CAN A LEFT WING LABOUR PARTY LEADER WIN A GENERAL ELECTION?

In order to undermine Jeremy Corbyn’s campaign various establishment figures have argued that it is not possible for the Labour Party to win a general election with a left wing leader. The precedent given is that of 1983 when the LP suffered a devastating defeat under the leadership of Michael Foot. However, Foot was no longer a committed left winger and had become the expression of establishment politics, and the election was influenced by the Falklands factor which enabled Thatcher to obtain many working class votes because of the role of nationalism. The LP has never contested an election with a genuine left wing leader since the time of Keir Hardie when the LP was still struggling to establish an identity that was distinct from that of the Liberal Party. However, the primary argument of the right wing is that the LP had its most sustained period of electoral success when the domination of New Labour meant the standpoint of pro-market politics was adopted and the traditional emphasis on nationalisation had been rejected. It is also argued that the influence of Tony Benn during the 1980’s had been disruptive and undermined the prospect of the LP gaining an electoral victory despite the unpopularity of Thatcherism. This situation could be repeated if Corbyn becomes leader of the LP.

In empirical terms it is difficult to disagree with these arguments. The views of the left wing of the LP have only appealed to a minority of activist’s ad trade union militants, and it is unlikely that Benn could have won an election with his programme of democratic socialism. However many years of New Labour government, combined with the ineffectual opposition of Ed Miliband, has generated enthusiasm for the possibility to create a LP led by a left-wing leader. The organisational procedure of ‘one member one vote’ has generated the real possibility that Corbyn can win the contest for leader of the LP. However, we are faced with a problem: are the concerns of LP activists shared by the electorate? We know that the Conservatives have been able to win an election on a very reactionary programme of austerity, expenditure cuts, and support for a referendum on the UK’s membership of the EU. These policies seem to be very different to Corbyn’s support for the welfare state, limited nationalisation and the defence of the interests of the working class. Does this apparent discrepancy mean that Corbyn’s policies will be unpopular and therefore lead to electoral disaster? The answer to this question is uncertain, but what we do know is that the period of the confusion of Ed Miliband’s leadership will be over. It was Ed Miliband’s inability to resolutely oppose the austerity of the Conservatives that provided credibility to their policies. In contrast, Corbyn can become a symbolic rallying point for all those people that want to oppose the economic policies of the Conservatives.

A crucial test for Corbyn will arise if this opposition is encouraged to become a mass movement that engages in extra-Parliamentary action. Will he be prepared to test his popularity by supporting the development of militant struggle? If he fails to provide principled support it is entirely possible that he could fail to convince people about his sincerity, but it is also possible that explicit support for mass action will undermine support for the LP with the floating voters. The point is that if a mass movement of struggle is to be presented as being principled and constructive it has to be connected to aims and values. These should represent the perspective of socialism, and the alternative of a society which is different to capitalism. Without this standpoint it will always seem that militant action could represent the sectional interests of given groups of workers and interest groups, but the aim of socialism is capable of uniting the majority of the population because it expresses the aspiration for equality, social improvement and the democratic transformation of society. The LP has never convincingly stood at any election on a programme for socialism because it has considered that this would mean the defeat of the party. Instead it has either campaigned in terms of reforms and the defence of the welfare state, or lately has adopted the approach of uncritical support for the market combined with social justice. The recession of 2008 has disorientated the LP and meant it has adopted confusing policies that are no alternative to the deflationary standpoint of the Conservatives. Corbyn could challenge these limitations if he was prepared to support the programme of democratic socialism.

This approach would be opposed by the right wing of the LP. They would argue that this standpoint would not be understood by an electorate that is naturally traditionalist and cautious about policy. But what the campaign of Corbyn has discovered is that an important section of people is in favour of change. It is necessary to define this aspiration in terms of an alternative to the present which we would argue is best described as democratic socialism. If this standpoint was explicitly adopted by Corbyn, and he was elected leader of the LP, it would be possible to contest the general election in terms of support for a new society of peace, common purpose and the extension of democracy versus the greed, inequality, austerity and unfairness of the society upheld by the Conservatives. It would be possible to put the Conservatives onto the defensive, who could be portrayed as being defenders of a society that was morally questionable and therefore upheld the interests of the few against the many. In other words, if the LP lost an election conducted in terms of capitalism versus socialism it would still represent a political and ethical victory that could be the prelude to the possibility of further progress and electoral success in the future. The LP would be establishing a situation of ideological hegemony despite failing to win an election victory. In contrast, the Conservatives presently are able to be on the offensive because the policies of the LP are confused and lack stable values. This situation could be rectified if the LP adopted a perspective and values of socialism. Such a possibility can be advanced if Corbyn became leader, but this advance towards socialist politics could be undermined and compromised if a process of conciliation is adopted towards the right wing. What is vital is that Corbyn goes beyond the approach of protest politics and instead adopts the standpoint of democratic socialism.

