

Black National Minorities, Working Class & the RCG

Recognising the importance of struggling against all forms of oppression and endorsing all forms of struggle against oppression is a hallmark of the political activity of Marxist-Leninists. What is as important is adopting correct and specific means of fighting that correspond to those oppressions. This is especially relevant when tackling the dual oppression of women and national minorities. Otherwise there is an evasion of the political conclusions necessary to rectify those particular dual oppressions, thus hampering the progress to a classless society.

That understanding forms the starting point for this article. In criticising the line of the Revolutionary Communist Group (RCG) on black people in Britain and their role in the revolutionary struggle for the socialist revolution, we focus on Issue 9 of 'Revolutionary Communist', the last issue of the RCG's theoretical journal to appear. The main article was devoted to "The struggle of the oppressed in Britain against racism and imperialism" (R.C. 9 p.1). Although published in the Summer of 1979, the discussion article "Racism, Imperialism and the Working Class" remains the most complete statement of the political basis the RCG sees for an anti-racist movement in Britain; it also laid the foundations for a line eventually endorsed in the RCG's Manifesto published in 1984.

Many points and arguments criticised in the RCG's line have appeared in the League's own newspaper, 'Class Struggle', because "for a considerable period 'Class Struggle' did not promote our collective viewpoint, but a view that was held by the editor of the paper." (CS Vol. 8 6/7 July/August 1984 p.2) Thus, in a real sense these criticisms are relevant to wider questions of reorientation debated within the league.

Inevitably the criticisms of the RCG's article involve presenting the arguments for a perspective that the League upholds. This perspective has become known as 'Free National Development' - (previous public explanations of the strategic alliance it entails are to be found in OCTOBER Vol.1 no.1 - 'The Struggle of National Minority People and the line of the RCL' - and Vol.1 no.2 - 'Racism, National Oppression and Free National Development') While the League makes no pretence of having examined all the questions concerning the oppression of national minorities in Britain, nor of having exhausted the subject, Free National Development is part of the programmatic task facing us as revolutionaries in Britain. It forms part of a developing contribution to our endeavours to shoot the arrow of Marxism-Leninism at the target of revolution in Britain (to paraphrase Mao Zedong).

The laws of dialectical development make any detailed prediction of exact plans for the future idealist. In advancing the principles inherent in the Free National Development

stance, we recognise that our theoretical understanding and analysis will become more specific, profound and detailed as it is subject to the corrective of practice. This is to be expected if our efforts are to be rooted in an objective and historical analysis of the contradictions that are confronted in the on-going development of working class and national minorities' struggles. Those whose theory and practice of revolution are little more than a dogma present the case that the national question must always be seen as subsidiary to the cause of revolution. But they are answering the wrong question.

As an organisation the League does not romanticise or belittle the tasks before us. In preaching, sermon like, workers unity, the argument often concentrates exclusively on the use of racism to divide the working class or on the racist ideas of white workers, reducing the struggle for working class unity to either self interest or a liberal appeal to conscience and morality. In doing either the revolutionary thrust of national minority struggles is denied.

The appeal to help the "underprivileged minorities" reinforces the approach that national minorities should be uplifted into the mainstream labour movement, that is, trade unions. But for practical reasons alone, a working class imbued with the prejudices of chauvinist patriotism and racism requires more than a few formulas on workers unity.

Such an appeal blurs over the differences between the working class and national minorities. And in doing so side-steps the historical necessity involved: the right of the multi-national working class to be free of national as well as class oppression. This is a demand that has been developed in numerous struggles, on the initiative of the national minority people themselves. To exclude this demand from the revolutionary programme is a fatal act of chauvinism.

Part of what is at stake in the struggle against racism is the unity of the multi-national working class. This unity can only be built by addressing the contradictions within the class, the resolution of which is the recognition by white national majority of the right of the oppressed national minorities and support for their just demands.

A consistent element in the political consciousness and activity of black national minorities in Britain is their involvement with the struggles of their countries of origin: witness the demonstrations of Southall's Sikhs at the assassination of Gandhi, the vote for Kashmiri defendants in Birmingham's local elections and the composition of those who demonstrated at the U.S. invasion of Grenada. Such a point need not be laboured when so many national minority communities contain numerous specific organisations based on nationality. These national elements are also reflected in so many struggles, not just against state racism, but in relation to demands concerned with their own culture and language: for instance, Rastafarian prison rights, black educational orientation in schools, mother tongue teaching. (see National Freedom CLASS STRUGGLE 7.5 May 1983).

