the working day, they were overthrown. This means that the government of living (relative surplus value), but the constant fund of new workers into the market, with the capitalist class be the source of surplus value.

The margin of surplus value is the difference between the capitalist class and the working class. The capitalist class consider this margin as a "surplus" and its existence has important effects on the character of capitalist development.

Earlier we assumed that the worker was paid the full value of his labour power. This was basically in order to show that even when this is the case the process of capitalist exploitation still exists. Exploitation in this case means that the capitalist class can extract more surplus value by increasing the productivity of labour, without reducing the exploitation of the workers. In the general case we showed that the capitalists can extract more surplus value by increasing the productivity of labour, without reducing the workers' margin of living (relative surplus value), but the constant fund of new workers into the market, for example, the expansion of capitalist relations is always "more surplus value" to increase exploitation with no tendency to fall. Also with an expanding proletariat the capitalists can re-invest their augmented capital without increasing the proportion of constant to variable capital, the excess value due to the changes in production due to the same change, without altering the rate of profit.

In many cases when the profit rate falls below the current rate of interest, the banks of depositors, even if they do not necessarily increase their surplus capital, can always find other sources of profit. The depression in the '30s was a crisis of stagnation, brought on by insufficient investment. It could therefore be resolved by the state financing more investment. - Keynesianism. But we are not in the middle of a prolonged period of reinvestment of profit (accumulation of capital) in a society in which the capitalist system of production has replaced the pre-capitalist for the first time, and hence used up the latent reserve army of labour. That is why we say that 'progressive' Keynesian-type reforms are no longer an option.

1. We are simplifying here, but we shall come back to explain what is lacking in this formulation.
2. Thus the "value of labour power" is not reducible to a hypothetical "biological subsistence minimum". It is set historically and culturally. Relations between wealth and the value of labour power is historically relative - if the bourgeoisie imposes a wage cut out of a given class from which they are driven below the value of labour power, but if the wage cut is general and long-term we may say that the value of labour power had been reduced.
The British capitalist may be a bit slow on the uptake, but he is no idiot. He has not yet got the combined brains of the treasury and a few consultative economists to call on. So, now, twenty years on from the point at which the share of surplus value going in profit started to fall, he has realised that this may have something to do with the shift from productive to unproductive work.

### Division of Surplus Value 1949–1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Wages and Salaries of Unproductive Workers</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Profit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The spokesmen of the ruling class express their intention of cutting back on the number of "unproductive workers." Just what do they mean by "unproductive"?

For capital, the only productive workers are those who produce a profit — the workers who can be exploited to produce a profit. Since capitalists can make no profit out of state employees, civil servants, nurses, etc., these are all considered unproductive. Workers in industry, from when capital can make a profit, are considered productive, just as are transport workers. These, therefore, are the first to be counted in our table showing productive and unproductive workers from the viewpoint of capitalism.

### Table: Productive and Unproductive Workers from the Capitalist Stereotype

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages and Salaries</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>9,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>1,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering &amp; Hotels</td>
<td>2,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Productive for Capital or Labour?**

As we can see, however, the public administration workers make up only a small proportion of the unproductive workers. Many more are employed in banking, retailing, etc. Why then all this fuss about the state sector?

The answer is obvious. Although banking and retailing are unproductive, being mainly a matter of book-keeping and transferring property between owners, they enjoy a whole group of capitalist advantages to make profits. Workers in the banks do not produce any surplus value, but they do enable bankers to get hold of profit produced elsewhere. The capitalist class has a vested interest in keeping such unproductive workers that it rather than the state employs. The attack on unproductive labour must be carefully steered away from the more wasteful aspects of the capitalist division of labour.

