**UNDERSTANDING THE CURRENT POLITICAL SITUATION**

The character of the current political situation can be connected back to the bourgeois revolution that occurred in the 17th century. In a sense this was a premature process of change that was based on the radicalism of the petty bourgeois strata and the mass support of the agricultural labourers. In this context there was not the development of industrial capitalism and the related influence of the capitalist class. Instead what occurred was a genuine democratic process of change based on the role of Parliament discontent with the role of the monarchy. But the very premature nature of this process meant that the achievements of the revolutionary process were undermined by the restoration of the rule of Charles the second which led to the domination of the role of a landed gentry. In this political situation the development of capitalism began and so the bourgeoisie lacked any political power. Instead there was the rule of a monarchy which promoted the development of industry and trade. In this context the capitalists were a political subordinated class and the Whigs and Tories represented the primary interests of the landed aristocracy. This situation was only ended in the mid 19th century when Robert Peel repealed the corn laws and so inaugurated a situation of free trade which allowed for the maximum development of capitalism. In the context of the increasing influence of the role of industrial capitalism the major political parties became the expression of the interests of the bourgeoisie, but the situation was still characterised by the subordination of the capitalists to the role of the parliamentary political system, which meant that the various parties ruled on behalf of a bourgeoisie that was increasingly based on the combined aims of the promotion of industrial development and trade and the increasing consolidation of the empire in order to enhance this process of economic dynamism. The two major parties, which were the conservatives and liberals competed to become the major party of the capitalists, but the situation became complicated by the increasing influence of the votes of a section of the skilled male working class. The conservatives appealed to these workers in terms of the ideology of nationalism and imperialism, whilst the liberals upheld the gains from free trade and limited reforms. The point is that the representatives of the bourgeoisie were concerned about the increasing influence of socialism and so utilised nationalism in order to undermine the influence of this standpoint. This reactionary ideology is still important in the present. However, the crisis of the ideology of nationalism and imperialism was indicated by the onset of the first world war which outlined the necessity of international cooperation between nations as an alternative to conflict. But only the opposing ideology of socialism could generate the possibility of the cooperation of nations and so this perspective had to be opposed by continuing to connect the benefits of capitalism with the role of imperialism and the victory of Britain in the first world war. However, the Russian revolution expressed the basis of a historical alternative to the present situation and so the Bolshevik regime had to be discredited by the connection of the end of the war with the apparent potential expressed by the interests of British capitalism when compared to the uncertainty and upheaval of the Russian revolution. This standpoint was connected to the assertion of nationalism as compared to the internationalism expressed by the ideology of Bolshevism. Socialism was portrayed as a doctrine that had nothing to do with the national traditions of Britain and the standpoint of internationalism was defined as being of little significance when compared to the potential expressed by the role of the UK within the world economy dominated by the role of imperialism and free trade. This perspective meant that the character of the British state was defined by anti-Bolshevism and the rejection of the aspirations of the working class. The problem was that this rigid stance could not undermine the continued influence of the Labour party and its increasing electoral success. Therefore, it was necessary to discredit the Labour party by allowing it to become the government, and in a situation of economic crisis this meant the introduction of measures that resulted in the rejection of the interests of the working class. The logical result was that the most right wing members of the Labour Cabinet of 1929 became members of a coalition government with the Conservatives and liberals. But the result of this situation was that the Labour Party became more left wing and so adopted objectives that seemed compatible with the aim of the transformation of capitalism into socialism. This left wing development was connected to the implications of the 1926 general strike which posed the possibility for the working class to take power, but the role of the trade union leaders undermined the potential to realise this aim. Thus, the UK before the second world war was based on an increasing polarisation between the classes and the increasing mass unemployment caused by the onset of depression led to the generation of a radicalised working class that was increasingly supportive of the aim of socialism. The role of Parliament in this context was to undermine the potential for the working class to promote the realisation of the aim of socialism. There was unity between the parties of the establishment and the capitalist class in relation to the concern to undermine the possibility of proletarian revolution. In international terms this perspective led to the acceptance of the influence of Fascist Germany and the effective encouragement of the role of fascism as an agency of opposition to the influence of the USSR. But the onset of the German occupation of Poland led to the second world war, and the discredited Chamberlin government was replaced by that of Churchill. This led to a genuine Conservative-Labour alliance and the objective of victory was connected to progress in the social conditions of the people. The role of the Labour party in the coalition led to the influence of the view that a Labour government would be possible after the war. This is what happened, and the Labour government introduced genuine reforms such as the creation of the National Health service and promoted the role of an economy based on the principles of full employment. But it has to be indicated that this development was not realised in opposition to the American aim to revive the economies of Western Europe in order to undermine the appeal of Stalinism. For a brief period, the aim of the reform and improvement of capitalism was not an expression of the undermining of the system, and in this context the reformism of the Labour party could be successful. This is why the Conservative governments of the mid 1950’s did not seriously propose to end the measures of the previous Labour administration and instead continued with a combination of Keynesian economics and the importance of the welfare state. It seemed that reformism could be the prelude to socialism with the onset of the role of a Labour party government.

