

Platform

February 2024 No.9

The World Anti-imperialist Platform

A stylized illustration of a woman with dark hair, wearing a light-colored long-sleeved shirt, holding a large, dark red flag aloft with her right arm. The background is a solid red color. The illustration is positioned in the lower right quadrant of the page, partially overlapping the text area.





Contents

Work	Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism2 VII. Imperialism as a special stage of capitalism V.I. Lenin
Article	Zionism—A racist, anti-semitic and reactionary tool of imperialism8 Chapter 2. Zionism—a racist ideology Harpal Brar Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)
	On the Operation Al-Aqsa Flood, the role of the Spanish government and communism19 Z. Kosmodemianskaya Iniciativa Comunista (Spain)
	The political stance of the Communist Party of Greece... a communist stance? ·29 Chilean Communist Party (Proletarian Action)
	On the relationship between imperialism and fascism during WWII36 Dimitrios Patelis Revolutionary Unification (Greece)
	Lenin’s work remains a guide for our time44 Joti Brar Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)
	The historical experience of the October Revolution and the factors that will guarantee the victory of the revolution in the 21st century49 Stephen Cho Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism

VII. Imperialism as a special stage of capitalism

V.I. Lenin

January-June, 1916

(It is an extracted version from the “Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism”.)

We must now try to sum up, to draw together the threads of what has been said above on the subject of imperialism. Imperialism emerged as the development and direct continuation of the fundamental characteristics of capitalism in general. But capitalism only became capitalist imperialism at a definite and very high stage of its development, when certain of its fundamental characteristics began to change into their opposites, when the features of the epoch of transition from capitalism to a higher social and economic system had taken shape and revealed themselves in all spheres. Economically, the main thing in this process is the displacement of capitalist free competition by capitalist monopoly. Free competition is the basic feature of capitalism, and of commodity production generally; monopoly is the exact opposite of free competition, but we have seen the latter being transformed into monopoly before our eyes, creating large-scale industry and forcing out small industry, replacing large-scale by still larger-scale industry, and carrying concentration of production and capital to the point where out of it has grown and is growing monopoly: cartels, syndicates and trusts, and merging with them, the capital of a dozen or so banks, which manipulate thousands of millions. At the same time the monopolies, which have grown out of free competition, do not eliminate the latter, but exist above it and alongside it, and thereby give rise to a number of very acute, intense antagonisms, frictions and conflicts. Monopoly is the transition from capitalism to a higher system.

If it were necessary to give the briefest possible

definition of imperialism we should have to say that imperialism is the monopoly stage of capitalism. Such a definition would include what is most important, for, on the one hand, finance capital is the bank capital of a few very big monopolist banks, merged with the capital of the monopolist associations of industrialists; and, on the other hand, the division of the world is the transition from a colonial policy which has extended without hindrance to territories unseized by any capitalist power, to a colonial policy of monopolist possession of the territory of the world, which has been completely divided up.

But very brief definitions, although convenient, for they sum up the main points, are nevertheless inadequate, since we have to deduce from them some especially important features of the phenomenon that has to be defined. And so, without forgetting the conditional and relative value of all definitions in general, which can never embrace all the concatenations of a phenomenon in its full development, we must give a definition of imperialism that will include the following five of its basic features:

- (1) the concentration of production and capital has developed to such a high stage that it has created monopolies which play a decisive role in economic life;
- (2) the merging of bank capital with industrial capital, and the creation, on the basis of this “finance capital”, of a financial oligarchy;
- (3) the export of capital as distinguished from the export of commodities acquires exceptional importance;
- (4) the formation of international monopolist capitalist associations which share the world among themselves and
- (5) the territorial division of the whole world among the biggest capitalist powers is completed. Imperialism is

capitalism at that stage of development at which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital is established; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance; in which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun, in which the division of all territories of the globe among the biggest capitalist powers has been completed.

We shall see later that imperialism can and must be defined differently if we bear in mind not only the basic, purely economic concepts—to which the above definition is limited—but also the historical place of this stage of capitalism in relation to capitalism in general, or the relation between imperialism and the two main trends in the working-class movement. The thing to be noted at this point is that imperialism, as interpreted above, undoubtedly represents a special stage in the development of capitalism. To enable the reader to obtain the most well-grounded idea of imperialism, I deliberately tried to quote as extensively as possible bourgeois economists who have to admit the particularly incontrovertible facts concerning the latest stage of capitalist economy. With the same object in view, I have quoted detailed statistics which enable one to see to what degree bank capital, etc., has grown, in what precisely the transformation of quantity into quality, of developed capitalism into imperialism, was expressed. Needless to say, of course, all boundaries in nature and in society are conventional and changeable, and it would be absurd to argue, for example, about the particular year or decade in which imperialism “definitely” became established.

In the matter of defining imperialism, however, we have to enter into controversy, primarily, with Karl Kautsky, the principal Marxist theoretician of the epoch of the so-called Second International—that is, of the twenty-five years between 1889 and 1914. The fundamental ideas expressed in our definition of imperialism were very resolutely attacked by Kautsky in 1915, and even in November 1914, when he said that imperialism must not be regarded as a “phase” or stage of economy,

but as a policy, a definite policy “preferred” by finance capital; that imperialism must not be “identified” with “present-day capitalism”; that if imperialism is to be understood to mean “all the phenomena of present-day capitalism”—cartels, protection, the domination of the financiers, and colonial policy—then the question as to whether imperialism is necessary to capitalism becomes reduced to the “flattest tautology”, because, in that case, “imperialism is naturally a vital necessity for capitalism”, and so on. The best way to present Kautsky’s idea is to quote his own definition of imperialism, which is diametrically opposed to the substance of the ideas which I have set forth (for the objections coming from the camp of the German Marxists, who have been advocating similar ideas for many years already, have been long known to Kautsky as the objections of a definite trend in Marxism).

Kautsky’s definition is as follows:

“Imperialism is a product of highly developed industrial capitalism. It consists in the striving of every industrial capitalist nation to bring under its control or to annex all large areas of agrarian [Kautsky’s italics] territory, irrespective of what nations inhabit it.”^[1]

This definition is of no use at all because it one-sidedly, i.e., arbitrarily, singles out only the national question (although the latter is extremely important in itself as well as in its relation to imperialism), it arbitrarily and inaccurately connects this question only with industrial capital in the countries which annex other nations, and in an equally arbitrary and inaccurate manner pushes into the forefront the annexation of agrarian regions.

Imperialism is a striving for annexations—this is what the political part of Kautsky’s definition amounts to. It is correct, but very incomplete, for politically, imperialism is, in general, a striving towards violence and reaction. For the moment, however, we are interested in the economic aspect of the question, which Kautsky himself introduced into his definition. The inaccuracies in Kautsky’s definition are glaring. The characteristic feature of

imperialism is not industrial but finance capital. It is not an accident that in France it was precisely the extraordinarily rapid development of finance capital, and the weakening of industrial capital, that from the eighties onwards gave rise to the extreme intensification of annexationist (colonial) policy. The characteristic feature of imperialism is precisely that it strives to annex not only agrarian territories, but even most highly industrialised regions (German appetite for Belgium; French appetite for Lorraine), because (1) the fact that the world is already partitioned obliges those contemplating a redivision to reach out for every kind of territory, and (2) an essential feature of imperialism is the rivalry between several great powers in the striving for hegemony, i.e., for the conquest of territory, not so much directly for themselves as to weaken the adversary and undermine his hegemony. (Belgium is particularly important for Germany as a base for operations against Britain; Britain needs Baghdad as a base for operations against Germany, etc.)

Kautsky refers especially—and repeatedly—to English writers who, he alleges, have given a purely political meaning to the word “imperialism” in the sense that he, Kautsky, understands it. We take up the work by the English writer Hobson, *Imperialism*, which appeared in 1902, and there we read:

“The new imperialism differs from the older, first, in substituting for the ambition of a single growing empire the theory and the practice of competing empires, each motivated by similar lusts of political aggrandisement and commercial gain; secondly, in the dominance of financial or investing over mercantile interests.”^[2]

We see that Kautsky is absolutely wrong in referring to English writers generally (unless he meant the vulgar English imperialists, or the avowed apologists for imperialism). We see that Kautsky, while claiming that he continues to advocate Marxism, as a matter of fact takes a step backward compared with the social-liberal Hobson, who more correctly takes into account

two “historically concrete” (Kautsky’s definition is a mockery of historical concreteness!) features of modern imperialism: (1) the competition between several imperialisms, and (2) the predominance of the financier over the merchant. If it is chiefly a question of the annexation of agrarian countries by industrial countries, then the role of the merchant is put in the forefront.

Kautsky’s definition is not only wrong and un-Marxist. It serves as a basis for a whole system of views which signify a rupture with Marxist theory and Marxist practice all along the line. I shall refer to this later. The argument about words which Kautsky raises as to whether the latest stage of capitalism should be called imperialism or the stage of finance capital is not worth serious attention. Call it what you will, it makes no difference. The essence of the matter is that Kautsky detaches the politics of imperialism from its economics, speaks of annexations as being a policy “preferred” by finance capital, and opposes to it another bourgeois policy which, he alleges, is possible on this very same basis of finance capital. It follows, then, that monopolies in the economy are compatible with non-monopolistic, non-violent, non-annexationist methods in politics. It follows, then, that the territorial division of the world, which was completed during this very epoch of finance capital, and which constitutes the basis of the present peculiar forms of rivalry between the biggest capitalist states, is compatible with a non-imperialist policy. The result is a slurring-over and a blunting of the most profound contradictions of the latest stage of capitalism, instead of an exposure of their depth; the result is bourgeois reformism instead of Marxism.

Kautsky enters into controversy with the German apologist of imperialism and annexations, Cunow, who clumsily and cynically argues that imperialism is present-day capitalism; the development of capitalism is inevitable and progressive; therefore imperialism is progressive; therefore, we should grovel before it and glorify it! This is something like the caricature of the Russian Marxists which

the Narodniks drew in 1894-95. They argued: if the Marxists believe that capitalism is inevitable in Russia, that it is progressive, then they ought to open a tavern and begin to implant capitalism! Kautsky's reply to Cunow is as follows: imperialism is not present-day capitalism; it is only one of the forms of the policy of present-day capitalism. This policy we can and should fight, fight imperialism, annexations, etc.

The reply seems quite plausible, but in effect it is a more subtle and more disguised (and therefore more dangerous) advocacy of conciliation with imperialism, because a "fight" against the policy of the trusts and banks that does not affect the economic basis of the trusts and banks is mere bourgeois reformism and pacifism, the benevolent and innocent expression of pious wishes. Evasion of existing contradictions, forgetting the most important of them, instead of revealing their full depth—such is Kautsky's theory, which has nothing in common with Marxism. Naturally, such a "theory" can only serve the purpose of advocating unity with the Cunows!

"From the purely economic point of view", writes Kautsky, "it is not impossible that capitalism will yet go through a new phase, that of the extension of the policy of the cartels to foreign policy, the phase of ultra-imperialism",^[3] i.e., of a superimperialism, of a union of the imperialisms of the whole world and not struggles among them, a phase when wars shall cease under capitalism, a phase of "the joint exploitation of the world by internationally united finance capital".^[4]

We shall have to deal with this "theory of ultra-imperialism" later on in order to show in detail how decisively and completely it breaks with Marxism. At present, in keeping with the general plan of the present work, we must examine the exact economic data on this question. "From the purely economic point of view", is "ultra-imperialism" possible, or is it ultra-nonsense?

If the purely economic point of view is meant to be a "pure" abstraction, then all that can be said reduces itself to the following proposition:

development is proceeding towards monopolies, hence, towards a single world monopoly, towards a single world trust. This is indisputable, but it is also as completely meaningless as is the statement that "development is proceeding" towards the manufacture of foodstuffs in laboratories. In this sense the "theory" of ultra-imperialism is no less absurd than a "theory of ultra-agriculture" would be.

If, however, we are discussing the "purely economic" conditions of the epoch of finance capital as a historically concrete epoch which began at the turn of the twentieth century, then the best reply that one can make to the lifeless abstractions of "ultra-imperialism" (which serve exclusively a most reactionary aim: that of diverting attention from the depth of existing antagonisms) is to contrast them with the concrete economic realities of the present-day world economy. Kautsky's utterly meaningless talk about ultra-imperialism encourages, among other things, that profoundly mistaken idea which only brings grist to the mill of the apologists of imperialism, i.e., that the rule of finance capital lessens the unevenness and contradictions inherent in the world economy, whereas in reality it increases them.

R. Calwer, in his little book, *An Introduction to the World Economy*,^[5] made an attempt to summarise the main, purely economic, data that enable one to obtain a concrete picture of the internal relations of the world economy at the turn of the twentieth century. He divides the world into five "main economic areas", as follows: (1) Central Europe (the whole of Europe with the exception of Russia and Great Britain); (2) Great Britain; (3) Russia; (4) Eastern Asia; (5) America; he includes the colonies in the "areas" of the states to which they belong and "leaves aside" a few countries not distributed according to areas, such as Persia, Afghanistan, and Arabia in Asia, Morocco and Abyssinia in Africa, etc.