The working class, however, need no such reticence on the question. Unlike the bourgeois class the proletariat can deal with the question of productive and unproductive labour with a clear conscience. We know that it is not only the army of state bureaucrats who produce no profits, but also the whole host of company bureaucrats, salaried, accountants, and bank clerks, who are a burden on the productive workers. All of these serve no socially useful function, and are paid out of the surplus value expropriated from the working class. So long as the labour of the producers has to support this ever growing army of non-producers there can be no hope that the labour-saving inventions of modern technology will benefit the working class.

The manual workers of this country still have to work on average almost 6 hours a week. The enormous advances in the productivity of labour since the war have resulted in only the most meagre of reductions in the working week. We have a token 40 hour week — token because you can't get a living wage on 40 hours. While the average they produce rises from year to year, the share that the producers get back in wages falls, and we ever larger part of the growing surplus they produce goes on to maintain the unproductive. "The more productive capitalist industry has become, the greater the mass of surplus value it extracts from the productive population — the greater became the mass of capital, seeking its share in the surplus. And the greater the mass of capital, the greater the mass of unproductive activities which serve only the inversion of this surplus and its distribution among various capitals." (Marx, frenzement Labor and Monopoly Capital, MHR 1974).
We see that the capitalist standpoint there are 173 million hours of productive manual work done per week. On the other side there are 300 million hours of done work each week in unproductive sectors of the economy. We are left with the non-essential work done in industry, all 286 million. Consequently, whether this is productive or unproductive, none of it will be unproductive work like non-sleeping - work which keeps track of rather than produces value. Also included will be the work of managers and supervisors who are employed by the capitalist class to make sure that the workers are hard at work. This too is strictly speaking unproductive labour. On the other hand it will include the work of design, production, manufacturing, etc. Let's make the generous assumption that half of this work is really productive. That gives us 173 million hours of productive work per week. From the capitalist standpoint the remaining 286 million hours are an unproductive overproduction of commodities necessary under capitalism a continual increase in the proportion of society's labour devoted to accounting and sales effort.

The working class approach to productive and unproductive labour is quite different. For us labour is productive if it produces social use-values, i.e., it produces social use-values necessary for the existence of capitalist social relations. For us unproductive labour is that which produces social use-values necessary for the existence of capitalist social relations. Thus the working class standpoint will reduce to a bare minimum all activity of exploitation.

In the light of this discussion we can see that our previous definition of the rate of profit (G/ (V+M) theoretical capital invested) is rather abstract. Total surplus value includes not just profit but also interest, rent, and the wages of unproductive workers. So the ratio of profit in which the capitalists are interested depends not just on the value extracted from the productive workers but also on the proportion of the total surplus value which is paid out to unproductive workers.

We may now see the sense (from the bourgeoisie point of view) in the government's present strategy. The attack on unproductive workers' remuneration as an attempt to increase the restriction of the exploitable work force. An increase in the number of workers producing surplus value will mean that more surplus value is produced, and that less of the total surplus value is disposed of as wages of unproductive workers. Also the unemployment resulting from the expulsion of unproductive workers will bring about a reduction of productivity as not only will more workers be exploited but there is the possibility of increasing the exploitation of each worker.

As an unexpected consequence the workers will in the end be better off. But the result doesn't mean that we are witnessing the 'last crisis of capitalism', with socialism just round the corner. It seems that the government's strategy will meet with success. But this success may be temporary, for the measures outlined above lead to a recovery in the rate of profit and the accumulation of capital is revived in a new form, then once again there will be full employment and accumulation will run up against the limits of the exploitable work force. The working class may be forced to accept the process of accumulation, but it cannot abolish the laws of society.