In other words, the perspective of class struggle seems to have been discredited with the generation of the apparent success of socialism from above of the Labour government of 1945. The view that change could occur by the role of mass action of the workers seemed to have been replaced by the generation of the possibility for a Labour party administration to introduce reforms that would culminate in an effective transformation of society. This approach was connected to the view that the increasing affluent working class was no longer interested in socialism and so instead it would rely on a Labour government to introduce measures that would modify the capitalist economy, and so introduce progressive measures that would modify the system in terms of the interests of the workers and the people in general. However, the apparent validity of this approach seems to have become increasingly problematic because of the economic difficulties of the Labour government in the mid 1960’s which was connected to the contradictions of the world economy. This development led to the increased militancy of the working class but the influence of the perspective of socialism did not result from these developments. Instead there was a prolonged political crisis as the increasing limitations of capitalism, which was connected to the resurgence of the class struggle, did not result in the mass influence of revolutionary parties who advocated socialism. This limited militancy also occurred under the Conservative governments of the early 1970’s and this resulted in the return of a Labour government in 1974. But the issue of Europe led to the nationalist politics of the left wing of the Labour party and the right wing was able to retain its domination because of its apparently superior views about Europe and the challenges for British society. In this context increasing industrial militancy was not sufficient to result in a genuine revival of the left wing of the Labour party, even if ideas about workers control were increasing popular. But the malaise in the Labour party was about to be intensified with the advent of the Thatcher government in 1979.

The Conservative administration of Thatcher that was elected was determined to undermine the role of the welfare state, privatise most nationalised companies and oppose the influence of the trade unions. This government was Bonapartist in that it assumed to act on behalf of the capitalist class, and so was prepared to undermine the role of many companies in the supposed general interests of the economic system. In this context the only outcome was the intensification of the class struggle, but the Conservatives were prepared for this situation and so introduced policies in order to undermine the effectiveness of the opposition of the trade unions. Mass unemployment became an actual policy in order to facilitate the undermining of the influence of the working class within society. In this context the miners strike became inevitable and the defeat of the miners only intensified the realisation of the process of the undermining of the influence of the workers within society. In this context the Falklands war acted to promote the ideology of nationalism and so provide a popular basis to the role of the Thatcher government. This development proved an ideological precedent to indicate that nationalism could undermine the attempt to develop the unity of the working class in opposition to the measures of the reactionary Tory administration. However, in a limited manner the anti-Poll tax struggle indicated the continued ability of even the most disadvantaged sections of the working class to continue to struggle to oppose the actions of the government. But the problem was that success in this context did not result in the attempt to overthrow the administration in terms of the development of a general strike. The trade unions had become subservient to the aims of Thatcherism and the result was that the balance of forces favoured the interests of reactionary objectives in a general manner. In other words, the Bonapartist dynamic of the various Conservative governments acted to undermine the social influence of the working class and trade unions. The role of the trade unions was weakened to an extent from which they have never properly recovered. This situation meant an end to the influence of the working class over the actions of government in a consistent manner. In this context the capitalist class would benefit from this change in the balance of class forces, even if the capitalist class was also undermined by a process of the de-industrialisation of society. Only the creation of the new technological economy could gloss over the contradictions of this situation and so ensure that the UK was still a dynamic aspect of the world economy.