The above is not meant as a recipe for the transformation of society. Hence the above is not meant to suggest that the role of a revolutionary party has become irrelevant and antiquated if Corbyn is elected leader of the LP. On the contrary what we are trying to tackle is the question as to whether it is possible that a LP under Corbyn’s leadership can get elected. It is necessary to pose this question in more historical terms. On the one hand, the Conservative Party is a long standing party based on tradition, the ability to win elections, and the skilful defence of the interests of the ruling class, monarchy and the capitalist system. On the other hand, the party of change, the LP, has become increasingly disorientated because of the economic crisis and is incapable of upholding the interests of the welfare state. This situation could start to change if Corbyn is elected leader of the LP. The LP could become opposed to austerity and begin to elaborate a strategy for socialism. Contesting the election on these terms would not mean an inevitable electoral victory for the LP. It is entirely possible that the traditionalism of the Conservatives would continue to have a greater appeal. However the electorate would know what the LP stood for in explicit terms. Thus electoral defeat would not cause confusion and demoralisation. Instead the setback because of an unfavourable electoral result would be considered to be temporary, and the LP would prepare to be more effective and convincing at the next election. It would also promote a more powerful mass movement of opposition in the extra Parliamentary terrain.

It has been argued that this approach is bound to fail because of the political limitations of Parliament as an agency of capital.(1) This criticism is historically valid and explains the inability to realise a Parliamentary path to socialism. However, what is envisaged is that the role of a mass movement would be the vital aspect promoting the ability of Parliament to advance the forces of socialism. However, prior to electoral victory progress in the development of popular democracy would advance the morale of both the electorate and mass movement to believe that socialism could be possible. The combination of Parliament and extra Parliamentary activity could transform the class forces in a manner that promotes the cause of socialism. In this sense class consciousness, and confidence in the aim of socialism, increases. But without the aim of socialism politics lacks any definite historical logic and ability to appraise the electoral situation. Instead demoralisation is the result of electoral defeat.

Critics of the above standpoint would argue that the inherent moderation of British politics has been underestimated. Tradition implies that socialism is not an important aspect of elections. This is true, but the very election of Corbyn as LP leader could change this situation. What has to be recognised is that the moderation of the LP is no longer winning elections. The only valid approach that could begin to change this situation is if the LP adopted a new perspective. This would mean accepting the aim of socialism. This would be a big change for the LP and it is entirely possible that it will not accept this radical approach. However, rejection of socialism will mean that the disorientation of the LP will continue and its defensiveness in relation to the Conservatives will not be overcome. The crisis of the LP will continue, whoever is elected leader, in these circumstances. Hence, if the LP continues to be a bourgeois party people will prefer to vote conservative, but an adoption of socialism means that the political situation is transformed. People will be offered a real choice in elections and with socialism on the agenda confidence will grow concerning the ability to transform the situation for the better. The pre-conditions for a truly mass LP will have been created, and the connected interest in revolutionary organisations will also be encouraged. Political activity will increase, and community organisations and trade unions will be re-energised. However, if Corbyn does not adopt a socialist perspective then we just have an unarticulated discontent. The point is that Corbyn has become a symbol of potential progress or the unintentional generation of new demoralisation. Consequently the adoption of socialism as the aim of the LP will enable progress to be made in the re-awakening of British politics.