Here is a brief summary of the economic data he quotes on these regions.

Principal economic areas	Area	Pop.	Transport		Trade	Industry		
	Million sq. miles	Millions	Railways (thou. km)	Mercantile fleet (millions tons)	Imports, exports (thous-million marks)	Output		Number of cotton spindles (millions)
						Of coal (mill. tons)	Of pig iron (mill. tons)	
1) Central Europe	27.6 (23.6)	388 (146)	204	8	41	251	15	26
2) Britain	28.9 (28.6)	398 (355)	140	11	25	249	9	51
3) Russia	22	131	63	1	3	16	3	7
4) Eastern Asia	12	389	8	1	2	8	0.02	2
5) America	30	148	379	6	14	245	14	19

NOTE: The figures in parentheses show the area and population of the colonies.

We see three areas of highly developed capitalism (high development of means of transport, of trade and of industry): the Central European, the British and the American areas. Among these are three states which dominate the world: Germany, Great Britain, and the United States. Imperialist rivalry and the struggle between these countries have become extremely keen because Germany has only an insignificant area and few colonies; the creation of “Central Europe” is still a matter for the future, it is being born in the midst of a desperate struggle. For the moment the distinctive feature of the whole of Europe is political disunity. In the British and American areas, on the other hand, political concentration is very highly developed, but there is a vast disparity between the immense colonies of the one and the insignificant colonies of the other. In the colonies, however, capitalism is only beginning to develop. The struggle for South America is becoming more and more acute.

There are two areas where capitalism is little developed: Russia and Eastern Asia. In the former, the population is extremely sparse, in the latter it is extremely dense; in the former political concentration is high, in the latter it does not exist. The partitioning of China is only just beginning, and the struggle for it between Japan, the U.S., etc., is continually gaining in intensity.

Compare this reality—the vast diversity of economic and political conditions, the extreme disparity in the rate of development of the various countries, etc., and the violent struggles among the imperialist states—with Kautsky’s silly little fable

about “peaceful” ultra-imperialism. Is this not the reactionary attempt of a frightened philistine to hide from stern reality? Are not the international cartels which Kautsky imagines are the embryos of “ultra-imperialism” (in the same way as one “can” describe the manufacture of tablets in a laboratory as ultra-agriculture in embryo) an example of the division and the redivision of the world, the transition from peaceful division to non-peaceful division and vice versa? Is not American and other finance capital, which divided the whole world peacefully with Germany’s participation in, for example, the international rail syndicate, or in the international mercantile shipping trust, now engaged in redividing the world on the basis of a new relation of forces that is being changed by methods anything but peaceful?

Finance capital and the trusts do not diminish but increase the differences in the rate of growth of the various parts of the world economy. Once the relation of forces is changed, what other solution of the contradictions can be found under capitalism than that of force? Railway statistics ^[6] provide remarkably exact data on the different rates of growth of capitalism and finance capital in world economy. In the last decades of imperialist development, the total length of railways has changed as follows:

	Railways (000 kilometers)				
	1890	1913	+		
Europe	224	346	+122		
U.S.	268	411	+143		
All colonies	82	210	+128		
Independent and semi-independent states of Asia and America	43	125	137	347	+222
<i>Total</i>	617	1,104			

Thus, the development of railways has been most rapid in the colonies and in the independent (and semi-independent) states of Asia and America. Here, as we know, the finance capital of the four or five biggest capitalist states holds undisputed sway. Two hundred thousand kilometres of new railways in the colonies and in the other countries of Asia

and America represent a capital of more than 40,000 million marks newly invested on particularly advantageous terms, with special guarantees of a good return and with profitable orders for steel works, etc., etc.

Capitalism is growing with the greatest rapidity in the colonies and in overseas countries. Among the latter, new imperialist powers are emerging (e.g., Japan). The struggle among the world imperialisms is becoming more acute. The tribute levied by finance capital on the most profitable colonial and overseas enterprises is increasing. In the division of this “booty”, an exceptionally large part goes to countries which do not always stand at the top of the list in the rapidity of the development of their productive forces. In the case of the biggest countries, together with their colonies, the total length of railways was as follows:

	(000 kilometres)		
	1890	1913	
U.S.	268	413	+145
British Empire	107	208	+101
Russia	32	78	+46
Germany	43	68	+25
France	41	63	+22
Total	491	830	+339

Thus, about 80 per cent of the total existing railways are concentrated in the hands of the five biggest powers. But the concentration of the ownership of these railways, the concentration of finance capital, is immeasurably greater since the French and British millionaires, for example, own an enormous amount of shares and bonds in American, Russian and other railways.

Thanks to her colonies, Great Britain has increased the length of “her” railways by 100,000 kilometres, four times as much as Germany. And yet, it is well known that the development of productive forces in Germany, and especially the

development of the coal and iron industries, has been incomparably more rapid during this period than in Britain—not to speak of France and Russia. In 1892, Germany produced 4,900,000 tons of pig-iron and Great Britain produced 6,800,000 tons; in 1912, Germany produced 17,600,000 tons and Great Britain, 9,000,000 tons. Germany, therefore, had an overwhelming superiority over Britain in this respect. [7] The question is: what means other than war could there be under capitalism to overcome the disparity between the development of productive forces and the accumulation of capital on the one side, and the division of colonies and spheres of influence for finance capital on the other?

Notes

[1] Die Neue Zeit, 1914, 2 (B. 32), S. 909, Sept. 11, 1914; cf. 1915, 2, S. 107 et seq. —Lenin

[2] Hobson, Imperialism, London, 1902, p. 324. —Lenin

[3] Die Neue Zeit, 1914, 2 (B. 32), S. 921, Sept. 11, 1914. Cf. 1915, 2, S. 107 et seq. —Lenin

[4] Ibid., 1915, 1, S. 144, April 30, 1915. —Lenin

[5] R. Calwer, Einführung in die Weltwirtschaft, Berlin, 1906. —Lenin

[6] Statistisches Jahrbuch für das deutsche Reich, 1915; Archiv für Eisenbahnwesen, 1892. Minor details for the distribution of railways among the colonies of the various countries in 1890 had to be estimated approximately. —Lenin

[7] Cf. also Edgar Crammond, “The Economic Relations of the British and German Empires” in The Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, July 1914, p. 777 et seq. —Lenin

Zionism—A racist, anti-semitic and reactionary tool of imperialism

Chapter 2. Zionism—a racist ideology

Harpal Brar | Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)

published in the November/December 2016 issue of LALKAR

Zionism is not now, nor was it ever, co-extensive with either Judaism or the Jewish people. The vast majority of Hitler's Jewish victims were not Zionists.

The majority of Polish Jews repudiated Zionism on the eve of the Holocaust and in September 1939 abhorred the politics of Menachem Begin, one of the leaders of the self-styled 'Zionist Revisionist' movement in Warsaw.

There cannot be the slightest confusion between the struggle against Zionism and hostility to either Jews or Judaism.

In 1895 Theodor Herzl, the founder of Zionism, published *Jewish State*. This book laid the basis for the Zionist movement.

Believing anti-semitism to be unbeatable and natural, Zionism never fought it. Instead it sought accommodation with it—and pragmatic utilisation of it for the purpose of obtaining a Jewish state.

Overcome by his own pessimism, Herzl completely misunderstood the Dreyfus case in which a French military officer of Jewish origin, Alfred Dreyfus, was wrongly charged with treason. The secrecy of his trial and Dreyfus's courageous insistence on his innocence, made a lot of people believe that injustice had been done. As a result, there was a deluge of Gentile support for him. The French intelligentsia rallied to his side, as did the working-class movement. Eventually Dreyfus was vindicated, the right-wing of French society and the Church were discredited, and the army top brass besmirched. Anti-semitism in France was driven into irrelevance until the conquest of France by

Hitler's army.

And yet Herzl, a prominent Viennese journalist, could see the Dreyfus affair only as a defeat, and never as a rallying cry in the fight against anti-semitism. He was incapable of understanding the significance of the wave of Gentile sympathy for the Jewish victim. He did not see fit to organise a single demonstration in defence of Dreyfus. Following the victory of the struggle in defence of Dreyfus, French Jewry quite rightly saw Zionism as irrelevant. For this, Herzl savaged them in his diary, revealing in the course of doing so his diehard anti-socialist, reactionary views".

"They [the Jews] seek protection from the socialists and the destroyers of the present civil order... Truly they are not Jews any more. To be sure, they are not Frenchmen either. They will probably become leaders of European anarchism"^[1].

The views expressed by Herzl in his *Der Judenstaat* ('The Jewish state') had in fact already been expressed by two Russian Jews, Perez Smolenskin (in 1873) and Leo Pinsker (1882). Herzl's particular contribution was the building of an organisation, the World Zionist Organisation, which held its first Congress in 1897 in Basle, Switzerland, to negotiate with imperialism for the creation of a Jewish national state. He negotiated for it unsuccessfully with the ultra-reactionary Sultan Abdul Hamid II of Turkey, with Wilhelm II, the German Kaiser, with the Tsarist regime through Count Sergei Witte (Finance Minister) and the Minister of the Interior, Vyachaslav Von Plevhe, responsible for organising pogroms in Russia.

Herzl's proposals were always tailored to please the ears of the particular autocrat or representative of a particular imperialism with whom he happened to be having an audience. In every case "...he presented his project in a manner best calculated to appeal to his listener: to the Sultan he promised Jewish capital; to the Kaiser he undertook that the Jewish territory would be an outpost of Berlin; to Chamberlain, the British colonial secretary, he held out the prospect of the Jewish territory becoming a colony of the British Empire"^[2].

The Zionist leadership, beginning with Herzl, was clear about two things. First, that their project could only succeed with the backing of a dominant great power; second, that its goal could only be achieved by bypassing the Palestinians, not through any understanding with them. As the dominant great power in the Middle East changed several times during the 20th century, Zionism suitably shifted its allegiance in pursuit of its reactionary aim of a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

Zionism held great attraction for the imperialist, reactionary and anti-semitic regimes. Being a reactionary nationalist movement, it held out the prospect of weaning Jewish workers away from democratic and revolutionary movements, while promising to help them get rid of their Jewish population through emigration. Zionism saw revolutionary Marxism as an assimilationist enemy which obliged them to make an alliance against it with their fellow separatists of the anti-semitic right-wing nationalist movements in Eastern Europe. The essentials of Zionist doctrine on anti-semitism were clearly set down well in advance of the Holocaust: anti-semitism was inevitable and could not be fought; the solution was the emigration of unwanted Jews to a Jewish state still to be created.

Balfour Declaration

In view of the above, it is not surprising that

British imperialism, perceiving the reactionary essence of Zionism and the prospect it held for acting as a tool of British policy in the Middle East should it manage to entrench itself in Palestine. And who should be history's chosen instrument for providing substance to what at the time was a hare-brained Zionist dream? None other than the anti-semitic Arthur Balfour, the British foreign secretary! Hence the 1917 infamous Balfour Declaration favouring "...the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people" and the promise by the British government to use its "best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object".

The Balfour Declaration was a boon for the Zionists—not for Jewry. The Declaration was a price London was prepared to pay to get the American Jewry to use its influence to bring the US into the war, and to keep Russian Jewry loyal to the allies. In addition, a future Jewish state was to act as the outpost for British imperialism against the rising tide of the national liberation movement of the Arab people.

The World Zionist Organisation's leaders understood that the British government's priority was the crushing of the Bolsheviks, and that they had to be on their best behaviour in their activities in the turbulent east European arena.

Churchill saw the struggle unfolding "between the Zionist and Bolshevik Jews as little less than a struggle for the soul of the Jewish people"^[3].

Zionism was willing to cooperate with Britain in spite of British involvement with the White Russian pogromists.

Herzl's successor, Chaim Weizmann appeared at the Versailles Conference on 23 February 1919, where he pronounced the traditional line on Jewry shared by both anti-semites and Zionists. It was not the Jews who really had problems, it was the Jews who were the problem.

Zionism offered itself to the assembled capitalist

powers as an anti-revolutionary movement. Zionism, he declared, would “transform Jewish energy into a constructive force instead of being dissipated in destructive tendencies”^[4].

Weizmann completely shared the anti-communist mindset of his British patrons. He never changed his opinion. Even in *Trial and Error*, his autobiography, he still sounded like a high Tory, writing of a “time when the horrors of the Bolshevik revolution were fresh in everyone’s mind”^[5].

Only on the basis of an alliance with the working class and socialists could Jewish rights be obtained and safeguarded. This is precisely what the Zionists were fiercely opposed to.

The Bolsheviks gave the Jews complete equality and even set up schools and, eventually, courts in Yiddish, but they were absolutely opposed to Zionism, as indeed to all nationalism.