In terms of the Labour party this situation led to intense political struggle between the right wing and the left wing. Ultimately the left was defeated and so the Labour Party became an organisation that adapted to the reactionary objectives of Thatcherism. But the primary problem was that the Alternative Economic Strategy of the left wing was an impractical attempt to reform capitalism in a period of recession. The only alternative to the offensive of capital against labour was the success of genuine socialism based on the end of the domination of the bourgeoisie, but the problem was that the working class had become demoralised by the offensive of Thatcherism and so a section of it became increasingly right wing. However, the economic problems of the Tory governments in the mid 1990’s led to the election of a Tony Blair led Labour government. The perspective of this administration was based on the acceptance of the changes made by Thatcherism. However, it was able to benefit from a period of limited boom, which meant that various concessions could be made to the material interests of the people. But measures of privatisation were not ended, and to some extent were consolidated. Hence the Labour party had become a reactionary organisation that had no relation to the aim of socialism and its support was based on the role of the privileged white-collar sections of the population. The reactionary character of the Blair government was indicated by the support for the foreign policy of George Bush junior. However, what was critically problematical in this situation was the lack of support for a genuine left-wing alternative. Instead people preferred involvement in single issue campaigns, and support for revolutionary Marxism was minimal. The effective bourgeois degeneration of the Labour party did not result in the creation of a coherent form of support for a credible form of socialism.

However, the coalition government under the leadership of David Cameron led to specific expressions of defence of the public sector against the introduction of austerity because of the increasingly serious economic crisis. But these forms of protest were not sustained and so the trade unions effectively accepted the role of austerity despite its reactionary character. The leadership of the Labour Party led by Ed Miliband was a period of confusion and so did not represent any coherent alternative to the perspectives of the Conservatives. Predictably the Labour party was defeated in the elections of 2015. The result of this situation of social regression was increased support for the nationalist objective of leaving the EU in what became the BREXIT referendum. This development was in some respects an expression of protest against austerity, but it had the demoralised form of opposition to migration from the EU. Migrants were being blamed for the situation of the deteriorating social situation of the people in general. The result of the referendum became predictable because the advocates of remain in the EU were only able to outline confused views and the most vigorous supporters of a coherent perspective were the supporters of the Leave approach. Despite this context the working class has been blamed for the result because of its apparently reactionary character. But this understanding represents a crude generalisation that does not recognise the political differences within the working class on the issue of BREXIT. The point is that the workers organised in the trade unions, and so generally in the public sector, still continued to vote in favour of the aim of Remain, and so the less organised workers were those that favoured the Leave option. This process of differentiation was also expressed in terms of the middle class that was divided between a progressive section that was for remain and a more reactionary and conservative leave supporters. In other words, there was a situation of genuine polarisation between the 52% for leave and the 48% for remain. This uncertain development meant that the democratic basis of leave was uncertain, and no one had voted on the issue of the role of the single market or customs union. The result of the ambiguities of the referendum meant that the complex situation was bound to generate the potential for political crisis concerning the process of leaving the EU. It also has to be said that this situation was immensely problematical for the capitalist class which would prefer the possibility for the UK to remain in the EU because of the economic benefits of that situation. In other words, the Tory government would have to be an inherently Bonapartist administration because it would have to carry out actions that did not have the support of the capitalist class. This development was likely to result in uncertainty and it would mean that the Conservative party would become alienated from the capitalist class. But the Labour party was also in a dilemma because it had to try and resolve the tensions between its supporters. In other words, there was immediately a situation of political crisis that seemed to have no possible satisfactory outcome.