We have seen the bourgeois rationale for the cuts. We are likely to affect the working class? Let us make no facile assumptions, and start with the facts and functional questions: Are the cuts really against the interests of the working class? The explicit intention of the Intersoc of the Intersoc of the working class is the class that is capable of bringing about the changes a rather different from the straightforward trade unionist conception. In determining the interests of the workers in a period of crisis like this we must begin by analysing the counter-revolutionary conception of the Intersoc of the working class - the class that is capable of bringing about the changes in a rather different from the straightforward trade unionist conception. In determining the interests of the workers in a period of crisis like this we must begin by analysing the counter-revolutionary conception of the Intersoc of the working class - the class that is capable of bringing about the changes. First we can make the following list:

1. The crisis of British capital
2. The crisis of the working class
3. The crisis of manual labour
4. The crisis of the working man
5. The crisis of the working woman
6. The crisis of the working child
7. The crisis of the working class
8. The crisis of the working class
9. The crisis of the working class
10. The crisis of the working class
11. The crisis of the working class
12. The crisis of the working class
13. The crisis of the working class
14. The crisis of the working class
15. The crisis of the working class
16. The crisis of the working class
17. The crisis of the working class
18. The crisis of the working class
19. The crisis of the working class
20. The crisis of the working class

These are the crises facing the working class. Now let us see what the working class can do to counter these crises.

Strategy

We have seen why the capitalist state is trying to cut public expenditure and what it does but what about a socialist state? In other words, what could the workers do if they came to power?

First we must realize that a workers state is something very different from a capitalist one. A capitalist state exists to preserve the social relations which are the essential basis of a capitalist social order. Here we do not deny that the capitalist state has long since become a vast and parasitic bureaucracy upon the body of society, that it is of social order and it is by its own capitalist apparatus and functions, a dead weight that the workers must support.

The socialist revolution will be far more radical in its aims than could have been expected of the workers state. It is the workers state as the Paris Commune of 1871 - Marx said: "It begins the revolution of labour - and its great enemy - by doing away with all the man-made work of the state parasites, by cutting away the strings which absorb an immense portion of the national income."

The workers state is the state of the working class, the state in which the control of the state is controlled by the workers, in which the workers are in charge of the state. This is a political revolution. But the economic revolution is the economic revolution. The state apparatus and replace it with a system of worker-managers in which the real work of administration would be carried out by those who actually do the work in society.

Money or Labour?

A bourgeois government does its national accounting in terms of money. It is more natural, since capitalism is about making money. But labour is the real essence of all value as a workers state will, as we will calculate in terms of labour not money. Its first objective would be to free the workers of the burden of work. This would be the limit of the workers state. By getting free and creative energies of the working class and making work a pleasure, a true improvement in productivity could soon be achieved. But even without this, the 'free' saving could be made by simply cutting out the waste of labour. The following table gives some ideas of just how big the saving could be for instance we estimate that 1% of the working time of the working class could easily be reduced to 25 hours per year.
Our estimate of the number of workers who could be set free under socialism is about 80 million. This is a conservative estimate, since we have been forced to make some very arbitrary assumptions about the numbers set free from public administration and education, etc., but we have no justification for making such assumptions. At present about 60 million out of 1.5 million employed in the education sector are actually involved in teaching. That means that there is not even one teacher employed in education. None of them will be necessary, for preparing school meals for instance, but that still leaves an open space for administrative bureaucracy and for any teacher one can use, the further a job goes from the classroom, the greater its pay and perks. In this light, a reduction by one quarter is far from nonexistent. Similarly if public transport were free it is easy to imagine the savings in the public sector, in bus conductors, bus drivers, etc. The reduction of public administration and defense by 2/3 is a conservative estimate of what could be gained by changing the state and dismantling the standing army.

In qualitative terms our figures may be rough and ready, but in qualitative terms they give an accurate indication of the radical change that a revolution would bring.

After these deductions, we are left with 8,969,300 and 2,107,000 nonmanual and manual workers who can be considered productive from the orthodox class viewpoint. At the current working weeks for manual and nonmanual work, this gives a maximum of 700 million productive hours per week. If we include the unemployed, the available workforce in Britain is about 9 million. If all the 700 million HOURS OF WORK HAD BEEN EQUALLY ALLOCATED AMONG THEM, EACH WOULD ONLY HAVE TO WORK 30 A WEEK.