However, there are two important problems that could undermine the above argument. Firstly, the fact that the present limited appeal of the approach of socialism means that a LP may not be elected for a long period of time. This is the very standpoint of the critics of Corbyn. We cannot ignore this issue, and instead should seek to address it by developing accessible arguments as to why socialism is superior to the limitations of the present. We should produce a brief (and more detailed) understanding of the values and aims of socialism in order to promote the development of consciousness that becomes more receptive to our ideas. We have to accept that at present our standpoint has only minority appeal and consequently we have to tackle this problem by means of disseminating our ideas. Acceptance of the need to struggle for socialism does not mean that the confusion of the present is superior. It is this very confusion about the policies of the LP which are contributing to its unpopularity and lack of success. It is not mistrust of socialism that is presently resulting in election defeat. Instead it is the inability to differentiate the LP from the Conservatives that is facilitating the ideological hegemony of the latter and so leading to their election victories. In contrast, socialism has become an unknown idea. But socialism could become rapidly popular if it is connected to differentiating the LP from the Conservatives and is related to the support of the LP for a society based on equality, defence of the welfare state, and ending the power and influence of the rich minority. If socialism is popularised in an accessible manner it could become the distinctive ideology of the LP and enable it to make electoral advances.

It is argued that socialism is an antiquated ideology of the past and has been shown to have failed because of the Stalinist experience. But the problem with this standpoint is that without a constructive aim we are defined by what we are against and not by what we are for. The ultimate result of this standpoint is to capitulate to Toryism because of pragmatism and the desire for moderation and electoral success. Socialism is actually an untested and unknown doctrine in the UK context. We can stir up the imagination by presenting a vision of an alternative society without exploitation and based on cooperation and common purpose. If we argue in favour of this view it could generate mass support, and provide for the electoral advance of the LP. The alternative of right-wing New Labour is deeply unpopular and will not result in electoral success. Why vote for the LP when the Conservatives offer the most authentic programme of defence of the existing system and market economics? It is the vision of socialism, despite being presently unarticulated and crude, which is exciting the imagination of the support for Corbyn. This enthusiasm of the LP activists and new supporters can become the popular ideology that provides the most effective electoral challenge to the Conservatives.

There is a second problem. That is the question of proportional representation. The present electoral system favours the Conservatives and undermines the chances of smaller parties and the LP. Consequently, it is necessary to agitate for the introduction of PR if the prospects of electoral success of the forces of left-wing politics are to be advanced. It could be argued that PR will primarily promote the interests of right-wing populism, such as parties like UKIP. But if the argument is effectively made for socialism, the major beneficiaries of PR will be the LP and the Greens. An effective alliance can be made for the promotion of ecological politics and socialism. It could be argued that the Conservative will not introduce PR because they benefit from the existing system and so will oppose the installation of PR, but this is precisely why left-wing forces should agitate for its introduction. Many people presently perceive the system as being unfair and so will support a campaign for the implementation of PR, and this campaign could be incorporated into a LP led agitation for socialism.

The point is that if the LP became a grass roots and militant organisation, which is based on communities and the active involvement of the trade unions, the prospects for the success of left wing ideas would be immensely advanced. At present people are indifferent to socialism because of ignorance and the limitations and apathy of political culture. This situation could be transformed if the LP ended its present accommodation to the Conservative government and instead became an important agency for the promotion of socialist ideas. It will be argued that this perspective is unrealistic and represents antiquated politics. Instead it is the very limitations of neoliberalism that are re-developing the basis for a new acceptance of socialism. This prospect has been symbolised by the enthusiastic support for Corbyn’s campaign. Electoral success is not guaranteed if left wing ideas are adopted by the LP, but even defeat in these circumstances could mean hope and expectation that a future election could be won on the basis of a socialist programme.

In contrast, if the LP continues as a moderate, demoralised and servile organisation that accepts Tory politics, its electoral support will continue to decrease. The Conservatives will be accepted as the natural party of government because of the confusion and vacillation of the LP leadership. Membership of the LP will continue to decline, and its supporter voters will desert for alternatives. But the very prospect of the success of Jeremey Corbyn has led to an upsurge in membership and renewed enthusiasm. There is no reason to imply that this development could not be translated into increasing support from Labour voters. It is a very pessimistic doctrine that suggests British voters are naturally moderate and opposed to left-wing ideas. The point is that this conclusion has been made because the LP has become increasingly right-wing and dominated by New Labour. But it is not right—wing Labour politicians that provided hope and expectation about the future. Instead the figure of Corbyn – despite his limitations – is the only symbol of promise, and this sentiment could also be utilised in order to encourage trade union involvement in the LP. The effective end of the right wing domination of the LP could mean that the LP becomes an effective opposition to the Tories and so becomes considered in popular terms as an actual contender for government. Only the media, plus right wing LP politicians, cast doubt about this potential for success if Corbyn is elected leader.