In this context there was a surprising outcome to the Labour party leadership contest with the victory of Jeremy Corbyn. He was the most left-wing Labour leaders since Keir Hardie and was formally committed to a vague programme of the realisation of democratic socialism. But the most important issue that he had to tackle was how to create unity about the issue of BREXIT within the supporters of the Labour party. The advocates of remain had become ardent supporters of a new referendum, but Corbyn could not support this option because it meant alienating the leave supporters of the Labour party. But the dilemmas of the Labour party seemed to be entirely secondary when compared to the tensions within the Conservatives. There had developed within the Tories a populist wing that seemed to uphold the interests of nation as being more important than class and they were for the most intransigent accommodation with the EU on the issue of BREXIT. This situation meant that the contradictions between the Tories and the interests of the capitalist class had become acute, But May tried to resolve them in terms of the accommodation negotiated with the EU. However, the populist wing of the Tories was not satisfied on the issue of the backstop with Northern Ireland, and so her deal became rejected by the House of Commons. The result was a serious political crisis that seemed to have no possibility of being resolved. Instead the Tories under the leadership of Boris Johnston are committed to leaving the EU without a deal on the 31st of October 2019. In other words, the aspect of Bonapartism is completely dominant in relation to the contemporary character of the Conservative party. The interests of capital are secondary in relation to the influence of the ideology of national chauvinism and the related opposition to the role of the EU. This approach is considered to be necessary in order to obtain the support of the working class for the project of Conservatism and this means that the interests of British capital become defined in terms of the aim of the creation of this populist political project. In this context the possibility to develop an independent political profile for the Labour party is defined by its support for the aspiration of retaining a close association with the EU, such as maintaining a connection with the customs union and single market. Corbyn has defined this perspective in terms of supporting a second referendum on any negotiated agreement with the EU made by a Labour government, and this would include the possibility to vote in favour of membership of the EU. It could be argued that this approach neglects the aspirations of those Labour voters that are anti-EU, but the point is that viewpoint can be accommodated by the possibility to vote against membership of the EU. The point is that the leadership of the LP has recognised that there is only one possible progressive approach in this situation which is to strive to maintain the social gains represented by a close association with the EU. This means that the reactionary outcome would be the Conservative approach of rejecting any links with the EU, and instead adopting the mythical approach of adherence to the free trade rules of the World Trade Organisation.

But the problem with the approach of the Labour party is that they do not recognise the necessity to oppose the nationalism within the working class, and in that manner develop mass and popular support for what would be an internationalist approach towards the role of the EU. Nationalism is the major ideological issue that presently undermines the development of the class consciousness of the working class. This aspect cannot be undermined by a moral appeal to the virtues of internationalism which ignores the importance of the interests of working people. Instead it has to be outlined in popular and convincing terms that the logic of the realisation of the isolation of the UK from the EU and world economy will be to undermine the social and collective class interests of the working class. Such a situation will undermine the role of the National Health Service and result in the possibility of mass unemployment. Therefore, the material interests of the working class are connected to the continuation of close relations with the EU in terms of trade and social policy. In this context the ideology of nationalism can only be to the benefit of the interests of the leadership of the Conservative party and the BREXIT party. But the problem is that historically the Labour party has never challenged the influence of nationalism within the working class and so the result is that significant sections of the population have elevated nationalism to be the expression of their aspirations. But if the Labour party is to win the next general election it has to provide an alternative to the reactionary form of nationalism being promoted by the populists of the Conservative party. This means explicitly outlining the merits of internationalism as an integral aspect of the creation of a better society, and in this manner as the only progressive alternative to the expression of a nationalist form of capitalism. However, we have to accept that the Corbyn leadership of the Labour party will be reluctant to support this perspective which it will consider to be unpopular, and so it will be the task of the Marxist organisations to try and generate popular support for a internationalist alternative to the narrow nationalist limitations of the project of BREXIT. In this manner the rank and file of the Labour party may come to realise the importance of an international conception of the aim of socialism. In this manner working class people will become influenced by the ideas of internationalism which until that moment they had little awareness of their importance. The result could be that a crucial aspect of the general election could become the issue of nationalism versus internationalism. This development would not represent a diversion from more important issues, but instead would become the defining demarcation between populist conservatism and the modern labour party.