Superficially these elements, and their national character

are recognised in the article in 'Revolutionary Communist 9' when it states that:

"The racism and racial oppression within Britain today is a particularly form of imperialist oppression. It is the form taken by national oppression within the oppressor nation." (RC p.10)

This early recognition does not permeate the entire analysis and indeed is gradually diluted until we are informed that national oppression is reproduced in the imperialist heartland by "the ruling class encouragement of discrimination" p.22

In employing a conceptual approach that recognises that –

"The oppression of nations is reproduced within the imperialist state as racial oppression" (p.11),

But then shrinking from accepting the political consequences which that entails, the article fails to provide the clarity necessary for advance.

"A RACIALLY OPPRESSED SECTION OF THE WORKING CLASS"

Throughout the article it is clear that, despite the definitions employed, its authors use a deductive reasoning which channels the analysis to a priori principles rather than a study and analysis which results in the development of principles and premises. Take the RCG's use of the term 'black and immigrant workers' throughout its publications; the avoidance of the term 'national minorities' is not a matter of semantic niceties, it reflects a basic theoretical position. Quite clearly the RCG ascribes to black people in Britain a particular functional role in the domestic labour market. A great deal of empirical data is used in a mechanical fashion to assert the existence of "a special, super oppressed section of the working class" (p.25), that is, black people in Britain occupying a class position with a distinctive set of economic functions. Thus

"Racial oppression has forced black people to occupy the worst jobs, the lowest paid jobs, the worst conditions, shift work etc. and racial oppression is used to keep black workers in these sectors." (p38)

The RCG's article, for all its detail and polemics, does not make a qualitative break from the view which reduces the solution to that of uniting two class fractions. As its authors spell out, they see the situation that

"while one section of the working class – black and immigrant workers – face discrimination, face racist assault and face the state's attack, the other section – white workers – has not yet come to their assistance. This means the disunity, the splitting of the working class." (p.43)

The political basis for the unity of the class proves to be little more than a rehash of the traditional recipe of the English left. Its core is in the line that in the

struggle for an anti-racist unity as part of building the greater unity of the working class for socialist revolution, it is solely as workers that black people seek liberation: equality and full democratic rights to obtain an education, get a job and have a decent living.

However the facts do not fit this argument as neatly as some would want us to believe. It is not true that national minorities' struggles are immediately and directly bound up with the struggle of the working class. The struggle against national oppression in Britain is a movement of many classes, a reflection of the objective position and experience of national minorities in this country. There are specific community struggles that cross class boundaries within these communities, such as the struggle for Islamic provisions in education, the endeavours to send relief to Poland, and most commonly, the resistance to state deportations. Even the industrially based struggles of national minority workers have not been closely linked with the overall struggle of the working class and labour movement institutions in Britain, even when shared industrial conditions, such as at Hatfield's, provided a material basis for unity in struggle.

The daily experience of petty racist practices institutionalised in the state machinery, and endorsed by the majority nationality's individual racism and indifference, is the background in relation to which national minority communities often have a greater degree of unity and solidarity - in spite of class antagonism - than national minority workers have with class brothers and sisters in the dominant nationality. National oppression acts to weld communities together in resistance against that oppression. The RCG position, in common with the vast majority of the political left, avoids any consideration of the specific oppression which was previously identified as the reproduction of national oppression. The cardinal question that national oppression is the bourgeoisie's systematic suppression of nationalities - economically, politically, socially and ideologically - is not addressed. The RCG's reply to -

'What do we get from oppressed nations?'

is -

"a racially oppressed stratum of the working class"
(p.31)

This transformation is achieved by a reasoning that allows for the structural unity of the working class despite fractionalisation on the basis of racial oppression. No trace here of a national element to impede -

"the real issue facing the working class, that of building an anti-racist movement against the British state." (p.9)

ECONOMIC DETERMINISM

Imparting certain specific characteristics to immigrant labour, which is so central to the RCG analysis, is close to perpetuating the racial stereotype of the "backward" immigrant, with no formal education, no knowledge of industrial society etc. This theme runs through the main sources on which the article draws; so we have the influential Castles and Kosack talking of immigrants coming from communities with a pre-industrial mode of existence in which the