Bolshevism opposed Zionism as pro-British and as fundamentally anti-Arab. So the Zionists turned to the local nationalists. In Ukraine, they turned to Simon Petliura’s Rada (Council) which, like the Zionists, recruited on strictly ethnic lines—no Russians, no Poles, no Jews. The Zionists made every effort to rally Jewish support everywhere for the anti-Bolshevik Rada.

Churchill lost his gamble as, following anti-Jewish pogroms after the first Ukrainian defeat at the hands of the Red Army in January 1919, the Jewish masses deserted the Zionists.

The ideological affinity between Zionism and anti-semitism, the Zionist hostility to assimilation and Marxism, could not but incline it towards an alliance with anti-semitic nationalists and imperialism. It was not for nothing that Balfour facilitated Zionism’s entrenchment in Palestine. But for the support of the British during the early years of the Mandate, the Palestinians would have had not the slightest difficulty pushing Zionism out.

World Zionist Organisation’s policies were

continued under Weizmann during the Hitler years.

Blut and Boden

Herzl was not devout. He had no special concern for Palestine—the Kenyan Highlands would do just as well for a Jewish state. He had no interest in Hebrew. With Weizmann, however, cosmopolitan Zionism died an early death. The German university graduates who took over the Zionist movement after Herzl’s death developed the racist ideology of Jewish separatism. They agreed with the German anti-semites: the Jews were not part of the German Volk. Jews and Germans should not mix sexually for the sake of their own unique Blut and, not being of the Teutonic Blut, they perforce had to have their own Boden: Palestine.

Even Einstein subscribed to the Zionist race conceptions and thus reinforced racism, lending it the prestige of his reputation. Though sounding profound, his contributions to the discussion are based on the same nonsense:

“Nations with a racial difference appear to have instincts which work against their fusion. The assimilation of the Jews to the European nations ... could not eradicate the feeling of lack of kinship between them and those among whom they lived. In the last resort, the instinctive feeling of kinship is referable to the law of conservation of energy. For this reason it cannot be eradicated by any amount of well meant pressure”^[6].

Zionists believed that because they lacked their own Boden, the Jews were Untermenschen and, therefore, for their ‘hosts’, little more than leeches—the world pest.

If one believes in the validity of racial exclusiveness, it is difficult to object to anyone else’s racism; if it is impossible for any people to be healthy except in their own homeland, then one cannot object to anyone else excluding ‘aliens’ from their territory.

Zionist Blut und Boden provided an excellent rationale for not fighting anti-semitism on its home ground; it was no fault of the anti-semites, it was because of the Jews' own misfortune of being in exile.

By this logic, the loss of Palestine was the root cause of anti-semitism; therefore in the regaining of Palestine lay the only solution to the Jewish question. In view of this, is it difficult to understand the gullible reader of a Nazi newspaper who concluded that what was said by the Nazis, and agreed to by the Zionists—had to be right?

“Any Jewish movement that prattled about the naturalness of anti-semitism”, observed Lenni Brenner, “would, just as ‘naturally’ seek to come to terms with the Nazis when they came to power”^[7].

German Zionism, through the Zionist Federation of Germany (ZVfD), turned away from the society in which Jews lived. There were only two Zionist tasks: (i) instilling nationalist consciousness in as many Jews as would listen, and (ii) training youths for occupations useful in the economic development of Palestine. Everything else was useless.

In 1925, the most fervent expounder of complete abstentionism, Jacob Klatzin, co-editor of Encyclopedia Judaica, vividly expressed the ramifications of the Zionist approach to anti-semitism thus:

“If we do not admit the rightfulness of antisemitism, we deny the rightfulness of our own nationalism. If our people is deserving and willing to live its own national life, then it is an alien body thrust into the nations among whom it lives, an alien body that insists on its own distinctive identity, reducing the domain of their life. It is right, therefore, that they should fight against us for their national integrity... Instead of establishing societies for defense against the anti-Semites, who want to reduce our rights, we should establish societies for the defense against our friends who

desire to defend our rights”^[8].

Instead of uniting with the anti-Nazi working class on a programme of militant resistance, the Zionist Federation of Germany leadership in 1932, when Hitler was gaining strength by the day, chose to organise anti-communist meetings to warn Jewish youth against ‘red assimilation’.

On 18 March 1912, Weizmann brazenly told a Berlin audience that “each country can absorb only a limited number of Jews, if she doesn’t want disorders in her stomach. Germany already had too many Jews”^[9].

With views like these, he and his fellow Zionists could hardly be expected to mobilise world Jewry against anti-semitism and the Nazis. Not one demonstration against Hitler was organised in America by the Zionists before Hitler came to power. Nahum Goldmann was unwilling to work with the assimilationists.

The German Zionists agreed with two fundamental elements in Nazi ideology—that Jews would never be part of the German Volk and, therefore, did not belong on German soil. Further ideological affinity between them was based on (i) anti-communism; (ii) Common Volkist racism; and (iii) mutual conviction that Germany could never be the homeland of its Jews. Because of this ideological affinity between Zionism and Nazism, the Zionist Federation of Germany, believing that it could induce the Nazis to support them, solicited the patronage of Hitler repeatedly after 1933.

In early March 1933, Julius Streicher, the editor of Der Stürmer, declared that as of 1 April, all Jewish stores and professionals would be boycotted. In response, Rabbi Stephen Wise had planned a counter-demonstration to be held in New York on 27 March if the Nazis went ahead with their boycott. This worried Hitler’s capitalist backers as Jews were prominent throughout the retail trade in America and Europe; any retaliation by them against German companies would prove very

hurtful. So they urged Hitler to call of the anti-Jewish boycott. As the Nazis could not do that without losing face, they resorted to using the Zionists to head off Rabbi Wise. Thus, Herman Goering called in the Zionist leaders. He told them that the foreign press was lying about atrocities against Jews; unless the lies stopped he could not guarantee the safety of German Jewry. Above all, the New York rally had to be cancelled. Following this meeting, a delegation of three arrived in London on 27 March to make contact with the world Jewry, where it met 40 Jewish leaders at a meeting chaired by Nahum Sokolov who was at the time president of the World Zionist Organisation. The delegation saw two tasks before it: (1) to promote Palestine as “the logical place of refuge” for Jews and (2) to head off all anti-Nazi actions abroad. The Zionist leadership saw to it that no anti-Nazi action took place in New York or anywhere else.

On 21 June 1933, the Zionist Federation of Germany sent a memorandum to the Nazi Party which was nothing short of treason to the Jews of Germany. In it the German Zionists “offered calculated collaboration between Zionism and Nazism, hallowed by the goal of a Jewish state: we shall wage no battle against thee, only against those who would resist thee”^[10].

All this was taking place in complete secrecy behind the backs of the Jewish people, who knew nothing about the disgraceful machinations of the Zionist leaders acting allegedly in the name of the Jewish masses. But, kept in ignorance as they were, the Jewish masses could not miss what was appearing in the Rundschau (the organ of the Zionist Union of Germany) in which assimilationist Jewry was attacked with gay abandon.

Its editor, Robert Weltsch, took the occasion of the 1 April boycott to lay into the Jews of Germany in an editorial: “Wear the yellow badge with pride”. It blamed the Jews for their misfortunes, saying,

inter alia: “...Because the Jews do not display their Jewishness with pride, because they wanted to shirk the Jewish question, they must share the blame for the degradation of the Jewry”^[11].

Just at the time when the Nazis were busy throwing communists, socialists and trade unionists into concentration camps, Weltsch attacked left-wing Jewish journalists as “Jewish buffoons”^[12].

Be it said in passing that, although the left-wing press had been under attack from day one of the Nazis assuming power, the Zionist press was still legal.

With the ascent of the Nazis to power, racism was triumphant in Germany and the Zionist Federation of Germany ran with the winner. Rundschau of 4 August 1933 literally went mad, urging that “Jews should not merely accept silently the dictates of their new masters; they, too, had to realise that race separation was wholly to the good”^[13].

Continuing it said: “Race is undoubtedly a very important, yes, decisive momentum. Out of ‘blood and soil’ really is determined the meaning of a people and their achievements”. Jews would have to make good for “the lost generations when Jewish racial consciousness was largely neglected”.

To prove that the “Jewish renaissance movement” had always been racist, the Rundschau reprinted two pre-1914 articles under the title ‘Voices of Blood’, which asserted with delirious joy how “the modern Jew... recognises his Jewishness through an inner experience which teachers him the special language of his blood in a mystical manner”^[14].

The charitable interpretation of such kind of nonsense is that it allowed the gentry peddling it to “reconcile themselves to the existence of anti-semitism in Germany without fighting it”^[15].

The most fervent propagandist of the Zionist Federation of Germany’s racism was Joachim Prinz who had been a social-democratic voter before 1933. He became rabidly Volkist in the first years of the Third Reich. The violent hostility towards Jews

sprinkling the pages of his book *Wir Juden* could have been easily inserted into the Nazi propaganda. To him the Jew was made up of “misplacement, of queerness, of exhibitionism, inferiority, arrogance, self-deceit, sophisticated love of truth, hate, sickly patriotism and rootless cosmopolitanism, a psychological arsenal of rare abundance”^[16].

Prinz firmly, not to say foolishly, believed that an accommodation between Nazis and Jews was possible on the basis of a Zionist-Nazi accord: “A state which is constructed on the principle of the purity of nation and race can only have respect for those Jews who see themselves in the same way”^[17].

After Prinz went to the US, he gave up his bizarre notions, for they made no sense in the prevailing conditions in America.

Even the Nuremberg laws of 15 September 1935 failed to shift the German Zionist belief in an ultimate *modus vivendi* with the Nazis.

The *Rundschau* published a statement by the head of the Nazis’ press association, A I Brandt, which informed, to the surprise of the world at large, that the laws were “both beneficial and regenerative for Judaism as well. By giving the Jewish minority an opportunity to lead its own life and assuring governmental support for this independent existence, Germany is helping Judaism to strengthen its national character and is making a contribution towards improving relations between the two peoples”^[18].

The Zionist Federation of Germany was obsessed with trying to unite the segregated Jewish institutions to inculcate a Jewish national spirit. The harder the Nazis pressed on the Jews, the greater became the Zionist conviction that a deal with the Nazis was possible. Their reasoning was that the greater the exclusion of Jews from every aspect of German life, the greater the need of the Nazis for Zionism with the aid of which to get rid of the Jews.

Although Zionist hopes for an agreement with

the Nazis vanished in the face of ever-augmenting intimidation and terror, yet there was no attempt at anti-Nazi resistance on the part of the leaders of the Zionist Federation of Germany. Throughout the entire pre-war years there was only the tiniest of Zionist involvement in the anti-Nazi underground. Instead, the Zionist leaders vociferously attacked the underground KPD (Communist Party of Germany) which was the leadership of the anti-Nazi resistance

Ideological jackals of Nazism

The World Zionist leaders gave their approval to the general line of their German affiliate. Before the Nazis came to power, German Zionism was no more than an isolated bourgeois cult. Then, all of a sudden, this small group saw itself as destined by history to negotiate secretly with the Nazi regime in opposition to the vast mass of humanity and the vast mass of Jewry alike who wanted to organise resistance to the Hitlerites—all in the hope of gaining support of the deadly enemy of the Jews and general humanity alike, for the building of their state in Palestine. Mere cowardice on the part of the Zionist leadership of the Zionist Federation of Germany does not go far enough to explain the pro-Hitler evolution of Zionist racism, nor does it explain the World Zionist Organisation’s endorsement of their stance. The Zionists did not fight Hitler’s rise to power, “not out of any... cowardice, but out of their deepest conviction, which they had inherited from Herzl, that anti-semitism could not be fought. Given their failure to resist during Weimar, and given their race theories, it was inevitable that they would end up as the ideological ‘jackals of Nazism’”^[19]

The World Zionist Organisation saw Hitler’s victory in the same light as the Zionist Federation of Germany—not as a defeat for all Jews, but as positive proof of the bankruptcy of assimilationism. Their own hour was at hand... Hitler’s victory was

a flail to drive stiff-necked Jews back to their own kind and their own land.

Emil Ludwig, the world-famous author and then a recent convert to Zionism, in an interview given to a fellow Zionist on his [Ludwig's] visit to America, expressed the general attitude of the Zionist movement: "Hitler will be forgotten in a few years, but he will have a beautiful monument in Palestine," adding that the "coming of the Nazis was rather a welcome thing. So many of our German Jews were hovering between two coasts; so many of them were riding the treacherous current between the Scylla of assimilation and the Charybdis of a nodding acquaintance with Jewish things. Thousands who seemed to be completely lost to Judaism were brought back to the fold by Hitler, and for that I am personally very grateful to him"^[20].

Ludwig's views were exactly the same as those of such veterans as the much-acclaimed Chaim Nachman Bialik, at the time considered as the Poet Laureate of Zionism. Because of his reputation, his statements enjoyed wide circulation, among the Zionists as well as their left-wing enemies. Hitlerism, he held, had saved German Jews from annihilation through assimilation. Like many of the Zionists, Bialik thought of the Jews as something of a superior race: "I, too, like Hitler, believe in the power of the blood idea"^[21].