The Labour party general election manifesto is likely to have many proposals for the ending of austerity and the revival of the role of the welfare state. These should be supported by Marxists, but we should also indicate that these measures will only be effective and durable as an integral aspect of a minimum programme that is based on the promotion of the possibility to develop the process of transition to a new socialist type of society. If the measures of the Labour party are presented and defended in an ad hoc manner of being a limited and specific character, there is always the possibility that they could be undermined and rejected by any possible conservative government. This means that our aim should not merely be a minimum programme, but instead the regeneration of the role of the welfare state should be connected to the possibility to continue a process of movement towards the creation of an increasingly favourable balance of class forces that would be in support of the realisation of socialism. However, this perspective does not mean that the role of a minimum programme is superfluous. Instead the introduction of the proposals of the minimum programme, such as the improvement of the NHS and public services, and increased participation of the workers in the administration of the economy, would contribute the increased confidence of people that a socialist society is possible. In other words, the realisation of the minimum programme would generate the necessary confidence that the aim of socialism was attainable and realistic. But the problem is that the Labour party and the working class in general would have more limited objectives, and instead be content to merely end the policy of austerity. Thus, Marxists have to argue that the approach of the minimum programme is realisable if people act to implement it with the support of the role of the Labour government. In this context it is necessary to challenge the ideology of reformism which is content with the realisation of some limited and specific demands. Hence it is necessary to transform the Labour party from being a reformist organisation into a party that is sympathetic to the understanding that a minimum programme only has ultimate credibility as an expression of its connections to the aim of socialism. It is quite possible that this relationship of the minimum programme to socialism will not be recognised, and that instead people will be immediately satisfied by the improvement of society. Marxists will not reject this development, but we will indicate that the gains of the minimum programme can only be upheld and consolidated by a process of continued movement towards the realisation of socialism. Therefore, we will contend that the genuine character of reforms is expressed by the progress that is made towards the successful attainment of socialism.

However, if this project is to become realisable it will initially be necessary to successfully undermine the nationalism and populism of the forces of Conservatism. This task has been avoided by the Labour party and the Marxists because they have tried to ignore the influence of nationalism within the working class. But this attempt to deny important political tasks can no longer be justified because the only basis of the policies of the dominant strand within the Conservatives is an appeal to reactionary forms of nationalism. However principled socialists can suggest that the Conservative conception of nation is opposed to the possibility of the progressive improvement of the NHS and other public services and is instead based on the continuation of austerity. Indeed, this perspective is how the Conservatives envisage the character of the economy and society. This reactionary form of nationalism means that the only principled alternative is a type of internationalism which is connected to the interest of working people to make genuine social progress. But this standpoint could be considered to be abstract if it is not connected to a minimum programme that would indicate how it is possible to make social progress in immediate terms. In this context the class interests of the working class would become related to internationalism – the defence of the association of the UK with the EU – and the aspiration to realise a minimum programme of the renewal of the welfare state. In this connection it will be possible to connect the aspirations of the workers in the trade unions with workers who have no trade union affiliation. In this manner an alternative progressive nation is being created in terms of the aspirations of class solidarity, internationalism and the aim of socialism.

The major objection to this perspective is that the importance and influence of the role of the working class has been undermined by the process of economic and social change that has occurred within the last 50 years. But this understanding is based on the view that there is no possible common interest between the role of the blue-collar worker and the new white collar staff. But the fact is that there has to be a close economic relationship between these two major sections of the workforce if production is to occur. This means that there is a potential connection that can express the potential for shared political aims such as defence of the welfare state. But traditionally this connection has not been established for ideological reasons such as the apparent conservatism of the blue-collar worker and the liberalism of the white-collar staff. But the very challenges of BREXIT indicate the importance of unity within the various sections of the workforce if the interests of all workers are to be upheld and promoted in a period of serious economic uncertainty. In this context the Labour party could promote this type of unity by outlining how the populism of the Conservative party only expresses the possibility of serious economic crisis and the development of unemployment. But primarily the LP could develop unity within the various sections of the working class by promoting the possibility of mass support for its minimum programme of reforms to create improvements within capitalism. In this manner the nationalism advocated by the Conservative party could be undermined and an alternative advanced in terms of demands that indicate in a feasible manner how the problems associated with BREXIT could be overcome. This process would involve the re-establishment of relations with the EU and an end to austerity as immediate measures. The result of this development would be the resurgence of confidence within all sections of the population and in this manner the unity could be created to sustain the role of a Labour government. The point is that at the moment there is still support for the nationalism of the Conservatives because this type of progressive alternative is not being promoted or advocated with confidence. Instead there is uncertainty within the LP about the perspective on the EU, and so the result of this situation is continued support for the Conservatives. This unsatisfactory situation could be ended by the LP adopting a minimum programme with a coherent position of negotiating a new deal with the EU and for the defence of the role of the welfare state. Corbyn effectively supports this position but his ability to promote it is undermined by the role of the right wing of the LP who reduce the position on the EU to support for a new referendum. But the point is that this possibility can only be successfully realised by the role of a Labour government. Instead the view that the Conservatives will call a referendum on the EU is an illusion.