" hours and rhythms of work have been determined by the seasons and the natural needs of plants and animals " (S. Castles & Kosack, Immigrant workers and the class structure in Western Europe - Oxford University Press 1973 p.43) and the fiction that immigrants are unused to formal rules, and so on. Castles and Kosack's analysis defines the immigrants empirically, as young, unaccompanied men in the prime of their working lives with the particular aim of earning money and therefore cheap for Capital. These specific characteristics enable immigrants to be exploited in a specific way, and immigrant labour is seen as somehow external to imperialism but able to contribute to the domestic development of an imperialist economy. The RCG article does not take on board the last point . It recognises that:

" forced out of the oppressed nations by the poverty and starvation imposed by imperialism, immigrant workers and their descendants have become a super-exploited section of the working class. By this process imperialism has sown the seeds of its own destruction. " (FRFI 12, Sept. 1981 p1)

But it has taken on aspects of the Castles & Kosack approach in an uncritical way. National minorities demands are an element in the wider class struggle against Capital, but they cannot be deduced simply from the position of national minorities within the labour process. The RCG article falls into an empiricist position which detracts from the nature of the oppression to which black national minorities (along with other national minorities) are subject. A crude economic determinism colours their analysis as if a pure undefiled unit of labour abstracted from the mesh of countervailing social influences actually existed: theirs is the academic desire for the sameness of the statistic.

The British Left's analysis is coloured by the prescriptive assumption that the immigrant has entered a class position that is obscured by the emphasis on racism. Because racism is seen as a functional utility, the means to the realisation of ruling class interests - that of dividing class forces - the means of tackling intra-class antagonism is seen as a united class offensive against Capital's rule. The distribution of emphasis throughout the RCG's argument is on the need for unity because:

" The basis for creating real political unity is the recognition that the working class the oppressed people in Britain have a common interest in overthrowing the British imperialist state. " (RC 9 p43)

This finds expression in the slogan 'one struggle one fight' implying a convergence of struggles. Thus the RCG analysis remains in the left's framework that either liquidates the national element in national minority struggles or tries to portray it as really a class struggle for socialism. This theoretical model falls in error on many vital issues, and, through a narrow economic interpretation, seriously fails to challenge the ideological hegemony of imperialism.

The general strategic thesis on the fundamental contradiction between Capital and Labour is not replaced by the contradiction between the national minorities and dominant nationality in Britain. Both of these contradictions arose out of the development of imperialism as a world system, and one should not sever the inter-connections.

A dialectical materialist appraisal of these contradictions does not posit a fractured picture of the reality of imperialist exploitation. The conjuncture of class struggle can no longer validly be analysed or understood by looking at the internal economic workings or social formations of a specific society but must be studied at the global level of the imperialist world system. Defining racism in terms of the function performed for the domestic imperialist economy loses sight of the fact that racism developed as, and still remains, the ideological concomitant of imperialism's oppression of nations.

For national minority people in this imperialist society, racial oppression is the highest and most vicious form of national oppression. It is not separate from national oppression - it is intimately bound up with it and consequentially requires the resolution of the national question as the basis for its removal. If the question is posed whether class oppression precedes racist oppression as the determining factor, it is a good chance that one seeks an answer which can prove both arbitrary and mutually exclusive. This is fine for those who wish to invoke their desired conclusion which too often purports a class consciousness devoid of the racist reality of Britain. It gives no indication of a need for qualitative rupture with the opportunist practices, the virus of cultural supremacy and national arrogance engendered by over a century of British imperialist rule. Such a one dimensional 'workerist' approach is essentially an argument based on the premise that national minority oppression is a result of the function and position of the national minorities within the labour market. Conscious activists in class battles, in confronting the reality of a decaying imperialist society such as ours, recognise that a break from such an analysis is a task specified by the needs of revolutionary advance.. The fetish of fitting all phenomena within the parameters of the Labour/Capital contradiction

leads the RCG to eradicate the specific oppression of black people and, in practice, to portray it as part of a general offensive against democratic rights. As the article in ' Revolutionary Communist ' 9 argues the ruling class

" has launched a systematic offensive against this oppressed section of the working class. To achieve success in their aim of defeating black and immigrant workers the British capitalists are relying on there being no united working class struggle against racism If they succeed in that aim they will be capable of disuniting the working class struggle and so lay the basis for defeating the whole working class. " (RC 9 p43)