In totally objective and impartial terms we do not know what will be the significance of Corbyn being elected leader of the LP. We do not know because there has never been a left wing leader since the period of Keir Hardie’s short regime, and this was based on co-partnership with Ramsey Macdonald. Furthermore, the very possibility of Corbyn being elected leader of the LP is not yet certain, and nor is the prospect of him adopting and advancing a programme of democratic socialism. If these eventualities are not realised the LP will continue to be a bourgeois organisation that does not provide a principled alternative to the Conservatives. This situation will only alienate the voters and mean that many will desert the LP and vote for other organisations. The point is that unlike New Labour in 1997 the present policies of the LP do not inspire the imagination of the voters. There was generalised confusion about the caring capitalism standpoint of Ed Miliband, and he was criticised for being evasive about the economic policies of the Conservatives. Furthermore, Cameron has been able to successfully blame the LP establishment for having reckless expenditure policies in the period of the recession. But most importantly, the present candidates for the LP leadership, apart from Corbyn, have not inspired enthusiasm and hope. Presently, only Corbyn can motivate the LP to believe that it can win elections, even if this is a false dawn.

Consequently the actual issue concerning a Corbyn led LP is whether he would be effective enough to successfully oppose the influence of bourgeois ideology, and so lead a LP that could win elections? It would be a disastrous mistake to try and accommodate the concerns of the political establishment and media. This would result in comfortable politics that ultimately satisfy very few people and result in a LP that is similar to what presently exists. Instead the only principled basis to oppose the supporters of capitalism is to advocate democratic socialism. This standpoint can provide inspiration to LP supporters, and floating voters, that change can occur. In this context it will also be possible to portray the Conservatives as the party of the rich and powerful. Society will become polarised to the advantage of the LP that is striving to realise a better type of system. Furthermore, the values of equality and fairness will be connected to the strategy of transforming society. If this strategy is successful, the alienated support for UKIP will be undermined and instead attitudes will become more left wing and optimistic. The Conservatives will be put on the defensive, and their policies will be exposed as being the expression of the interests of the few and at the expense of the majority. Consequently, the situation will become favourable for the election of the LP, and the SNP will have to accept popular pressure to accommodate with a future Labour government.

However, if Corbyn is not elected leader of the LP there will be widespread dismay, and many of the new members of the LP will leave. The new leader of the LP will struggle to motivate the remaining members, and the decline of the organisation will continue. Alienation with the existing system will continue to grow but without hope and purpose. The fragile influence of socialism will have suffered a setback and the Marxist Left will struggle to advance the cause of progressive ideas. Furthermore, the trade union bureaucracy will have one more excuse not to promote the mobilisation of their members against austerity and the Conservatives will be able to maintain their initiative and inflict continual un-egalitarian policies. In this situation the political conditions become more favourable for the election of a new Conservative government. Also, the situation will be to the advantage of the Euro-sceptics and so favour the ending of the UK’s role within the EU. These reactionary possibilities do not mean that Corbyn’s election as LP leader will magically change the political situation. What is crucial is his ability to be an inspirational leader and whether he promotes the imaginative policies and vision that can promote hope within the population. This was the ability of Tony Benn, he could encourage hope as the alternative to the politics of fear of Thatcherism. Unfortunately, Corbyn is no Benn, but despite his limitations he seems able to generate enthusiasm and has revitalised the LP. It is to be hoped that he will develop his campaign by the production of an accessible pamphlet outlining his views, and explaining why a left wing stance is supportable. In other words, it is vital that the momentum of his campaign continues to make progress and he outlines what he favours, as opposed to merely declaring what he is against. This means emphatically declaring in favour of democratic socialism and elaborating this approach for the contemporary era. It is necessary that Corbyn indicates that he is more than a protest politician. The elaboration of his views can only enhance the prospect of the election of a Labour government.