Indeed, the role of the right wing of the Labour party is very reactionary because they effectively support the aim to establish a coalition government as an alternative to BREXIT on October 31st 2019. The major aim of this coalition will be to undermine the realisation of a Corbyn led government. Presently the demand for a coalition is being led by the role of the Liberal Democrats, but it has the secret support of the right wing of the LP. The problem for Corbyn is that he has presently the support of fewer than 50 MP’s. The right wing of the LP is dominant in relation to its influence within Parliament. These members effectively oppose the possibility of the formation of a Corbyn led government because of its potential to introduce radical changes within society. Thus, it is necessary to reduce the influence of these right-wing MP’s if the possibility of a radical Corbyn government is to be successfully elected. Hence it is necessary to promote the reselection of the right-wing MPs with left wing alternatives, and in this context to popularise the necessity of the strategy of a radical minimum programme. Without reducing the influence of the right-wing MPs, the prospect of the realisation of a genuine left wing Labour government will be undermined. But it is still possible that the acute political crisis of the Tories could result in the election of a Labour government led by Corbyn. This situation could result in an acute struggle to increase the influence of the left wing within the Labour government. The task of the Marxists in this situation would be to facilitate the success of the left wing transformation of the Labour government.

However, the possibility of a Corbyn led Labour government seems to be unlikely because of the apparent difficulty of obtaining an electoral victory because of the apparent resurgence of support for a nationalist and populist type of politics. This situation has been considered to be because of the apparent support of sections of the working class for this type of politics. Hence the major issue is to obtain the support of this nationalist inclined section of the working class for a left reformist programme. This means that the Labour party and its sympathisers have to convince the people that an end to austerity and the defence of the welfare state is in their interests. It could be suggested that the majority of the population support this perspective but have doubts about its feasibility. Therefore, it is necessary for Corbyn to mobilise the trade unions to propagate and agitate in favour of this programme within the population. In this context the trade unions should indicate their strength in terms of limited but militant actions that reinforce the determination to end austerity and to regenerate the role of the welfare state. These actions should attempt to involve the non-unionised sections of the working population, or precisely the people who are likely to presently vote in favour of populist parties. This development would create a momentum in favour of the election of a Corbyn led Labour government, but if this tactic fails because of the election of a new Conservative government the trade unions should no longer meekly accept this situation and instead should demand that such a government ends austerity and that it should try to establish genuine relations with the EU in order to promote trade and economic growth. The point being made is that if we develop a situation in which there is a mobilised and confident advanced section of the working class this could inspire the non-organised sections of the workers to support this example. In this context it may be possible to overcome the divisions within the working class and so create a progressive expression of the possibility to oppose the nationalism of the Conservatives. The point being made is that the influence of nationalism within sections of the working class has been caused by a situation of demoralisation and the related acceptance of the apparent permanent character of the present economic and political system. If it was to be possible to transform this situation and to create a more confident and dynamic working class, it would then create a situation in which reactionary attitudes could be challenged and the possibility of a new progressive stance would then emerge. But this prospect is connected to the end of the present divisions within the working class between those in a trade union and those people who are not members of a union. What is being suggested is that it is the prevalence of an attitude of demoralisation that is the reason why reactionary views become influential within the most demoralised sections of the working class. If this demoralisation is transformed into a more confident and activist stance then support for more progressive politics may be created. Hence the trade unions should consider forms of action that would generate this type of unity within the working class, and they should organise in an active manner in order to promote the possibility of the election of a Corbyn led Labour government. This process should mean the creation of community councils to develop forms of popular organisations that should agitate in favour of the improvement of local services, and for the central government to increase expenditure made available to the various forms of local government. The trade unions could then agitate in favour of the ability of central government to become accountable to the community councils. In this manner the political conditions would be created in which the possibility to end the situation of austerity would be created. Furthermore, this process of democratic accountability would encourage people that progressive change was possible, and this would increase the morale and confidence of the exploited sections of society. In this manner the political conditions would be created for the election of a Corbyn led Labour government. This development would raise the morale of all sections of society that genuine and progressive change could be possible. The confidence of the working class would be immensely raised and the expectation that improvements to society could be made would become a general attitude. The situation would express the level of consciousness that the transformation of the economy and politics of the UK could be realised.