THE BLACK VANGUARD

Seeing only a strategy for the ruling class to pick one section off at a time, the racist wedge in working class unity is the RCG's principal complaint, emphasised throughout the article. Such a line negates any intrinsic value or autonomy in the struggle for national rights. Such national minority struggles are seen as important because they can be utilized in radicalizing the white working class, as FRFI has stated., " it is they, the black vanguard, whose experience and example will explain the issues to the rest of the working class. " (FRFI) No. 4

The revolutionary Communist Group would have seemed to have progressed a long way from their founding statement of October 1974 with its single mention of "immigrant labour" (our tasks and Methods Revolutionary Communist Reprints No. I, RCT August 1979 p11) But the emphasis placed on those least implicated in the old traditions reflects the RCG's birth marks, as the Revolutionary Opposition, inside I.S. (now S.W.P). Far from resting on the economic determinist basis that colours the RCG's perspective, the line with regard with young black workers could be mistaken for the inverse of the conclusions of bourgeois criminal sociology with its almost pathological fear of street unrest.

In its endeavours to defend working class unity against bourgeois and separatist ideologies, the article paves the way for ignoring any community response and the specific oppression of national minority communities. It refuses to see national minority people in any context other than as 'advanced workers'. A prime example of this approach was contained in FRFI's reportage on the Black People's Day of Action (FRFI 9 March/April 1981). Headlined 'Black Workers on the March' the report concluded: "All true revolutionaries and communists will see the resistance of the youth as a splendid example of revolutionary working class means of fighting oppression. Far from needing to 'excuse' it we rejoice that one section of the working class is on the road to revolution." (FRFI 9 p5) The transformation in terminology to proxy victories of black workers, nay black youth, fighting as the vanguard of the class singles out one section of national minority communities although the entire communities are effected by the national oppression imposed by an imperialist state.

Not content with arguing that the fundamental class character of national minority struggles stems from the over-

whelming working class composition of those communities, the RCG article argues that black people have utilized more advanced forms of class struggle and broken with respectable political tradition. It is part of a process that presents the case that the class demands of black people (!) are revolutionary and that their national demands are not. This neatly dovetails with the RCG's analysis of a labour aristocracy in Britain (a position stated in D.Reed's restatement of Lenin's position in FRFI 27, March 1933 : " Marx and Engels : the Labour aristocracy, opportunism and the British Labour Movement "), with its mechanical adoption of Lenin's advice " to go lower and deeper to the real masses ... not affected by 'bourgeois respectability' ". The tremendous potential of the working class for change has been crippled by decades of class collaboration, and divisions within the class are given prominence by the RCG. Indeed, the polarisation of class forces " between the privileged strata of the working class on one side and the growing ranks of oppressed workers on the other " (FRFI 33 Oct./ Nov. 1933) is ever present in their analysis. However in the application of this understanding the RCG identify the revolutionary potential of black people as that emanating from their status as workers, or more specifically as "people of no property" : the unemployed, the youth elements making up the vanguard that will draw in other sections. The English left's traditional commitment to specific struggles have contained a dominant element, an assessment of that struggle's relative social utility. For the RCG :

" The only revolutionary strategy today is to work among the most oppressed sections of the working class to build an anti-imperialist, anti-racist movement which can destroy the influence of the labour aristocracy over the working class as a whole. " FRFI 33)

CLASS STRUCTURE OF NATIONAL MINORITIES

The article's judgement that national minorities have been in general integrated into the social relations of production in the British class structure avoids acknowledging that their relations with the majority nationality remain both distant and generally uneasy. The marginalisation of national minorities by a bourgeois definition of " ethnicity " has provided an alternative, but equally reactionary set of racist stereotypes which reduces the national oppression of dynamic communities to the need for an 'equal rights' policy.

The article emphasises the state's attempts to buy off middle class members of the national minorities. The attempt to subvert resistance into organized channels of complaint by provision of state-funded resources to cultivate allegiances is indeed a dangerous threat to the solidarity of an anti-racist resistance not only that based in national minority organisations but also that of the proclaimed anti-racists in the dominant nationality. The attention paid to individuals co-opted by the state as "spokemen", to act

as "professional moderators of the struggle", as they are described in the RCG Manifesto, underplays the resistance to national oppression as a material social force. The intention of the British state to create a black professional middle class, to create an interest in the imperialist system, comes up against the racist reality that hems in any advance: the State could not provide enough subsidies or employment to defuse the resistance to state racism. As that oppression increases, more and more are drawn into the struggle against it.

