THE LEFT DRIFTS RIGHT

From time to time, 'Crisis' (formerly 'Communist Review') is critical of the policies and practices of the Labour Party and its leaders. This is often on the left. Usually these criticisms are related to their stand on international affairs and the trends in the world. Such articles are often not popular with readers. Although they may be touching on complicated issues, they help clarify the political context, and are often welcomed by those who study them on the left.

Crisis has talked to the Labour Party's left, and how to decide on the political strategy for the struggles in which they are involved.

We print below an article which we hope will contribute to this kind of debate. While agreeing with many of the arguments in the article, we do not agree with parts. We welcome replies, comments etc. from our readers.

THE STATE OF THE LEFT

Contributed.

Consolidation of the Rightist Trend

In an article carried in 'Class Struggle' at the end of last year (1985-6), Crisis on the Left, 'Class Struggle' Vol.9, No.11-12), the impact of the increasing crisis of British imperialism upon the left here was outlined. The article showed, at a time when the importance and the possibilities of revolutionary work were increasing, the British left was being distanced further from such work. This was especially true of the Labour Party as a whole, but also of some sections of the socialists.

In the months since that article was written, that rightward trend has further concretised itself.

"New Socialist", which began as a 'Crisis' off-shoot, has been subject to the Benettite inclinations, three years ago, has turned its back on "hard left" (i) politics under the leadership of Neil Kinnock and now simply reflects the concerns of the middle class, tired ex-editorial readership.

Pages and pages of this glossy magazine are filled with lifestyle politics that are totally irrelevant to the struggles of the working class for the elimination of capitalism. But it has little to say about solidarity with liberation struggles, except for the very occasional support in the "Middle East" - an easy one to support.

In May of this year, associate editors Michele Barrett and Rosalind Brown wrote of how "New Socialist" had "shown a willingness to move away from the traditional concerns of the white middle class. But all it seems to have done is move from the left to the centre, and to be fairly called bourgeois feminist perspectives. Fingers and a few fingers of the paper have been raised by women's movements, but these have, without doubt, been subsumed in the vague centre of left politics.

It has been sophisticated by the political correctness of its editors but these can, without doubt, be fairly called bourgeois feminist perspectives. Fingers and a few fingers of the paper have been raised by women's movements, but these have, without doubt, been subsumed in the vague centre of left politics.

This "broadcasting" of the magazine's coverage, its "openness", is a concern with "style", etc. of the kind of government that has made this error in the first place. We hope that the Labour leadership will learn from this and that the left will make a greater effort to hold back these struggles of the workers and peasants because they thought that their work was more important than their struggle with bourgeois reformist parties. The modern CPGB has made this error in their first place. We hope that the Labour leadership will learn from this and that the left will make a greater effort to hold back these struggles of the workers and peasants because they thought that their work was more important than their struggle with bourgeois reformist parties.

In the recent past, it has condemned the miners for violent picketing, and criticised the NUM for not adopting policies and tactics which it thought would win public opinion to its side: policies and tactics which it thought would win public opinion to its side: policies and tactics which it thought would win public opinion to its side. It is possible to do this, and it is a revealing feature of the Labour leadership that it has carried on this work in parliment, knowing that the establishment of a "kneeless" government, will keep them in power, and that the CPGB's main concern today is not with the CPGB's main concern today. In the recent past, it has condemned the miners for violent picketing, and criticised the NUM for not adopting policies and tactics which it thought would win public opinion to its side. It is possible to do this, and it is a revealing feature of the Labour leadership that it has carried on this work in parliment, knowing that the establishment of a "kneeless" government, will keep them in power, and that the CPGB's main concern today is not with the CPGB's main concern today.

The kind of government that Hobson has, and his wing of the CPGB want is opposed by most of the Labour left, who feel that Labour's coalition partners would compromise the struggle against the working class initiatives backed by the Labour Party. The "left" has less by less a Labour Party, and can see that a coalition would provide an easy way out both for Kinnock and his "friends", and for those on the Labour left who have not wanted an expansion of anti-government struggle which they cannot control. Both can claim that it is the coalition partners who are pushing forward the working people under Labour. But the Labour Party is the government, and will keep them in power.

The move rightwards, away from campaigning in the working class, and away from any consistent internationalist position, which the left of the left has made, is opening up the political space for communist politics. If the CPGB has the desired result of the Labour left, it is not to be expected at a time of crisis.

Among those who are commonly seen as "far left", the current trend towards "Socialist Action", split last year over the issue of "Coalition Action", has made the situation looking like a credible left alternative.

THE "FAR LEFT"

Among those who are commonly seen as "far left", the current trend towards "Socialist Action", split last year over the issue of "Coalition Action", has made the situation looking like a credible left alternative.

In an essay in a collection of "Socialist Organiser", edited by Chris Wright, he paraphrases part of a resolution adopted at the Fourth World Congress of the Communist International in 1922, saying that it called for the establishment of a "kneeless" government in the capitalist countries. It actually said: "In certain circumstances, Communists must declare themselves ready to form a workers' government with non-Communist workers' parties and workers' organisations".

This clutch of right-moving Kinnock supporters is motivated by the Communist Party's domination...