By 1934 Zionism claimed a worldwide membership of over a million.

The Ha'avara

In early May, 1935, Chaim Arlosoroff, the political secretary of the Jewish Agency, reached a preliminary understanding with the Nazi authorities to allow Zionist émigrés to transfer some of their wealth out of Germany into Palestine in the form of farm machinery. On the Nazi side, the motivation was to weaken and defeat, through dissension within world Jewry, any resolution

boycotting German goods at the then-impending Jewish Conference in London and, into the bargain, push a few thousand Jews out of Germany. This coincided with the Zionists' aims of getting German Jews, especially the young and sturdy, to Palestine and to acquire funds for the project of building a Jewish state in Palestine.

Arlosoroff visited Berlin again in June, returning to Tel Aviv on 14 June, where, two nights later, he was assassinated for his dealings with the Nazis. That, however, did nothing to retard the World Zionist Organisation's accommodation with the vile Nazi regime, which announced the conclusion of the Zionist-Nazi Pact on 18 June—just in time for the 18th Zionist Congress in Prague.

In view of the Jewish hostility to this notorious Pact, known as the 'Ha'avara' or Transfer Agreement, the World Zionist Organisation leadership tried to protect itself by resort to outright lying to the effect that the executive of the World Zionist Organisation had played no part in the negotiations leading to this agreement with the Nazi government. Literally nobody believed this barefaced lie.

The controversy over this agreement continued until 1935 among recriminations. All the same, the Ha'avara grew to become a sizeable banking and trading house with 137 specialists in the Jerusalem office at the peak of its activities. It was used by the Nazis as an instrument for weakening the boycott movement through damaging the considerable political and economic strength of the Jewish community by using dissension within its ranks—a notorious scheme with which the Zionist leadership went along willingly—even enthusiastically.

Moshe Beilenson, who in 1922 had been a member of a delegation that pledged Italian Zionism's loyalty to Mussolini, presented a spirited theoretical defence of the Zionist Nazi Pact, saying that "...verily, the Eighteenth Congress [of the World Zionist Organisation] had the courage to

destroy the assimilationist tradition and appeals to others... For generations we have fought by means of protests. Now we have another weapon in our hand, a strong, trusty and sure weapon: the visa to Palestine”^[22].

Thus it is clear that to the Zionists the land of Israel had assumed greater significance than the urgent needs for survival of the Jewish people. To them, emigration to Palestine had become the sole means for the survival of the Jewish people. The millions of Jews around the world, the real Jewish people, were reduced to no more than a pool out of which they would pluck out some young Jews to build their state. Jews elsewhere, in their perverse thinking, would either be driven out, as in Germany, or assimilated, as in France. It is hardly to be surprised at that with such a warped perspective on the question of survival of the Jewish people, the Zionists were increasingly driven to seek cooperation with the Nazis in an effort to bring about the realisation of their vision.

Writing on 3 July 1935 to Arthur Ruppin, director of the Colonisation Department in Palestine, in the context of the then-impending Lucerne Congress of the World Zionist Organisation, Chaim Weizmann advised that the German question be not discussed at it, for such a discussion would prove “...dangerous to the only positive thing we have in Germany, the intensified Zionist movement... We, being a Zionist organisation, should concern ourselves with the constructive solution to the German question through the transfer of the Jewish youth from Germany to Palestine, rather than the question of equal rights of Jews in Germany”^[23].

Lewis Namier, an erstwhile political secretary of the World Zionist Organisation, and a major historian of the British aristocracy, had prefaced Ruppin’s book. Knowledgeable Zionists, including Nahum Goldman, quite correctly saw him as an intense Jewish anti-semite. Such was his devotion to the gentry that he despised Jews as the epitome

of capitalism, of vulgar trade: “Not everyone”, he wrote, “who feels uncomfortable with regard to us must be called an anti-semite, nor is there anything necessarily and inherently wicked in anti-semitism”^[24].

Doubtless the most glaring example of the World Zionist Organisation leadership’s unwillingness to offer resistance to the Nazis was the following statement by Weizmann: “The only dignified and really effective reply to all that is being inflicted upon the Jews of Germany is the edifice erected by our great and beautiful work in the Land of Israel... Something is being created that will transform the woe we all suffer into songs and legends for our grandchildren”^[25].

The presidium of the Lucerne Congress successfully manoeuvred to keep all serious discussion of resistance to the Nazi regime off the floor of the Congress. Even the leading American Zionists, such as Rabbi Stephen Wise and Abba Hillel Silver, who had talked a lot about boycotting German goods but done nothing in practice to organise it, capitulated to Weizmann and endorsed the Ha’avara. As a result, after the Lucerne Congress there no longer were any differences between them and the leadership of the World Zionist Organisation.

Large sections of world Jewry were incensed at the decisions taken in Lucerne. London’s World Jewry, the best Zionist magazine in the English language at that time, fiercely condemned their own World Congress thus: “Dr Weizmann went as far as to state that the only dignified reply the Jews could give was a renewed effort for the upbuilding of Palestine. How terrifying the proclamation of the Congress President must have sounded in the ears of Herren Hitler, Streicher and Goebbels!”^[26].

Going further, the Zionist leadership had secretly organised the extension of the Ha’avara system to other countries: through the creation of the International Trade and Investment Agency

(INTRIA) Bank In London, it proposed to organise the sale of German goods directly to Britain. The Nazi regime had the satisfaction of this further demoralisation of the forces advocating the boycott, for it was the chief beneficiary of the Ha'avara. Not only did it help the Nazis to get rid of some Jews but, more importantly, it was of tremendous value, providing as it did the perfect rationale for all those who wanted the trade with Nazi Germany to continue. In Britain, Sir Oswald Mosely's newspaper, the Blackshirt, could barely contain its delirious joy:

"Can you beat that! We are cutting off our nose to spite our face and refuse to trade with Germany in order to defend the poor Jews. The Jews themselves, in their own country, are to continue making profitable dealings with Germany themselves. Fascists can't better counter the malicious propaganda to destroy friendly relations with Germany than by using this fact"^[27].

Basis for Zionist-Nazi collaboration

While the World Zionist Organisation's bourgeois leadership was busy making deals with the Nazis, thousands of Germans, many Jews among them, were heroically fighting in Spain against Hitler's Condor Legion and Franco's fascist army. All that the Ha'avara did was to demoralise the Jews and non-Jews alike and undermine the forces willing and ready to resist the Nazis. It effectively removed the million-strong Zionist movement from the front line of the anti-Nazi resistance, for the World Zionist Organisation, instead of resisting the Hitlerite fascists, sought to collaborate with them.

After the war and the Holocaust, a contrite Nahum Goldmann, tortured by his own shameful role during the Hitler years, wrote of a dramatic meeting with the Czech foreign minister, Edward Benes, in 1935. Goldmann's graphic account of Benes' waring to the Jews says everything that needs to be said on the Ha'avara and the totally

shameful failure, or rather the unwillingness, of the World Zionist Organisation to offer and organise resistance to the Nazis:

"Don't you understand', he shouted, 'that by reacting with nothing but half-hearted gestures, by failing to arouse world public opinion, and take vigorous action against the Germans, the Jews are endangering their future and their human rights all over the world:' I knew Benes was right... in this context success was irrelevant. What matters in a situation of this sort is a people's moral stance, its readiness to fight back instead of helplessly allowing itself to be massacred"^[28].

The dominant ideologist on the Jewish question was the Baltic German refugee, Alfred Rosenberg, who had developed his theories while still in his native Latvia. He, correctly, was of the opinion that Zionist ideology served wonderfully as a justification for depriving Germany's Jews of their rights and that, perhaps, there was the possibility of future use of the movement for the promotion of Jewish emigration. Hitler began to touch on these themes in his speeches: on 6 July 1920 he stated that Palestine was the proper place for the Jews where alone they could hope to get their rights.

For Hitler the validity of Zionism only lay in its confirmation that Jews could never be Germans. No better proof could be adduced of "Zionism's classic role as an outrider to anti-semitism" than Hitler's own statements on the subject is his Mein Kampf.

By 1939 the SS had become the most pro-Zionist element in the Nazi Party. To commemorate Baron Von Mildenstein's expedition to Palestine, Goebbels had a medal struck: on one side the swastika, on the other the Zionist star.

Even the Nuremberg laws of September 1935, the finishing touches of Germany's pre-2nd World War anti-Jewish legislation, which the Nazis defended as an expression of their pro-Zionism, had the tacit approval of the wiser heads amongst

the Jews themselves. All the speakers at the World Zionist Congress in Lucerne had reiterated that the Jewry of the world were to be correctly seen as a separate people unto themselves regardless of where they lived. Well then, wrote Alfred Berndt in a commentary in the Rundschau of the new restrictions: all Hitler had done was to meet “the demands of the International Jewish Congress by making the Jews who live in Germany a national minority”.

Under the Nuremberg laws, only two flags were permitted in the Third Reich—the swastika and the blue and white Zionist banner. This greatly excited the Zionist Federation of Germany which hoped that this was a sign that Hitler was moving closer to an accommodation with them. In fact it was nothing short of a burning humiliation for the Jewish people.

Heinrich Himmler was Reichsführer of the SS—in 1934 his staff presented him with a ‘Situation report—Jewish question’ which stated that the overwhelming majority of the Jews regarded themselves as Germans and were determined to remain in the country. Since at the time, for fear of international repercussions, in order to overcome that resistance, force could not be employed, the Nazis, in order to overcome their resistance, resorted to the device of installing a distinctive Jewish identity among them by systematically promoting Jewish schools, Hebrew, Jewish art and music, etc., the hope being that it would induce the mass of Jews to abandon their homeland. Since this formula was far from being effective, the Nazi policy was to give added support to the Zionists with a view to persuading the Jews to join the Zionist movement as a means of averting worse troubles. All Jews, Zionists included, were to be persecuted as Jews; however, within that set up it was possible to relax the pressure. Thus, on 28 January 1935, the Bavarian Gestapo sent a circular to the regular police that from then on “members

of the Zionist organisations are, in view of their activities directed towards emigration to Palestine, not to be treated with the same strictness which is necessary towards the members of the German-Jewish organisation’s [assimilationists]”^[29].

The pro-Zionist Nazi policy did not bring about the desired outcome, for the World Zionist Organisation had little interest in the vast majority of German Jews, as these were not Zionists, spoke no Hebrew, were not young enough and were not possessed of the right ‘trades’.

In November 1938 the Nazis finally closed down the Zionist Federation of Germany’s headquarters after Kristalnacht. For their dreadful conduct the Zionists could not even assert that they had been deceived by Hitler, for his race theories and views had been there in plain German since 1926. The Zionists ignored the elephant in the room, namely, that Hitler and his party hated all Jews. The Zionists chose to ignore this fact, for they “...were simply reactionaries who... chose to emphasise the points of similarity between themselves and Hitler. They convinced themselves that because they, too, were racists, against mixed marriage, and believed that Jews were aliens in Germany; because they, too, were opposed to the left, that these similarities would be enough to make Adolf Hitler see them as the only ‘honest partners’ for a diplomatic détente”^[30].

Instead of accusing everyone at the slightest opportunity of being anti-semitic, the Zionists should look into their own ideology and the entire course of the development of the Zionist movement.

Notes

[1] Raphael Pattar, Ed., The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl, Vol II, pp.672-673.

[2] Avi Shlaim, ‘The Iron Wall’.

[3] ‘Zionism versus Bolshevism’, Illustrated Sunday Herald, 8 February 1920.