Class differentiation within national minority communities is expected, but reference to the disproportionate number of middle class "immigrant members of the Executive Committees (RC 9 p29) of CRCs is hardly evidence of any serious consideration of the interaction of classes within the national minority communities. The composition of a "special and oppressed stratum within the working class" is one drawn from skilled and unskilled urban workers, agricultural labourers, middle peasants and poor peasants. This is lost in the catch-all reference to "Black and Immigrant workers". In terms of migrant labour from the "New Commonwealth", the unskilled category C was abolished by the 1965 white Paper, whilst vouchers for other categories containing doctors, teachers, technological graduates etc. were increased, creaming off the skilled and professionals from the Third World.

The existence of different socio-economic positions is a feature of national minority communities, and it is evident that the struggle for leadership of these communities does involve different class forces. However since there is a distinct fraction of petty-bourgeois capital that arose partly out of the specific needs of such communities, what should also be acknowledged is that it has not been successful in entering British Imperialism's stronghold of wealth, to exercise social power over the national minority working class, let alone the working class as a whole. In Britain's racist society, in which racism was, and remains an element in the construction of a class alliance (however transitory) the shopkeeper, small manufacturer, food importer, and religious hierarchy have joined in defence of their communities. This in spite of the contradictions within that community. This is demonstrated time after time in anti-deportation campaigns, and even though no one is protected by their class position if they are from a national minority community, the RCG, along with the rest of the British Left, maintains that immigration controls whilst inherently racist, is one of the major ways

"by which the state manipulates and controls this section of the working class". (RC 9 p18)

The assumption of an entity termed "black and immigrant labour" totally devalues the existence of national minority communities with different duration of settlement, geographic concentration, generational structures etc.

In the RCG's examination of immigration, people from the Third World are given a very ahistorical treatment. They are presented without a history or suggestion of continuity.

What is missing are those important dimensions of an anti-imperialist history and culture. The concept of a long independent historical tradition of national minority resistance in anti-colonialist struggles, providing an inspiration for struggles in Britain is absent in the RCG's understanding. Instead national minorities, particularly the youth " showed spontaneous anti-imperialist consciousness" (FRFI 4 p3). The lack of even passing reference to third World Theoretical or political traditions as providing any political basis reflects more than just a passing contempt.

PERPETUATION OF RACISM

Since the mid-sixties immigration controls have been overwhelmingly targeted upon the flow of dependants. The 1965 TUC General Council report expressed concern about the numbers of New Commonwealth Immigrants because " ...progress towards their integration is in some aspects being reversed as the numbers become large enough to constitute an extension of their previous environments and lead towards their settlement as a series of communities. " (Miles R & Phizakelaa A. - the TUC, Black Workers & New Commonwealth Immigration 1954 - 73 SRRC paper 6 1977 p17) That reactionary concern to promote assimilation has found its echo in the Left's attitude that it is a united class offensive against Capital that will end all manifestations of racism. To state that there is "a distinct oppressed stratum" (RC 9 p42) and then offer no specific remedy other than unite and fight against a common enemy of an imperialist bourgeoisie and its state fails to grasp the nature of the task facing communists in Britain. Not to recognize the national demands of oppressed nationalities is to perpetuate the chauvinism that has perpetually crippled the revolutionary movements in the imperialist countries. There is no understanding that the working class of an oppressor nation, a working class that has been enlisted in the process of the subjugation and depredation of the oppressed nation.

The main essence of racism is not that it divides a multinational working class (which is empirically correct), but that it was directed primarily at the subordinate classes in the oppressor nations and has been a major contribution to the ideological basis for working class support of imperialism. The alliance, however temporary, shifting and contradictory, between the classes of the oppressor nation directed against the oppressed nationalities has been presented in the 'national interest' be it against Polish refugees in the aftermath of the Second World War or the acceptance of expelled Keryan Asians. While it is true that the Labour Aristocracy has been responsible for the strengthening of chauvinism among the working class, with Labour's accomodation to the development of Britain's imperialist economy, the Left has consistently seen this as an all-embracing explanation and avoided the need to confront the racist and pro-imperialist ideology of the majority working class.