30 hrs

In the present economic situation, a 30 hour week with no loss in real income seems like an impossible dream for capitalism it is, but for socialism it would be the first step in the construction of a society that is, of course the state 'socialist' of the civil service alphabet. It opens with the assumption that the specialization of the state employee is accepted without question as the true socialist, that there is not even a thought about it, even: restricted to Britain, the state socialism of Italy in 1904 into Lenard's words:

"In the present situation, all employees recognized as such were established, which all, more or less placed themselves under the protection of socialist communists, and turning the office workers into the protector of their interests. At first these were the party office and telegraph office employees, from the lowest to the highest; then the teachers of primary and secondary schools, then those of the Jewish colony, and all in the name of democracy, civilisation, and socialism, demanded an increase of wages, and a dispersion of work in connection with the work of the employees; L. Giolitti himself, an official, had to declare in the Chamber that, if the employees of the state were like private employees, a fourth of the present numbers would suffocate the producer, that a concentration of offices, shops and warehouses, should render easier and more comfortable the lives of these officials, gentlemen, who work so hard, you know, the ignorance of the Italian socialists is so immense that no one asked if it were compatible with the program of the party of socialism to uphold the interests of bureaucratic personnel under the specious pretense that bureaucratic work was the right way to get rid of the party's most defined their claim. This policy of bureaucracy and electoral blackguardism is defended by Turati as the absolute leading of the state workers' movement. (see A. Labriola, 'Italian Socialism', in New International No. 27).

Our left, to the extent that it thinks about much foreign matters, imagines that Mussolini is one of the corporate state out of his evil head. In fact he neither had nor needed that originality, as Mussolini realized the condition of Italy only as he found it, organized, then he saw, into a syndical corporative interest groups all alienation for private and corporate profit, to make a state which confirmed as standing overwrought 'above' society. Class, whoever could capture that state directly controlled society. Mussolini's role on a plate - his 'Kauf' was like something out of Shakespeare. Opera is the scale of the opposition (or rather organized lack of it) is considered. But it is absurd to ask ourselves that 'all about the left wing of socialism and the editor of the party newspaper Avanti!'
General Principles

Three general principles hold true: 1) the working class should not allow its attention to be diverted into capitalistic side issues like devotion, politics, or religion; 2) it should seek its class strength; 3) the working class needs an overall policy concerning the economic conditions of the day, whereas we, if our condition is not immediately on the order of the day, or rather, even more because of this.

In the view of the left we believe that the interest of the working class will be served by a reduction in the number of unproductive workers, and the remuneration of capital accumulation; but only on certain terms.

These ideas are starkly unconventional. The left and all conventional ideas are not taken in trust but must be argued for.

The first reason for our opposing a reduction in unproductive labour is that it is the primary function of unproductive increase in the size of the industrial working class. Clearly, an increase in the numerical strength of an industrial proletariat improves the strategic position of the working class in society. The industrial proletariat is the hegemonic section of the working class, carries the greatest economic weight in any class struggle, and is the soul of such class consciousness as exists.

Secondly, we argue earlier, any substantial reduction in the working week would require a reduction in the number of unproductive workers or a rather a big reduction in the working week without a corresponding fall in earnings, and this may be why the amount of unproductive work is reduced.

But, you say, a reduction in the number of unproductive workers leads to unemployments. How many workers’ interests, the objection is real, and we will have to answer it. But first we must go on to the other point: capital accumulation.

Accumulation

Capital accumulation is the proper pace for what is more usually called investment. It is the process whereby a surplus product that capital has gained from the unpaid labour of the working class is converted back into capital. Capital, the accumulation of productive forces, is the essence of capitalism. workers’ income, the minimum of free wages, the capital.