- [4] Leonard Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, Simon and Shuster, 1961, p.348.
- [5] Emphasis added, quoted by Lenni Brenner, *Zionism in the age of the dictators*, Croom Helm, London, 1983, p.12.
- [6] cited by Lenni Brenner, *op.cit.*, p.21
- [7] *Ibid.*
- [8] Jacob Agus, *The meaning of Jewish History*, Ram's Horn Books, Abelard-Schuman, 1963.
- [9] quoted by Benyamin Matuvo, 'The Zionist wish and the Nazi deed', *Issues*, Winter 1966/7.
- [10] Brenner, *op.cit.*, p.49.
- [11] Davydowicz L, *A Holocaust reader*, Behrman House, New Jersey, p. 148.
- [12] *Ibid.* p.149.
- [13] quoted in Brenner, p. 51.
- [14] quoted in Brenner, pp.52-52.
- [15] *Ibid.* p.52.
- [16] cited by Kopel Pinson, 'The Jewish spirit in Nazi Germany', *Menorah Journal*, Autumn 1936.
- [17] Benyamin Matuvo, 'The Zionist wish and the Nazi Deed', *Issues*, Winter 1966-67, p.12.
- [18] Abraham Margalio, 'The reaction of the Jewish public in Germany to the Nuremberg laws', *Yad Vashen Studies*, Vol XII, p.86.
- [19] Lenni Brenner, *op.cit.*, p.55.
- [20] Quoted by Meyer Steinglas in 'Emil Ludwig before the judge', *American Jewish Times*, April 1936, p.35.
- [21] Chaim Bialik, 'The present hour', *Young Zionist*, London, May 1934.
- [22] Moshe Beilenson, 'The new Jewish statesmanship', *Labour Palestine*, February 1934, pp.8-10.
- [23] Chaim Weizmann 'To Arthur Ruppin', 3 July 1935, in Barnett Litvinoff, *Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann Letters Vol XVI*, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, 1982, p.464.
- [24] Introduction to Arthur Ruppin's book, *Jews in the modern world*, Macmillan, New York, 1934, p.xiii.
- [25] Barnett Litvinoff, *Weizmann—the last of the patriarchs*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1976, p.82.
- [26] 'Kiddush Hashem', *World Jewry*, 6 September 1935, p.1.
- [27] 'Blackshirts peeved at Reich-Zion trade', *Jewish Daily Bulletin*, 6 February 1935, p.5.
- [28] *Autobiography*, Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1969, p.148.
- [29] Kurt Grossman, 'Zionists and non-Zionists under Nazi rule in the 1930s', *Herzl Yearbook*, Vol VI, Herzl Press, New York, 1966, p.340.
- [30] Brenner, *op.cit.*, p.89.

On the Operation Al-Aqsa Flood, the role of the Spanish government and communism

Z. Kosmodemianskaya | Iniciativa Comunista (Spain)

In memory of all the martyrs who gave their lives for freedom.

1. New episode in the Palestinian struggle and the West's reaction

On 7 October 2023, the Martyr Izz El-Din Al-Qassam brigades kicked off Operation Al-Aqsa Flood. Hours later, the rest of the Palestinian armed organisations answered the call. The attack bypassed the Israeli defences, shattering the myth of the invulnerability of the walls of the Zionist colonial fortress. As Marxists, we cannot isolate the military and media milestone of the Palestinian Resistance from its offensive on the political plane. Especially since the counter-attack of the Western leaders is not exclusively military either, as we can observe by analysing the latest moves of Pedro Sanchez and the Spanish executive.

In the first hours of the Al-Aqsa Flood, videos were shared of Al-Qassam fighters entering Zionist military bases, catching Israeli soldiers literally in their underwear. This image is a good metaphor, as it was not only the Israeli Occupation Forces (IOF) that were caught completely unprepared. The Palestinian Resistance surprised the entire Western world, decisively setting the political agenda, altering everyone's plans.

The initial reactions of politicians and the media were slow and clumsy. So was the military response of Zionism. They were unprepared and had to improvise. They resorted to old tactics, tried and tested on a few other occasions, hoping that they would work again. They had no time to analyse the new situation and act accordingly. As a result, the old tactics proved useless in the new context.

On the 7th we woke up to videos of Al-Qassam

fighters, mounted on paragliders, entering occupied territories. We also saw bulldozers breaking through the fence surrounding the Gaza Strip, allowing civilians to step onto land that was taken from them decades ago. The images were so powerful in the media that to come out and condemn them was ridiculous and politically counterproductive. But senior US and EU officials have very square heads and do not know how to get out of their old patterns: "any attack on Israel must be condemned". Lack of arguments is not a problem when you have a gigantic propaganda machine greased with banknotes.

1.1. Two hoaxes

In the aftermath of 7 October, the pro-Zionist media put all their efforts into spreading mainly two stories that later turned out to be false and manipulated. The first was the rave music festival, held a few kilometres from the Strip, and the second was the story of 40 beheaded babies. Two hoaxes tailor-made for the Western public. A public that, for whatever reason, empathises much more with white ravers than with the Palestinian population; that is much more horrified by the idea of a decapitated baby in an Israeli hospital than by hundreds of babies killed in indiscriminate bombings or for lack of medical care in Gaza, if not directly by conscious abandonment as happened in the Al Nasr children's hospital.

There are two clear objectives behind these propaganda hoaxes. One is the interest of news agencies, the media and people in general to harvest interactions and visualisations for the joy of their wallets and egos. The second objective was to demonise and dehumanise the Palestinian

Resistance. With these two stories, the Zionist propagandists had enough arguments to be able to ask everyone and at all times the same question: «Do you condemn Hamas?» This is how these two hoaxes not only damaged the image of the Palestinian Resistance, but also automatically delegitimised any person or organisation that dared not to condemn the Islamic Resistance Movement (Hamas, by its Arabic acronym). The message to the Palestinian sympathetic population was clear: if you want someone listen what you say, you must condemn Hamas. At this point one should ask rhetorical questions: what good have these condemnations by human rights advocates done? What good has it done to distinguish between «bad» (pro-Hamas) and «good» Palestinians? How many lives has the «not all of Gaza is Hamas» discourse saved?

Anyone who embraced the pro-Zionist discourse, whether out of ignorance or interest, became an accomplice to the war crimes perpetrated by Zionism. Demonising the main Resistance organisation in the Gaza Strip only served to pave the way for the war crimes perpetrated by IOF. For the umpteenth time the excuse of the “fight against terrorism” is being used not only to crush the legitimate resistance of a people against colonisation, but also for the ethnic cleansing of a territory with more than two million inhabitants.

1.2. International popular support

However, in response, and in clear antagonism to the above, a spontaneous movement of support for Palestine arose around the globe. It was clear that there would be demonstrations of solidarity, but no one imagined the scale that this decentralised movement could reach. This was another victory for the Resistance. It was not enough for their cause to be just; they also needed a good line of communication to connect with the masses around the world. And they succeeded. An organisation

locked up in the largest open-air prison in the world managed to beat the entire Western Zionist propaganda, bringing millions and millions of people to their side. The Al-Aqsa Flood unleashed a global popular storm.

It should also be stressed that support for the Palestinian cause is not exclusively spontaneous and is not limited to large demonstrations in cities around the world. There are also organisations that promote active boycott actions. But, above all, it must be stressed that there are higher organisational forms that have entered directly into armed confrontation against the genocidal Zionist entity. We are talking above all about the Houthis in Yemen and Hizbullah in Lebanon. So far these have been the two clearest and most direct international supporters. Governments, as the saying goes, are no match for their people. If only the situation were different and the Palestinian Resistance did not feel so alone. However, at the risk of sounding cynical, this juncture—which is bad for the brigades—has the positive aspect of highlighting the gap between states and their peoples. The mobilised people realise that their governments, including those of the Arab countries, are not capable of fulfilling their demands and that other means and other forms of organisation are needed to achieve what we demand.

The Resistance has forced the whole world to take a stand for their cause and has promoted the largest cleavage of camps in recent times. This is yet another important contribution of the Palestinian people to the cause of liberation of all humanity, making our debt to them ever greater.

Of course, these last few months have not been without the most abhorrent displays of opportunism. One of the clearest examples is the attitude of Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan, whose crisis-worn government did not hesitate to try to spearhead the popular support shown by Turks for the Palestinian cause. But

the same president does not rush to break off all relations with Israel, thus contributing to the survival of the Zionist entity. This contradiction between what is said and what is done, this blatant hypocrisy, should help the communists of the world to help the masses learn to recognise the real interests behind every political statement. Erdogan speaks out in favour of Palestine not because he defends its liberation, but in order to strengthen the legs of his presidential chair, which have been eaten away by the crisis and corruption. In the same way, Ione Belarra spoke out against Netanyahu only for the political convenience of the moment, to show herself as the radical option against the PSOE and, above all, against Sumar.

We must not lose sight of the fact that at this time any show of support for the Palestinian people can have a positive character for the Resistance. But the hypocrisy of our rulers will never be viewed positively from the perspective of the liberation of all humanity. We have to be aware that we communists cannot prevent these situations from happening. However, what we can and must prevent is that the hypocrisy and deceit of our rulers manipulate the consciences of the population. In other words, we must know how to unmask the particular interests of this or that politician behind any statement or action in favour of Palestine. This is a basic pedagogical exercise in political education.

1.3. The interests defended by Pedro Sánchez

What, then, are the interests behind Pedro Sánchez's visit to occupied Jerusalem and the subsequent diplomatic crisis with the Zionist entity? Having secured his government, the PSOE leader had nothing to lose. That is why he was able to act on the fringes of social democracy, showing himself to be much more forceful and relevant than his apparently more radical partners. The Spanish president did not even have to take any

political decisions. Mere lip service to war crimes was enough to satisfy and silence the most critical voices within the Podemos-Sumar space. No break in relations with Israel, no embargo. Just a couple of sentences about the obvious and undeniable reality of Zionism's crimes and the «progressive» press could sell Sánchez as the champion of human rights and the Palestinian people.

However, it is more interesting to analyse these statements by the leader of the Spanish government from an international perspective. The Zionist government's lack of any attempt to conceal the genocide it has set in motion damages the image of international institutions. The worldwide popular outburst in defence of Palestine is a threat to imperialist governments because it can be exploited by opposition forces in any Western country. Moreover, it encourages extra-parliamentary forces to carry out actions that damage the economy (boycott, blockades, sabotage, strikes, etc.). In this situation, the political and financial powers are desperately seeking to restore stability. Pedro Sánchez's actions are part of these plans. It was untenable to continue ignoring civilian casualties and the West had to back down. The cornered power looked weak and Sánchez went out to project the opposite image. An image of a European leader who «puts in his place» a genocidal rampage and threatens to take action by means of a peace conference subject to the control of what is called «the international community», i.e. finance capital.

The Israeli military failure added to the action of internationalist organisations are working in favour of the Palestinian Resistance, putting it in an advantageous position. If it continues in this way, the Zionist entity may be forced to make important concessions, which will result in a weakening of the positions of the imperialist powers in the Middle East. A heavy blow which, added to the spectre of defeat in Ukraine, will be seized upon by the subjugated countries. Without

exaggeration, the future of the world system is at stake in the Palestinian lands. That is why Israel's defeat is unacceptable, but the current Zionist government seems incapable of reaping victory and thus becomes a hindrance to the West. At the same time, Israeli elites are fully aware that they cannot survive without foreign support. The future of the genocidal Netanyahu, unpopular among his own people, threatened both from within and without, looks increasingly bleak.

The goal for the West is not to save Netanyahu, but to save Israel. The actions of the Spanish government are contributing to just that. Pedro Sanchez has, with one hand, put on a theatrical performance of reprimand and with the other, condemned the actions of the Resistance, reaffirmed Israel's right to defend itself, and has given wings to the failed "two-state solution". This is the real position of the Western rulers today. Netanyahu may fall if he is unable to defend the objective of the financial oligarchy, which is none other than the perpetuation of occupation and colonisation. Pedro Sánchez is not a defender of Palestine, but of the existence of the «state» of Israel and has come to its rescue in its low hours.

We must focus our attention on the fact that the return of the discourse on the recognition of the Palestinian state is not a benevolent gesture, but a concession that is being wrested by the Resistance with its offensive that began on 7 October. European and US politicians are trying to calm the situation before it is too late. They are aware that things are out of their control. A hypothetical "peace conference", under the tutelage of the financial oligarchy, would have as its main objective to save the day. It would in no way put an end to the continuing massacres of the Palestinian people, the apartheid state and colonial domination.

Valid interlocutors are needed for such a conference to be possible. It is unclear whether Netanyahu would be a good candidate on the

Israeli side. In any case, this is not a big problem, as he could be replaced at any time by someone with less blood on his hands. Perhaps even someone who could be painted as "progressive" by the international press. The question is who the West might accept on the Palestinian side. At this point the situation becomes complicated.

The Palestinian National Authority has no support from its population and, more importantly, does not even control the militias in the West Bank. Let alone those in the Strip. The Martyr Izz El-Din Al-Qassam brigades, the core of the Resistance in Gaza, will not obey any agreement taken outside them. This situation suggests that an interlocutor would have to be sought from within the ranks of Hamas, which is considered a terrorist organisation under European and US law. This might seem an unlikely scenario, but it should be borne in mind that the last truce was the result of negotiations between the Zionist entity and representatives of the Islamic Resistance Movement, so nothing is impossible. But in that case, how would Western leaders explain negotiating with "terrorists" to their population? It would be a rather uncomfortable scenario in which, perhaps, the media would have to take it upon themselves to prepare public opinion and "decriminalise" Hamas and the entire Palestinian Resistance. In this way, the fighters could add one political victory more to their list.