In other words the creation of the political conditions for the election of a Corbyn led Labour government requires that various forms of activity should begin in the present to create a situation in which forms of mass action and agitation occur that make it possible to realise the successful victory of the Labour party. In this context the trade unions should act to relate to the members of the working class who are not organised and who have often been demoralised by the period of austerity, with the result that they have developed a reactionary political stance. Once elected, it is necessary to try and influence the Labour government to introduce a minimum programme to end austerity, restore the role of the welfare state, and to create the conditions for the end of capitalism in terms of the advance of the role of workers control. The Labour government should also try to negotiate a new arrangement with the EU and the outcome should be subject to the test of a referendum, which would include the option of remain. However, if the Labour government is not elected then the trade unions should try to organise the defence of the interests of the workers in a manner that is more effective than that which has occurred in the recent period. This development should include militant action in order to defend the economic and political conditions of the workers, and in this manner enhance the level of morale about the ability of the organisations of the working class to uphold the interests of the people. The problem in the present has been that the trade union leadership has rejected the responsibility to organise the defence of the interests of the working class. In this situation the policy of austerity has not been opposed. The result has been a situation of demoralisation within the most advanced sections of the working class, and this has facilitated the success of the influence of reactionary views that have promoted forms of populism and nationalism. In contrast the balance of class forces could be changed in a favourable manner if a Corbyn government is elected. The political situation would be transformed and the confidence of the majority of the working class would be enhanced and the result could be a new situation that was more favourable to the interests of the people. But in this situation the workers should not rely on the actions of the Corbyn government to introduce progressive measures. Instead they should act to ensure that maximum political pressure is applied in order that the Labour administration does act in a genuinely progressive manner. It will be necessary to create a dynamic process of interaction between the government and the role of the working class organised in the trade unions and community councils. This development will not be unopposed because the forces of Conservatism will maintain that the situation is an expression of the undermining of social cohesion. Such a political viewpoint can be rejected in a practical manner by the expression of the level of organisation of society by the people. The very process of changing society in a progressive manner will indicate the ability to organise the economy and politics in a different and more emancipatory form.

However, if a Corbyn led government is not elected then the situation will be characterised by the intensification of demoralisation. The working class will be on the defensive and the ability to organise to uphold its interests will have been undermined. But it will be necessary for Marxists to elaborate a perspective to relate to this situation and to advocate policies that can create political unity between the various sections of the working class. In this context it will be necessary for the collective action of the working class to end austerity. Furthermore, the realisation of a no deal BREXIT will result in immense economic chaos such as problems relating to trade and the exchange of goods in international terms. The only answer to this situation is to agitate in favour of the trade unions organising the flow of goods between countries and to put pressure on the government to accept the regulations of the customs union of the EU. The various Marxist parties have failed to develop a principled position on BREXIT because of their opposition to the UK being a member of the EU. This stance means that they adapt to the most reactionary positions on the issue of the EU. The result is that they fail to provide political leadership on the issues of the moment. The decay of Left Unity means that there is no group that is able to provide a progressive view on the character of the EU and its relationship to the UK. This means that there is no alternative then to try and develop a new revolutionary group that can promote a more progressive programme. However, the working class cannot expect constructive developments in this regard. Therefore, it is necessary to promote the policies that can enhance its level of organisation and confidence in this complex period of change. The immediate priority is to elect a Corbyn government that can create more favourable conditions for the advance of the workers, and the people in general, in the complex circumstances that are prevalent within the UK.