He called it the General Law of Capitalist Accumulation. In his words:

"In these absolute movements of the accumulation of capital which we reflectively represent as movements of the wages of productive labour power, and therefore seen produced by the labourer’s own independent movements. To put the question in another way: does capital accumulation depend on the independent movements of the class, the independent, the dependent, the independent variable."

Correct! But capital accumulation depends on the independent movement of the workers. Capital’s independent movement, the workers’ spontaneous movement, is the centre of capital accumulation. "We must return to the independence of this movement (to the law of wages), to the independence of income, which is not the same as the independence of the workers."

Paradox

This is the fatal paradox of the system of private capitalism. Full employment provides the best opportunity for the prolongation of the system. Over population and complete employment undermines the workers’ capitalistic strength and forces down real wages. But full employment depends on the accumulation of capital as the motive and the fuel of this motor is exploitation.

Only scarce exploitation seems to provide a chance to beat back exploitation.

This is the deal which progressive governments have offered us. Allow an increase in exploitation (through a new free market), this will give the "incentive" required for investment, bring full employment, and then we can, or, rather, we shall, become richer. This is not mentioned if we do raise, as a result of full employment, investment, inflation (investment is thus once again, banks and money, but banks and money are now under the control of the state). That is the essence of the new deal.

Talk about a topper that you can’t handle.

But why do the workers’ movement accept it? (And don’t go telling us it’s only the militant leaders who do).

Well, it doesn’t always. (For verification see 3. Death, etc. c/o Palace of Justice). During periods of capital accumulation and/or low unemployment, pay police don’t enter, but when accumulation stops and unemployment sets in, we lose the spirit of '75, the rates of workers see one option but to obey the (social) outside. Since the bourgeois initiative, it does happen, after all, to have the basic law of capitalism working for you.

Working Day

The only reason we can make, is to use the superior understanding of these laws given us by our socialist mentors to outclass the bourgeoisie. It has been the classical Marxist response to the industrial climate of what has been the classical Marxist response to the industrial climate.

The working day of the three ways the working class can fight against exploitation, the fight against the mechanization of work, the fight against the struggle for a shorter working day, the last being the most effective and in the long term most revolutionary. In the following advantages:

1) It reduces exploitation most effectively, since exploitation is nothing other than the compulsion to perform unpaid labour, to support capital and its state. The more the working day, and surplus labour is cut off at some rate.

2) It polarizes society, and makes class solidarity on the one hand those who perform surplus labour on the other, those who live off it.

3) As the International Working Men’s Association said over 100 years ago when proposing an international struggle for the 8 hour day (still not achieved here), the fight against the mechanization of work, or the struggle for a shorter working day, is the last the most effective and in the long term most revolutionary.

4) It is the only effective means in the workers’ hands to combat unemployment.

5) It offers an opportunity of raising the labour struggle from the squall level of demands disputes, and criticism, towards the pyramid of class struggle, from the domination of the factory, to a struggle by the whole proletariat against the whole bourgeoisie.

6) It opens a avenue for the development of the international unity of the working class as for instance in the struggle for a 7 hour work throughout Europe.

7) It directly opposes the example of the proletarian class to that of the bourgeoisie and the systematic production of the make of the surplus value profit (labor productivity) and the surplus value profit (labor productivity) across the board. It is a great step forward in the struggle against the domination of capital. This in turn lessens the pressure on the workers, which the workers must meet for their survival.

8) Prior to the revolution, the working class can not at that win comprised in its struggle and capital, the crucial thing is big disputes, and small gains, the struggle of one victory of a society which makes no other externally imposed necessity to which the producers must submit for safety survival, but becomes instead, the free activity of the free people who make their own world.

9) Because of the weakness of capital accumulation, they can’t compete with the capital accumulation, the workers can’t compete with the capital accumulation. Some workers have to work more, to work more, to work more, to work more, to work more, to work more, to work more.

Initiative

If the working class could only gain the Initiative, then only then, would it be in a position to dictate from strength, to impose terms rather than wait the bourgeoisie, to the famous words.