The recognition of this racist class symbiosis in terms of an acquiescence alongside a simultaneously antagonistic relationship between capital and labour is not to 'write off' the working class or its potential for revolutionary advance. The ideological permeation of the working class exists, brought about by an imperialist history and has its effects upon internal political relations. Working class struggle is already divided: mutual recognition of complementary struggles will advance freedom from oppression. Simply to assert that black people are part of the class does not result in the working class becoming a uniform whole. In fact it avoids tackling any question of the basis on which principled and effective unity is to be built between the majority working class and its most reliable allies, the national minority in Britain. This is to emasculate Marxism as a science of revolution, to remove it from the realm of the practice of revolution and strip it of its ability to serve as a reliable guide to the revolutionary process in Britain. The unity of theory and practice is best served not by arguing against the role of class, but by appreciating the dialectical force of national minorities in Britain as expressed in the 'Class Struggle' editorial of September 1982:

" Now the world crisis is "bring it all back home" and these world phenomena are imploded with increasing force into the imperialist countries themselves. "

The importance of the revolutionary nature of the national question in Britain finds no significance in an article which takes as its base assumption a sophisticated variant of a widely held view on the Left, that of an automatic structural unity of the working class in spite of factionalisation based upon racial oppression " achieved by the ruling class encouragement of discrimination" (RC 9 p22).

NATIONAL OPPRESSION AND SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

The struggle of the oppressed nationalities against the British state, in essence, can only be resolved through socialist revolution, because national oppression is an inherent feature of imperialism existence and can only be eliminated with the system's destruction. The historical example of socialist China and revolutionary Soviet Union in Lenin's and Stalin's time have shown that socialist revolution opens the way to the liberation of peoples and equality between nationalities. Lessons are to be learnt although speculation about the nature of the post revolutionary state is pointless. What must be clear is the need for a territorial component. The whole question of national oppression in Britain is not reducible to the right for provisions and rights in education, language and culture etc. It must encompass all local questions concerning the areas of national minority concentration. The strategic alliance will not come from denying specific national elements in national minority resistance, but by

recognizing them as worthy and positive factors.

There is agreement with the RCG article that "the struggle against racism, the defence of black people must be a necessary and integral part of the struggle for socialism." (RC 9 p35) But it is not a matter of the "working class must defend those suffering" (ibid) as national minority communities have and are defending themselves, nor is it that acceptance of the revolutionary road be made conditional on joint participation in anti-racist struggles as suggested in the article (RC 9 p30).

In the re-building of a genuine revolutionary communist party in Britain, communist activity in building the strategic alliance is essential.

While national divisions already exist in the working class, the reconstituted multi-national communist party is not built by smashing pre-existing forms of national minority organisations, arrogantly to 'feed off' them. Because of the differing nature and purpose of national minority organisations and the multi-national communist party the automatic merger of the two should not be taken as read. Given the double oppression of national minority working class comrades, both class and national oppression, they have a specific dynamic role in the forging of the strategic alliance.

Because the forging of this alliance is not simply a matter of struggle within the multi-national working class, it is essential for a multi-national communist party to build the alliance between the working class and national minorities, and to build working class unity as a predominant element. Communists must unite in action with national minority organisations regardless of whether any one national minority organisation within that alliance is communist led.

Communists from the dominant nationality have the prime responsibility for taking up the struggle against racism in the working class and winning the class to support the national rights of national minorities. While the tendency to tail after national minority nationalism may emerge as a main deviation at times, a deviation to be corrected, the opposite tendency to tail after the deep rooted chauvinism and liquidate the national element is overall the main danger to combat. The danger of narrow nationalism, as a vehicle to establish an exploitative dominance within national minority communities means that the responsibility to fight such bourgeois nationalism lies with national minority comrades.

Today's embryonic communist forces can only strengthen their grasp of the requirements of the revolutionary struggle through integrating marxism-leninism with concrete conditions. The process of the rectification of past Euro-centric practice is not just a readjustment, or reorientation, it is participation in constructing genuine

anti-imperialist politics on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. The long stubborn and ruthless struggle against opportunism, reformism, social chauvinism, sexism, racism and all imperialist ideologies is one of the necessary conditions for preparing the proletariat for its victory. It may involve on the road to state power mistakes and deviationist errors. This is not a bad thing : it can only be accomplished against the background of revolutionary practice. The promotion of free national development is part of the programmatic work to aid that victory, by recognising that the national question must be considered a part of the general advance of the socialist revolution. That consideration is absent in the RCG's article "Racism, Imperialism, and the Working Class".