It could be argued that the above represents a dilution of the standpoint of revolutionary politics. The perspective of a mass movement outside Parliament organising to realise its popular will seems to be watered down. In reply we can argue that this strategy is still our preferred option, but we also have to respond flexibly and imaginatively to changing events and circumstances. The possible election of Corbyn as leader of the LP creates the possibility of transforming traditional perspectives and strategies. Hence the role of theory is to relate to these new developments and to outline how the possibility of socialism can arise in new and previously unexpected situations. In this context the standpoint of democratic socialism has been provided with a new impetus and possibilities. But the overall role of the Marxist is not to become a dogmatist, and so should maintain the role of theory as a guide to the realisation of the success of the class struggle. Therefore the role of democracy does not replace class conflict but it possibly provides the basis for the peaceful transition to socialism, as Kautsky explains: “Democracy cannot do away with the class antagonisms of capitalist society. Neither can it avoid the final outcome of these antagonisms – the overthrow of present society. One thing it can do. It cannot abolish the revolution, but it can avert many hopeless revolutionary attempts, and render superfluous many revolutionary uprisings. It creates clearness regarding the relative strength of the different parties and classes. It does not abolish their antagonisms, nor postpone their ultimate object, but it does operate to hinder the rising class from sometimes attempting the accomplishment of tasks of which it is not yet capable, and to keep the governing class from refusing concessions it no longer possesses the strength to maintain. The direction of development is not thereby changed, but the course becomes steadier and more peaceful.”(2)

In other words the very course of historical development could be altered by the significance of the possible election of Corbyn as leader of the LP. The character of the revolutionary process begins to take the form of involving the role of the LP. Assessments of the LP as a bourgeois party may have to be revised and different definitions adopted. However, this modification may depend on the quality of Corbyn’s leadership. Can he be equal to the tasks posed by the struggle against capitalism and for socialism? This question is a big unknown, and it also depends on the results of the leadership contest. A defeat in the contest and things ‘going back to normal’, could mean the widespread outbreak of demoralisation. It is no exaggeration to suggest that the course of history could depend on the results announced in September.

The above analysis is not meant to suggest that the role of the LP could replace that of the agency of the working class in relation to the prospect of socialist transformation. What is crucial is that a left wing LP begins to develop popular support within the trade unions and local communities if the dynamics for the generation of a process of socialist transformation begin to become possible. If the enthusiasm for Corbyn remains within the LP, and is not apparent within the working class, the prospect for the development of the democratic transformation of society will not occur. The strength of the Benn movement was that it expressed within society as a whole. Benn symbolised the popular opposition to Thatcherism and his strategy of combining the role of a left wing within Parliament with the development of popular democracy was expressed by militant action such as the miner’s strike of 1984. In contrast, the left wing trend of Nye Bevan was limited to Parliament and so did not become the basis of struggle for socialism within wider society. The big question for Corbyn is whether he can translate his support with LP activists in more general terms to the ranks of Labour voters. This potential development is presently being undermined by the ideological campaign to suggest that a Corbyn led LP is unelectable. The role of this propaganda offensive should be rejected and instead a policy adopted to build a mass movement of opposition to the Cameron government. The aim will be to translate this popular activity into the basis of winning a general election.

Winning an election on a left wing platform would pose the question of the reform of society, which would modify economic and social activity in the interests of the subordinated classes, or carrying out measures that would express the fact that the LP in Parliament had become a workers government. This government would be prepared to create workers militia, promote industrial democracy, and end the economic domination of the bourgeoisie, introduce progressive taxation, and prepare for the prospect of civil war.(3) It has been argued that this type of revolutionary change would result in the formation of an authoritarian regime.(4) However, the commitment to multi-party democracy, and the rights of minorities to peacefully protest, could express the possibility that what is effectively a revolution in terms of the change of economic and political power is compatible with the standpoint of pluralism and the right to dissent.

This perspective is being advocated because it is historically been shown that the standpoint of reformism has not altered the relationships of power within society. Furthermore, reformism has been in a crisis since the era of neoliberalism, and New Labour was the adaption of right wing reformism to the imperatives of the market. The point being made is that the very argument for democratic socialism is created by the character of contemporary capitalism. The compromise of reforms has been undermined by the development of a global economy that imposes the logic of the market and the interests of finance capital onto the activity of nation states. Hence the only alternative to capitulation to this reactionary logic is democratic socialism. However, Meszaros would argue that even this possibility cannot be realised because of the subservient subordination of Parliament to the logic of capital: “Naturally the fundamental changes required for securing and safeguarding the socialist transformation of society cannot be accomplished within the political domain as constituted and ossified during the last four hundred years of capitalist development. For the unavoidable challenge in this respect necessitates the solution of a most bewildering problem. Namely, that capital is the extra-parliamentary force par excellence of our social order, and yet at the same time completely dominates parliament from the outside while pretending to be simply a part of it, professedly operating in relation to the alternative political forces of the working class movement on a fully equitable basis.”(5)