To return to the famous words. Where the bourgeoisie actually does stick out on the periphery of an economy. The reduction in the working week, the lower the pressure on the workers. The more capital will find that it can no longer afford its workers. If more workers reduce the workers and clerical work, but more, if instead the bourgeoisie to itself, the workers, when the number of workers who are not a profit to capital, to capital, capital, capital.

There are of course still some groups of workers who are productive for labour but not for capital. Among such are health workers and local authority social services. Their employment must be defended. But only an effective working class, can do it. If the working class has taken the initiative of the bourgeoisie, then can you forget any prospect of the working class leaning the economic power of the workers. The workers must know, there is no hope of investment directed to social use and not profit, no chance of full support this is the line, no option but to accept capital’s increasing bullying society.

To launch such an offensive, after it has been defeated, the key link in the strategy must be the remaining of the workers’ right to work, in the reduction of the working day.

Our Cut? Or theirs?
What is COBI?

1) COBI is a Marxist-Leninist Collective, formed on 1st January, 1974. Its purpose is to disseminate Marxist-Leninist Theory with the concrete conditions prevailing in the British Isles, and guided by this concrete development, to organise the British working class to express the class interests of the proletariat in the trade unions, in the political parties and in its movements for revolutionary socialist policies.

2) The history of the struggle to build such a party in the British Isles has been largely one of culture, the conscious transition to this was the Socialist Labour Party, henceforth, this party, unless otherwise we have adopted, and whose valuable experience we intend to assimilate.

3) A major reason for general failure has been the inability of revolutionaries in the British Isles to make a complete break with capitalist ideology; their failure to break with the praxis capitalist outlook of the British capitalist class has led them to underestimate the importance of Marxist-Leninist Theory for Revolutionary Socialism. Without the guidance of this theory there can be no communist parties.

4) We take the natural economic unit of the British Isles as the area of our organisation and oppose any attempts by bourgeois or popular nationalists to fragment working class organisation and solidarity within the above socio-economic unit. We resolutely place ourselves on the proletarian of the whole British Isles without exception, and will strive to strengthen their consciousness of belonging to an international class. Hence as a European state we shall extend ourselves accordingly.

5) In terms of the development and strength of its economic organisation, the working class of Britain has long ago pioneered and achieved adequate organisations of economic defence; in Trade Unions. So far, however, the working class has failed to get itself to the offensive development, the socialist organisations of industrial unions represents. We are going to get beyond the expression of trades unions - the Labour Party - to the class party of communists, although how this is to be formulated is by the Socialist Labour Party.

6) Thus COBI has as its immediate task the launching of a Mobilisation Programme for the proletariat in Britain, designed to constitute the proletariat as a class in its entirety over the working class as a whole. This Programme will not be the Transitional Programme of Trotskyist Stalinism, but which analyses the problems of the working class. Instead, it will be the Programme of a Social Democratic revolution, which proposes to make the working class a socialist class, instead of a socialist party. Hence we will be guided by the approaches of the Socialist Labour Party.

7) COBI demands the maximum ideological unity among its members, all members, must be prepared to engage in the struggle and continue to improve their understanding of scientific socialism and contribute to the ideological struggle. We will be admitted to full membership of the organisation unless they have demonstrated their commitment to the class struggle and their understanding of scientific socialism.

8) To supplement the efforts of its full membership, COBI encourages a wider group of Associate members to work in cooperation with it.

9) We call upon those who consider themselves Marxist-Leninists to work with us and to join the Collective Organisation, if they agree with what we have said above.

10) We call upon all those who regard themselves as revolutionary socialists, whether organised or not, to work with us as associates.

For full elucidation of these points, see:

THE PRESENT PLATFORM OF THE CONSOLIDATED ORGANISATION IN THE BRITISH ISLES From : 1/8 May Court, Edgbaston, XH1, 4ID.