It is not worth speculating on how Operation Al-Aqsa Flood will end, as everything is still in the hands of the Resistance, which has already won a series of important victories in both the purely military and political arenas, providing valuable lessons for liberation movements around the world. What seems to be clear is that the survival of Netanyahu and his government can only be guaranteed by a military victory, which they promised to achieve in a few days and which now seems impossible due to the heroic and highly intelligent performance of the Resistance

brigades. If the Palestinians do not succumb on the battlefield, the West has no choice but to sit down and negotiate, looking for the most appropriate moment to do so, in order to freeze the conflict and save the Zionist project. In order to achieve this goal, the genocidal Netanyahu would probably have to be dispensed with. In order to carry out this process it would be necessary to look for “friendly” and “humanist” faces, both within Israel and among Western representatives. And who better for this task of safeguarding the interests of imperialism than social democracy, always prompt to come to the rescue of capitalism in times of crisis and of rise of revolutionary movements?

2. Outlines for a communist analysis of the situation

The first thing that must be clear for we communists is that we cannot resemble our «brave» and absolutely not hypocritical European left, which in the early days of the Flood was quick to put its hands up so as not to stain them with the blood spilled by Al-Qassam. Today we know that this was not a gesture of political neatness, but the umpteenth surrender to the interests of Western imperialism. Following in the footsteps of the media, hastened to condemn the Resistance not for humanist reasons, but to save their armchairs. However, while the whole bunch of grateful “left-wing” stomachs remained surrendered, with their hands raised to the whole world, the blood of the civilian population of the Gaza Strip began to trickle down to their chins, threatening to drown them in the sea of sympathetic people who came out to defend the Palestinian cause. This path of equidistance turned out to be too short and the whole radical social democracy quickly ran out of room for manoeuvre, crushed by professional social democracy on the one hand and international mass action on the other. Let them enjoy their bankruptcy and irrelevance and not say we didn't

warn them!

2.1. The Palestinian proletariat

Communism must know how to find his way in this situation, and analysis must begin with the correct characterisation of the Zionist entity and Palestine. Israel is an artificial state created for the purpose of being a politico-military base to control the Middle East. This fact has a decisive influence on the social configuration of the Zionist spawn. It is a markedly imperialist “state”, similar to any EU country, but more militarised and religious. Its existence is parasitic and it lives off the rents extracted from the super-exploitation of the oppressed countries supplied to it, mainly through the USA. Moreover, the welfare of its population is based directly on the colonial exploitation of the Palestinian people and land.

At the same time, the Palestinian people are deprived of the basic democratic right to a state of their own. This puts them one step below even the most imperialistically oppressed countries. It is a population that is not only highly proletarianized, but also colonised. We cannot therefore speak of a clash between two states or two bourgeoisies, but of a conflict between the Western Israeli oligarchy and a colonised people, deprived of basic bourgeois-democratic rights. As far as the social composition is concerned, on the one hand we have a typically imperialist society. In Israel, the determining role in the economy is played by the financial oligarchy, which is politically supported by the Hebrew labour aristocracy. The Israeli working class and proletariat are trained in compulsory military service and strongly indoctrinated through education, religion, professional politicians with a profile typical of an imperialist country, the media and a petty-bourgeois life based on the exploitation of the Palestinian proletariat. The latter, in turn, suffer more acute oppression and exploitation compared to the Israeli proletariat, precisely because of

the fact that it is a colonised nation. In the legal field, the dozens of apartheid laws testify to and perpetuate this situation. Despite the geographical proximity, the Palestinian and Israeli proletariat occupy distant and qualitatively different positions in relation to the imperialist value chains.

2.2. Politics and the armed struggle in Palestine

Palestine has its own bourgeoisie which, hypothetically, could reach agreements with the Israeli oligarchy. The infamous Oslo Accords (1993) are a historical proof of this. However, it is this historical precedent that makes the possibility of a new negotiation less likely because some political forces have learned their lesson. The rise of Hamas has much to do with its opposition to those agreements. The creation of the Palestinian National Authority quickly disillusioned those who sought a state of their own, certain freedoms or peace. It revealed itself as an apparatus for managing Israeli oppression, but now in outsourcing mode. Israel obtained a more obedient and peaceful submission, but not for long. The Palestinian bourgeoisie, in turn, got a share of the labour stolen from the Palestinian proletariat and—very importantly—all kinds of aid from the international community that accentuated the inequality between the people and their political leaders. This situation led irremediably to the point where we are now, when the course of the struggle is being led by an armed people, organised in different brigades of the Resistance with the unquestionable hegemony of Al-Qassam, a militia attached to the Islamic Resistance Movement.

The question of armed struggle in Palestine is a question of survival, a first order task. The popularity of Al-Qassam in Gaza, and consequently of Hamas, lies in the fact that it has been the best prepared organisation for resistance and that has fought most notably against Fatah's betrayal.

Its determination, the fact that it has achieved by military means what for so long could not be achieved by political means, that it has restored dignity to an oppressed people, is what is causing its popularity to grow in the West Bank of the Jordan River as well. In addition, this has been accompanied by an intelligent and generous policy towards other Resistance brigades. The creation of the Palestinian Joint Operations Room (2006), an initiative of Al-Qassam and Saraya Al-Quds (Islamic Jihad militia in Palestine), laid the groundwork for unity and coordinated action among all armed factions. Including the Martyr Abu Ali Mustafa brigade (Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine) whose members have on occasion served as spokesmen for the Chamber. There were also political precedents for such unity. One example is Hamas's support for Janette Khoury, a Christian woman who was a candidate on the PFLP's list for the Ramallah (the interim capital of the West Bank) City Council in 2005, in which she emerged victorious. On the other hand, the last municipal elections in the West Bank (2021-2022) were boycotted by Hamas. However, members of the Al-Qassam Movement and militiamen formed independent lists alongside the PFLP in 25 localities, winning significant victories. In those elections, the independent lists, which included members of the Resistance, won 70 per cent of the vote.

Palestine is an occupied territory, which makes it extremely difficult to lead a «normal» political life. We can observe that the Resistance enjoys great popularity among the population, but at the same time any political expression of the Resistance is persecuted by the Zionist entity. This is why it makes no sense to imagine Palestinian political parties and movements as homogenous and centralised entities. Quite the contrary. Decentralisation is a predominant factor both in the Resistance—whose organisations often operate in

the form of independent cells—and in the political parties, many of whose leaders are in prison or in exile. Needless to say, the occupation hampers communications among the militancy. Thus the relationship between the Martyr Izz El-Din Al-Qassam Brigades and Hamas is paradigmatic. There is an ideological nexus, but al-Qassam is a military wing with its own leadership, which makes its own decisions, does not take direct orders from Hamas and does not always report to it on its operations, as official members of the Islamic Resistance Movement have pointed out on occasion. In this sense, the brigades are more akin to what we understand as a mass front.

2.3. The essential character of the Palestinian and Hebrew proletarian movement

It is a mistake to try to apply the same schemas to an oppressed country as to an imperialist one when analysing its political reality. The political expressions of the Palestinian proletariat and its Resistance are really diverse, but this does not change their essential character. All forms of struggle of the Palestinian people are part of the anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggle, even if they are not hegemonized by communist currents. It's necessary to get rid of our European prejudices in order to understand that a religion, in this case Sunni Islam, can act as the ideological motor of a struggle for national liberation, acquiring a progressive character. Failure to recognise this reality is nothing more than a deviation of Western leftists who seek a pure revolution, without sin conceived. We must be able to see that we have much more in common with a believing Palestinian militiaman than with a Western atheist reformist. The socialists of Abu Ali Mustafa understand this and act accordingly, we cannot do less.

On the other pole is the reality of the Israeli proletariat. In the labour movement of the Zionist entity there are, albeit very few, internationalist

examples. But this does not change the essentially opportunist and colonial character of the movement as a whole. Imperialism plays a decisive role and builds an impassable wall between Hebrew and Arab workers. This wall can only fall with the end of colonisation, i.e. with the establishment of a Palestinian state from the river to the sea. Until this happens, the objective conditions necessary for unity across ethnic and religious lines will not be in place. In other words, it is no coincidence that there is no organisation in Israel, nor any minimally significant movement fighting against its own Zionist «state». Colonisation is the premise that makes the emergence of such a movement impossible. The protests against the Netanyahu government are not protests against the «state» of Israel. They are a manifestation of the fear and discontent of a population spoiled by imperialism. People terrified of the still remote prospect of the Resistance taking the rap for its crimes. They are convinced that the problem is their corrupt and useless government and that the solution is to change it for another—perhaps even a “left” one—that will end terror in one way or another. Israelis are unwilling and unable to recognise that the problem is what they call “their state”, which is really an occupying colonial regime. Therefore, the sine qua non condition for the end of terror is the defeat of “Israel” understood as the dismantling of all the apparatuses of the Zionist regime. Ergo, the victory of the Palestinian Resistance. The latter is the universal programmatic point or the universal slogan that must be defended by all communists in the world. And it is not because it is a more plausible scenario than a hypothetical union between the Israeli and Palestinian proletariat against the Zionist entity, but because it is the only real one, given the present objective conditions.

2.4. Inter-imperialist conflict?

These days there have been communists who

have seen the conflict as a struggle between imperialist blocs. The error of this position stems from a reversal of factors, not knowing how to detect the main contradiction. Does the conflict of interests between the USA and Iran or China have an influence on what happens in the Middle East? Undoubtedly. But it is only one of the many factors that mediate the Palestinian war against the Zionist entity. To take only this factor into account is to adopt a one-sided attitude, taking the part for the whole, to see the trees and not the forest. «That way it is impossible to kind the method for resolving a contradiction, it is impossible to accomplish the tasks of the revolution, to carry out assignments well or to develop inner-Party ideological struggle correctly» (“On Contradiction”, Mao). To think that what pushed the Resistance to launch the October 7 offensive was the defence of the interests of Chinese capital against US capital is naive and sounds more like conspiracy than an analysis of the concrete situation. The Al-Aqsa Flood is, in the first instance, a response against colonisation, a new episode in the Palestinian struggle against the Zionist regime. This is the main contradiction that defines the character of the phenomenon. To say this is not to exclude other factors from the equation, but to put them in order, not to confuse causes with consequences. To put it clearly: resistance to colonisation is the cause and any attempt to instrumentalise this struggle would be the consequence. It is colonisation, not the US-PRCh struggle, that unleashes the Flood. Therefore, no matter how much some reactionaries—like Erdogan, for example—pay lip service to Palestine, this does not make the struggle of the Resistance reactionary, nor does it make the Flood less just.

2.5. What we must be. What we must learn.

The Al-Aqsa Flood has unleashed an international political crisis and popular response unprecedented in recent years. Even the war in Ukraine pales in

comparison. Moreover, its character is intuited as qualitatively different because it was provoked by the action of the proletarian masses and not by the action of oligarchic governments. For better or for worse, it has also shown like no other recent crisis the irrelevance of Western communism, incapable of responding to the historical demands of the moment.

It is not only the inability to decisively influence the politics of the imperialist pole, what we are part of. Fortunately, this time the European masses have responded in an acceptable way, even if they were not guided by Marxist theory. The large mobilisations and actions against the Zionist genocide have undoubtedly influenced the recent political decisions of the European elites. They should not be overestimated, as they have not been a determining factor, but they have played their role and this is undeniable. The main incapacity of the Western communist movement lies in not knowing how to take advantage of this imperialist crisis and the spontaneous outburst of the masses to push forward the process of the reconstitution of the Party of Revolution.

The abandonment of Leninism has always led to the betrayal of proletarian internationalism. “Leninism” must be understood here as one of its main contributions: the concrete analysis of the concrete situation. One can only refer the reader to «The Foundations of Leninism» (I.V. Stalin) and especially to the section «The National Problem». Of the many passages that could be quoted here, I will retain that “The revolutionary character of a national movement under the conditions of imperialist oppression does not necessarily presuppose the existence of proletarian elements in the movement, the existence of a revolutionary or a republican programme of the movement, the existence of a democratic basis of the movement”. From the coordinates of Leninism, if one recognises the Palestinian liberation movement, embodied in

the Resistance brigades, as a proletarian movement which questions and puts into crisis the whole present system of imperialist domination, one must unreservedly support this movement. And not because there are organisations in it that carry red flags, but because of the essential character of the cause. That is to say, the concrete analysis of the situation must lead us to rid ourselves of prejudices built up by Western propaganda and recognise the progressive role played by the brigades of Martyr Izz El-Din Al-Qassam, as the spearhead of the movement. This is the real exercise of Leninism that the communist vanguard in the West must undertake.

The reason for implementing this exercise should not be done on the grounds that it will make things easier for the brigades. We must stop navel-gazing and recognise our very limited capacity to influence the international chessboard. This exercise must be done in pursuit of the reconstitution of the revolutionary theory that can guide the process of transforming our weak movement into the Party of the New Type that will then be able to build the bases of support for the World Proletarian Revolution and the processes of national liberation. As the Bolsheviks did in the past. Until then we must arm ourselves with humility and learn, learn and learn from proletarian processes far more advanced and powerful than our movement.

Some of the lessons that the Palestinian Resistance and its current main armed force are offering us deserve to be mentioned here. Firstly, the inability of the political projects of the labour aristocracy of an imperialist country to rid themselves of their social-chauvinism and to oppose the general interests of the world financial oligarchy. This translates into the inability of these projects to take up arms against the state, which only a proletarian organisation is capable of doing.