The problem with this viewpoint, which may be a limitation of reality itself, is that the prevailing influence of capital seems to exclude the possibility of a democratic transformation of society via the role of Parliament. If we have reservations about fully endorsing this view, we still have to accept that it explains the difficulties involved in promoting the democratic transformation of society. But despite these problems we are obliged to advocate democratic change because people within liberal democracies will not accept any other type of transformation. Meszaros is aware of the importance of this issue when he also argues: “What is important to bear in mind is that the renewal of the parliamentary form of political legislation itself is unavoidable if the labour movement is to achieve anything at all under the present circumstances. Such a renewal can only come about though the development of an extra-Parliamentary movement as the vital conditioning force of parliament itself, and of the legislative framework of transitional society in general.”(6) In other words the development of a mass movement outside of Parliament can interact with this institution in order to generate the dynamics of change and bring about the erosion of the influence of capital. Parliament without the addition of the mass movement lacks social power and influence, and popular struggle without the support of Parliament does not have legitimacy. Combined together these forces express both democratic credentials and social power. The result could be peaceful change.

At present we are unaware whether Corbyn has any strategy for the transformation of society. It is a vital task of Marxists that we act to persuade him to adopt a democratic perspective for revolutionary change. We do not believe that this will undermine his chances of winning a general election. Instead we would argue that the adoption of a statement of the aims and values of socialism would express the vision that people are yearning for the LP to articulate. This approach would represent the only principled alternative to conservatism, and so provide people with a genuine choice at the next election. However, if this message is acquire increasing credibility it is also necessary that the trade unions mobilise in support of the aim of socialism. In this context it would be possible to act against austerity in terms of upholding an alternative of democratic socialism. Left wing politics would no longer be characterised in terms of what we are against, and instead be connected to what we favour and support. As a result of these developments the politics of the Conservatives would seem to be narrow and unethical. They would be put on the defensive, and their standpoint would become characterised by anti-socialism. The politics of the LP would represent hope and promise, and the standpoint of the Tories would express fear and gloom. Other parties would have to define their politics in terms of being for or against socialism. Also the politics of hate towards migrants, and national chauvinism, would be undermined and challenged more effectively.

Hence it is possible that the politics of democratic socialism could become virtually unstoppable. A 1945 atmosphere of solidarity and community spirit would be developed, and the views of the Conservatives would become of a minority character and even considered to be eccentric. At present this is how socialism is conceived, but a powerful campaign by Corbyn could alter this situation. Caution and modesty could undermine any of these developments being realised. There is an important ideological problem. Possibly Corbyn does not share this perspective, and his aims are more modest. If this is indeed the situation he could disappoint his supporters who instinctively aspire for the articulation of democratic socialist politics. It is hope for a better future that generates his support within Labour activists. He could consolidate this support by outlining a vision of socialism and making the promise that the LP under his leadership will support this perspective. The alternative of his rivals is more of the same and an inability to inspire support. The LP will not thrive under their leadership. Instead we should reject defensive politics and embrace the ambitions represented by socialism.

LP activists are rejecting pseudo Tory politics, but they are not yet clear what they are in favour of. We should overcome this sense of uncertainty by elaborating a vision of socialism and rejecting the standpoint of neoliberalism. Corbyn has an important decision to make: will he definitively support democratic socialism, or equivocate? If he is elected leader the LP should campaign within the UK in favour of the socialist alternative and against the Tory politics of fear and vested interests. It is possible to win a general election on these terms.

FOOTNOTES:

(1)Istvan Meszaros: Beyond Capital, Merlin Press, London 1995 p p703-739

(2)Karl Kautsky, The Road to Power, Prism Key Press, New York, 2013 p49-50

(3)Theses On Comintern Tactics, In Theses, Rsolutions and Manifestos of the First Four Congresses of the Third International, Ink Links, London, 1980 p397

(4)Ralph Miliband: Socialism for a Sceptical Age, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1994 p43-50

(5)Istvan Meszaros: Historical Actuality of the Socialist Offensive, Bookmarks, London, 2010 p17

(6)ibid p127-128