Secondly, that an organisation of proletarian essence is capable of organising armed struggle

against imperialism even without the guidance of Marxism and this is good news at the time of the temporary defeat of communism. Since any crisis of imperialism is a good catalyst for the process of reconstitution.

In third place, placing the anti-imperialist struggle as the main contradiction does not mean leaving aside the capital-labour contradiction. On the contrary, it is a question of understanding what concrete manifestation this central contradiction of capitalism acquires at a particular historical moment. The historical struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie is omnipresent, but it takes on very diverse forms. To think that the only valid form of this struggle is that of the workers against the bosses is to fall into economic reductionism, however much this is allegedly done for the sake of preserving the purity of revolutionary theory.

Fourth, that «external causes act through internal causes» (“On Contradiction”, Mao). In other words, the positions taken by Western communism with regard to the offensive of the Palestinian Resistance have much more to do with the internal state of our movement than with the objective characterisation of the conflict. Broadly speaking, some of the analyses we have been able to read in recent days have not been the result of a detailed study of the question, but were predetermined by the fact that we have not yet rid ourselves of the influence of the labour aristocracy and its social-chauvinism. This has manifested itself mainly in leftist deviations which have aligned themselves with the factual condemnation, in one way or another, of the Resistance in general or of its main faction in particular.

And fifth, that political demands of a proletarian character—and these can range from the release of prisoners to the recovery of occupied lands—must ultimately be wrested by force. And the proletariat has no other decisive force in its confrontation with the bourgeoisie than the force

of an organised armed people. Likewise, that this force will always be attacked and slandered by the imperialist elites and their mouthpieces. Forming the masses in the spirit of revolutionary struggle also means legitimising the armed road and presenting it as the only possible way to fulfil the democratic aspirations of the proletariat on its road to emancipation.

This article is intended to help the communist vanguard, situated in the imperialist centre, to clarify its tasks in the present historical moment. The masses all over the world have risen up in support of the legitimate cause of the Palestinian people. Let us be the brains and the heart of these masses. Let us endow the movement with proletarian slogans and action. Let us scientifically explain the present situation. Let us win our right to be worthy members of the world revolutionary army that is rising up to fight against the imperialist beast. Let us advance in the process of the reconstitution of the Communist Party.

Those who die for life cannot be called dead.

The political stance of the Communist Party of Greece... a communist stance?

Chilean Communist Party (Proletarian Action)

Index

Part 1: Critical approach to the positions of the CPG

- Reasons for a response to the Communist Party of Greece (CPG)
- Greece must leave NATO! Or should not it?
- The CPG's subterfuge to avoid debate
- No support for capitalists?
- Reactionary Venezuela?
- The member organizations of the Platform "ignore or deny" that the current mode of production in the world is capitalist...

Part 2: Criticism of the ideological foundations of the CPG

- A handful of countries?
- "Imperialist pyramid" or Lenin's theory of imperialism?
- Idealism hidden in "Imperialist pyramid"
- Methodological error
- No participation of communists in governments led by the bourgeoisie?
- Are there no stages between capitalism and socialism?
- Erroneous positions are not harmless
- Incorrect and damaging derivations

Part 3: Imperialism vs. imperialism?

- A long work
- Brief and concise summary of the "imperialist pyramid" and the CPG study method
- A big mess
- China and Russia belong to the G20
- State presence in Russian companies
- Foreign penetration of the Russian economy

- "Gigantic amounts" of capital export from Russia
- The "big" Russian banking
- Warmongering Russia?

(The previous sections have been published in past issues.)

Warmongering Russia?

Imbalance

The task of defeating imperialism is not and will not be easy. As we see in Ukraine and recently in the Middle East, the struggle will demand sacrifices because the imperialist states, especially the U.S., wield immense military power which they do not hesitate to use when it suits them and because they control the world banking and financial system.

Only 42 of the nearly 800 military bases that the US^[1] maintains worldwide are located in NATO member states. The rest are scattered across the globe. This means that the US has undisputed military control over all continents.

Russia, for its part, has some 15 military bases in 8 countries^[2]... Most of them, with the exception of Syria and Moldova, are located in post-Soviet countries and therefore close to its borders. China has a single base in Djibouti^[3].

The imbalance between the United States, on the one hand, and Russia and China, on the other, in terms of the number of military bases around the world is remarkable. If Russia had withdrawn its military bases from all post-Soviet countries, as it did in the German Democratic Republic^[4], it would

be in a very precarious position today in the face of NATO’s advance. These bases guarantee Russia degrees of territorial security, albeit decreasingly over time, as NATO has managed to gradually (politically) separate the post-Soviet world from it, encircling Russia from the Baltic countries to Kazakhstan^[5], despite the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO)^[6] and all Russia’s attempts to enter an era of post-Soviet capitalist cooperation with “the West”.

If we add to all this the fact that the US has the largest war budget in the history of mankind and the incredible 255 military actions recorded from 1991 to 2024 by the US Congressional Research Service^[7], we find an unprecedented war culture. But that is not all: the history of U.S. interference around the world is inconceivable: China in 1945, Italy in 1947, Greece in 1947, the Philippines in the late 1940s, Korea in 1945, Syria and Albania in 1949, Germany in the 1950s, Iran in 1953, Guatemala in 1953, Costa Rica in the mid-1950s, Syria in 1956 and again from 2011, Indonesia in 1957, British Guiana in 1953, Italy in the 1950s, Vietnam from the 1950s, Cambodia from 1955, Laos from 1957, Haiti from 1959, then from the mid-1980s and again in 2017, Cuba from 1959. Then from the 1960s Guatemala, Algeria, Ecuador, Congo, Brazil, Peru, Dominican Republic, Indonesia, Ghana, Uruguay, Chile, Greece, Bolivia, Guatemala. Then Panama 1969, Costa Rica from the 1970s, Iraq 1972 and 1990, Australia 1973, Angola 1975, Jamaica 1976, Nicaragua 1978, Seychelles 1979, Grenada 1979, Afghanistan from 1979, Morocco 1983, Libya 1981 and 2011, Suriname 1982, Bulgaria 1990, Albania 1991, El Salvador from the 1980s, Yugoslavia 1990, Ukraine from 2014 and Yemen in 2024.

Air power 2024 by country

	China	Russia	USA
Total	3.304	4.255	13.393
Fighter aircraft	1.207	809	1.854
Specialized attack aircraft	371	730	896
Transport aircraft	289	453	957
Training aircraft	402	552	2.648
Special mission aircraft	112	145	695
Air tankers	10	19	606
Helicopters	913	1.547	5.737

Table 1: Air power of the countries of China, Russia and the US according to Global Firepower^[8] for the year 2024.

According to Global Firepower^[9], China has 1207 fighter aircraft, 371 specialized attack aircraft, 289 transport aircraft, 402 trainer aircraft, 112 special mission aircraft, 10 air tankers, 913 helicopters (see Table 1).

The same source notes that Russia has 809 fighter aircraft, 730 specialized attack aircraft, 453 transport aircraft, 552 training aircraft, 145 special mission aircraft, 19 air tankers, 1547 helicopters (see Table 1).

Comparatively, the US possesses 1854 fighter aircraft, 896 specialized attack aircraft, 957 transport aircraft, 2648 training aircraft, 695 special mission aircraft, 606 air tankers, 5737 helicopters (see Table 1).

The undisputed air supremacy is in the hands of the USA. China and Russia together cannot come close to US air power.

Land power 2024 by country

	China	Russia	USA
Tanks	5.000	14.777	4.657
Armored vehicle	174.300	161.382	360.069
Self-propelled artillery	3.850	6.208	1.595
Towed artillery	1.434	8.356	1.267
Mobile rocket projectors	3.180	3.065	694

Table 2: Land power of the countries China, Russia and the USA according to Global Firepower data for the year 2024.

Table 2 shows that the three countries are more or less on a par in terms of land power. However, it should be borne in mind that the land power of the United States is based not only on its equipment, but above all on its military bases distributed

over the five continents, especially those located at strategic points both from a military point of view and from the point of view of control of international trade routes. The U.S. has stationed several of its nuclear weapons (some are even active) at certain strategically located military bases. Its military bases are also used to monitor areas with drones or to deploy them in military conflicts. For example, the US used the Ramstein military base in Germany to recalibrate the flight of its drones by adjusting them to the curvature of the earth in order to deploy them in Syria.

Therefore, objectively speaking, one cannot speak of an equal relationship between the land power of Russia and China, on the one hand, and that of the United States, on the other.

Naval power 2024 by country

	China	Russia	USA
Fleet	730	781	472
Aircraft Carriers	2	1	11
Helicarriers	3	0	9
Submarines	61	65	64
Destroyers	49	14	75
Frigates	42	12	0
Corvettes	72	83	23
Patrol boats	150	122	5
Anti-mine	36	47	8

Table 3: Naval power of the countries China, Russia and the USA according to Global Firepower data for the year 2024.

According to Global Firepower, the US is the undisputed maritime power (see Table 3), although it may seem otherwise.

As for naval power, we would like to reproduce part of an article from Le Monde Diplomatique, which aptly describes US naval power and, in particular, its comparison with China:

“What makes a maritime power is its presence in the straits, the bottlenecks of the main maritime routes: the Strait of Gibraltar and the Suez Canal, which connect the Mediterranean, the Atlantic and the Indian Ocean; the Strait of Malacca, between the Indian Ocean, the South China Sea and the Pacific; and the Strait of Hormuz, at the exit of the Persian Gulf, through which a quarter of the

world’s oil exports are transported. The US Navy is in a position to control all three bottlenecks: the US 5th Fleet is based in Bahrain, the 6th is headquartered in Naples and the 7th in Yokosuka, just outside Tokyo Bay.

[...] U.S. ‘carrier strike groups’ play a particularly important role in securing defense. A CSG (Carrier Strike Group) consists of a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier with dozens of fighters, fighter planes and helicopters, accompanied by two guided missile cruisers, two or three destroyers and two combat submarines. The giant aircraft carriers, which are almost as long as the largest container giants, give the US a degree of control over the world’s sea lanes that no previous maritime power has ever achieved.

[...] The real challenge is the rise of China as a maritime superpower. The Pentagon is particularly concerned about the expansion of the deepwater port of Gwadar in Pakistan’s Balochistan province, which lies at the entrance to the Persian Gulf, and U.S. intelligence services consider the Chinese presence on this strategically important coast a serious problem. However, the Defence Intelligence Agency (DIA) and the Office of Naval Intelligence (ONI), as the Navy’s secret service is known, conclude in their analyses that China is incapable of challenging the US as a naval power.

It is true that China has expanded its military capabilities in parallel with its economic growth and has also developed anti-ship missiles, for example. However, Beijing has only two aircraft carriers, far inferior to those of the US. A DIA analysis states that China wants to ‘circumvent the US-led regional security system’ (in its own region!). The scenarios depicted by the Pentagon envisage a possible confrontation between the two countries in the waters of China’s areas of interest. The idea that China wants to seize control of sea lanes essential to its economy is pure speculation.”^[10]

The undisputed military power is that of NATO, especially that of the US. This fact is key to understanding which countries are aggressors and which are not. As *Le Monde Diplomatique* rightly points out in the previous quote, it is the US that has control of the sea lanes and it is the US that wants to confront China in “China’s areas of interest”.

What a brazen statement then from Jens Stoltenberg at the last World Economic Forum: “NATO is not moving towards Asia. It is China that is moving closer to us.”

And what dehumanization is evidenced by the words of NATO Admiral Rob Bauer, who told the press after a meeting of NATO defense chiefs in Brussels. He noted that NATO forces are preparing for the outbreak of a war against Russia in the next 20 years, that citizens should do the same (i.e., prepare for that war) and that they should understand that their lives will change radically. So that’s 20 years that NATO is giving humanity so that it—humanity—can prepare for its—NATO’s—war of annihilation against Russia...

Let us now see how far from reality the CPG assesses the current international situation.

All the same... or not?

A statement entitled “On the one year since the imperialist war in Ukraine”, published on the CPG website on March 27, 2023, reads:

“The peoples of the two countries, Ukraine and Russia, who lived in peace and prospered together as Soviet Republics under the USSR, have been shedding their blood for nine years now, culminating in last year’s massacre. This is due to the plans of the USA, NATO and the EU, in the context of the fierce competition of those powers with capitalist Russia for the control of markets, raw materials, transport networks and geopolitical pillars in the Eurasian region.

The Communist and Workers’ Parties express our

solidarity with the peoples of Ukraine and Russia, who are paying for the imperialist conflict with their blood. We have shown and continue to show the peoples that the developments in Ukraine are taking place in the framework of monopoly capitalism, rejecting the false pretexts utilized by both sides of the conflict.”¹¹¹

We agree with the idea that “the peoples of the two countries, Ukraine and Russia, lived in peace and prospered together as Soviet Republics within the USSR”, and also with that which points out that these peoples began to wage war against each other since its dissolution. However, the statement of the CPG and the other signatory organizations on the causes of these military conflicts seems to us to be erroneous. In its well-known reductionist analysis, the CPG overlooks important circumstances and consequently equates “the USA, NATO and the EU” with “capitalist Russia”.

According to this party, Russia would wage an “annexationist, predatory and rapacious war” in Ukraine, using Lenin’s terminology. Well, we have already seen that, according to the CPG, any capitalist country recognized by the United Nations would be imperialist, so it is not surprising that the CPG considers “capitalist Russia” as such. Similarly, Burkina Faso or Niger could wage a war on their own borders, for example over a conflict with the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), and in the opinion of the CPG they would be imperialists and the resulting war would be a war of an imperialist nature.

In this sense, according to the CPG there could be no support from the international proletariat and in general from all the exploited, oppressed and neglected strata in the world to almost any country involved in a war anywhere in the world, with the exception of the war waged by the Palestinian people against the Zionist fascism of Israel, although in this case with the usual lukewarm positions:

“The KKE has opposing ideological, political and philosophical views with this political-military organization. However, it will never allow the mass bombing of Gaza and the killing of thousands of small children, allegedly carried out for the elimination of Hamas, to enter into the consciousness of the people in order to justify the long-standing Israeli occupation. At the same time, all the evidence shows that Israel’s aim is to cancel the two-state solution, to exploit the hydrocarbons and the geographical location of the Gaza Strip, to commit genocide against the Palestinian people and to force the displacement of those who do not die in the Israeli massacre to the desert.”^[12]

We were surprised by the CPG’s not-so-unfavorable assessment of Hamas. However, the CPG makes its usual masterful leaps from correct to incorrect, or, in this case, lukewarm positions when it expresses support for the two-state solution. In our view, this solution lost its validity many years ago, and if we make a cold historical analysis, it lost its validity at the very moment when the Zionist state of Israel began to expand into Palestinian territory. A truly humane position in this context can only envisage one solution: a single secular Palestinian state in which Muslims, Jews (non-Zionists), Christians, all other religions and non-believers coexist on an equal footing; regardless of the fact that in a region where the Muslim religion predominates, it will naturally occupy the leading position.

To continue to insist on the two-state solution at this time seems to us, to say the least, naive, because it means accepting in the midst of the Arab, Turkish and Persian world a state that is in practice—as the CPG itself says—“a US base”. Moreover, the ideology underlying such a Zionist state is fascist. How could the Zionist state, aggressive by nature, not pose a threat to peace in the region? Genuine support for Hamas requires support for the struggle for a Palestinian state from

river to sea and an end to the Zionist state of Israel.

We also agree with the CPG that the conflict in Palestine is part of the international conflict, with the countries organized in NATO on the one hand and “Russia, China, Iran, etc.” on the other. However, on the basis of this correct statement, the CPG equates the second group with the first^[13]:

“Given that the war in Palestine is objectively intertwined with the competition between imperialist powers (USA, NATO, EU on the one hand and Russia, China, Iran, etc. on the other) in the region and internationally, two different but equally incorrect perceptions arise from the above: 1) one that says that an “anti-imperialist axis” (Iran—Russia—China) is being formed that should be supported against the US imperialists and their allies; 2) a second one, which is less widespread at the moment but equally erroneous, that says that both war conflicts are imperialist, that they are different expressions of an imperialist third world war, therefore we cannot support the struggle of the Palestinian people for liberation because it is part of the imperialist conflict. [...] Russia, China and Iran do not express their support for the Palestinians because they stand with the peoples’ just cause but because they want to hinder the US plans in the region, to impede it, to afflict it. Therefore, these powers do not constitute an “anti-imperialist axis”. Their monopolies work for their own interests and that is why they cannot be consistent in supporting the Palestinian struggle. It is another matter that the Palestinians, like any national liberation or even revolutionary movement, are righteously seeking to take advantage of these contradictions in their struggle against the Israeli occupation.”^[14]

The CPG rejects the fact that Russia, China and Iran support Palestine, which amounts in practice to postulating that the Palestinian people should fight alone against a Goliath, a country that has more than 80 nuclear weapons, a formal army, an

intelligence service considered the best in the world and is supported by the US and the EU, i.e. NATO. Not to rejoice that Russia, China and Iran are on the side of Palestine and to characterize this fact as “working for their own interests, for their own monopolies and therefore cannot be consistent in supporting the Palestinian struggle” is not to side with the Palestinian people, but to see them destined for a lonely struggle that therefore has no choice but martyrdom. “They have fought bravely for a just cause,” the CPG would like to proclaim, even though there is no longer a Palestine to fight for or living Palestinians to fight for.

Russia is currently fighting in Ukraine to defend its borders from NATO and in defense of the anti-fascist peoples of the Donbass. Unlike NATO, it does not make other peoples fight for it. Russia fights with its soldiers, Russian soldiers, and because it has fought a real human war, a war directed at military objectives, it has had to sacrifice excessive numbers of its own soldiers, which would not have happened if Russia had been the US or Israel. In that case, no stone would have been left unturned in Ukraine, as we see today in Gaza, or as we saw in Mosul (Iraq) and Rakka (Syria) when the US fought there one of its many battles for “democracy and against international terrorism”.

The CPG is unable to distinguish these essential differences between imperialist and fascist belligerent actions, on the one hand, and Russian actions, on the other, demonstrating a not inconsiderable myopia in matters of international politics.

On the other hand, the CPG expects Russia, which is not only trying to push back NATO in Ukraine, which is fighting against a miserable fascist regime^[15] lacking of this organization, which has supported Syria against NATO’s (almost) direct interference in this country, to pursue a “consistent” policy in Palestine as well. Our question is: What does the CPG mean by a “consistent” policy in

Palestine: Russia sending soldiers, weapons, planes and tanks to Palestine? We have not been able to find an answer to this question.

But we know that the CPG is in favor of a two-state solution on Palestinian territory. You may not know it, but in this case it shares its position with Russia, which has officially declared itself in favor of a return to the 1967 borders. Would this be a “consistent” Russian position according to the CPG?

In the following parts we will continue the “warmongering Russia” theme and discuss the current conflict in Ukraine and the way the CPG evaluates them.

Notes

[1] The United Kingdom, the main US ally, has another remarkable 140 military bases around the world.

[2] The countries in which Russia has military bases are: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Syria and Tajikistan. Some unserious lists also include the following countries: Georgia, Libya, Ukraine and Sudan. We have not included these countries for the following reasons:

- Sudan: because the project of a Russian military base in this country unfortunately never came to fruition. The civil war in Sudan broke out precisely because the Sudanese government had agreed with Russia to establish a Russian naval base on Sudanese territory. Imperialism (US and EU) prevented such “daring” by encouraging radicalized groups against the government, seemingly overnight. Today we see the sad result.

- Ukraine: Since the Donbass republics have decided by referendum to join the Russian Federation, it is no longer Ukrainian but Russian territory and therefore cannot be considered a “foreign military base”.

- Libya: because it is a military presence of the private Russian company Wagner, which is not a permanent deployment.

- Georgia: because Ossetia and Abkhazia have become independent from Georgia and are under Russian protection, which is not identical but similar to the situation of the Donbass republics.

Moldova deserves an additional comment: Transnistria became independent from Moldova and is supported by Russia.

[3] Two other military bases attributed to China (one in Cuba and the other in Tajikistan) do not exist.

[4] It is likely that this decision will not be viewed favorably by the CPG, although we cannot find any opinion about it on its website.

It seems to us that Russia’s decision to withdraw its armed forces from democratic Germany was a naive act, at least from today’s perspective, considering that the USA did not do the same and, on the contrary, subjected the whole of Germany to an iron military, political and

economic domination.

[5] A NATO peacekeeping center began operating in Kazakhstan in October 2023. U.S. Ambassador Daniel Roseblum attended the opening ceremony. Kazakhstan is a member of the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) and shares borders with China and Russia. Kazakh military personnel are scheduled to be trained to NATO standards at the center.

Soon, in January 2024, Kazakhstan began to follow the path of the Baltic countries and Ukraine in rehabilitating Nazi accomplices. The Socialist Movement of Kazakhstan condemns the final decision of the State Commission for the Final Rehabilitation of Victims of Political Repression to acquit 311,000 people, many of them criminals or with weapons in their hands, who fought against the Red Army and Soviet power as terrorists, Basmachi, members of the Turkestan Legion and Eastern Muslim SS units.

All of them are presented today as “victims of Stalin’s regime in the 1920s and 1950s”, although among the prisoners there were numerous people convicted of banditry, political sabotage, looting of public property, attacks on trains and motor vehicles.

A scenario similar to that of the Baltic countries or Ukraine is foreseeable in Kazakhstan in the future. If Russia were to intervene there in defense of the Russian-speaking minorities and to prevent further NATO advance on its borders, the CPG would have no qualms in accusing Russia of imperialism, because for this party defense is synonymous with aggression.

The case of Bulgaria is equally tragic. On January 17 and 18, 2024, the inhabitants of the Bulgarian city of Plovdiv defended the monument to the Soviet liberator soldier “Alyosha”, which was to be moved from the Liberators’ Hill to another place at the proposal of the Bulgarian deputies because “it does not belong to the culture and history of the city”.

It should be recalled that the Bulgarian Defense Minister recently gave vent to his Russophobia by calling for the facts concerning friendly Russian aid to Bulgaria to be removed from the history books.

The post-Soviet countries, under the influence of imperialism, continue the process of breaking with their Soviet past and their friendly relations with Russia and its peoples.

[6] The Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) is a Russian-dominated group of six post-Soviet states that requires its members to assist each other in the event of an attack.

[7] Congressional Research Service, “Instances of Use of United States Armed Forces Abroad, 1798-2023”, Updated June 7, 2023, in: <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R42738>

[8] In the case of the US, the data does not add up. There is an inexplicable difference of 184 air units.

[9] The information is available at the following link: <https://www.globalfirepower.com/>

[10] Le Monde Diplomatique, “Atlas der Globalisierung—Ungleiche Welt” (in english: “Atlas of globalization—Unequal world”), article: “Geopolitik des maritimen Welthandels—von Tankerflotten und strategische Allianzen” (in english: “Geopolitics of Global Maritime Trade: Tanker Fleets and Strategic Alliances”), author of the article: Tom Stevenson, p.107

[11] Communist Party of Greece (CPG), “On the one year since the

imperialist war in Ukraine,” in.: <https://inter.kke.gr/en/articles/ON-THE-ONE-YEAR-SINCE-THE-IMPERIALIST-WAR-IN-UKRAINE/>

[12] Communist Party of Greece (CPG), “Short answers to current ideological-political questions concerning the Israeli attack and massacre against the Palestinian people in the Gaza Strip”, in: <https://inter.kke.gr/en/articles/Short-answers-to-current-ideological-political-questions-concerning-the-Israeli-attack-and-massacre-against-the-Palestinian-people-in-the-Gaza-Strip/>

[13] At this point, we would like to point out another subterfuge used by the CPG: Let us note the “etc.” that comes after the enumeration of “Russia, China, Iran”.

The “etc.” certainly includes, and this is also recognized by the CPG, the people of Palestine, but also the people of Syria or the people of Yemen or the people of Donbass, the people of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea or the peoples of Venezuela, Nicaragua and Cuba. It seems to us no coincidence that the CPG has not included in the list at least some of the countries belonging to the bloc of Russia, China and Iran. The list replacing this “etc.” could in fact undermine their argument, because it would include countries like Cuba or Palestine, for example, which are clearly “anti-imperialist” according to the common sense of the broad progressive masses. Such sentiments would clash with the not-so-sensible positions of the CPG and cause perplexity among those who read its statements. The CPG is well versed, as we have already seen, in the art of obfuscation.

[14] Communist Party of Greece (CPG), “Short answers to current ideological-political questions concerning the Israeli attack and massacre against the Palestinian people in the Gaza Strip”, in: <https://inter.kke.gr/en/articles/Short-answers-to-current-ideological-political-questions-concerning-the-Israeli-attack-and-massacre-against-the-Palestinian-people-in-the-Gaza-Strip/>

[15] This miserable regime has on its conscience so many victims, among them the Chilean-American journalist Gonzálo Lira, was the product of a coup d’état in 2014, sends its people to death in the service of NATO as if they were cannon fodder, has systematically erased all traces of the memory of the victory of socialism over fascism during World War II... and a long etcetera of terrible deeds.

On the relationship between imperialism and fascism during WWII

Dimitrios Patelis | Revolutionary Unification (Greece)

Contents

- What is fascism and how did it emerge historically?
- On the ideology of fascism
- Fascism as a form of state-monopoly imposition during the interwar period and WWII
- Fascism after WWII
- Fascism today as an instrument of transnational-monopoly imposition
- Fascism as a “tool” of proxy warfare
- The need to crush imperialism, whose tool is fascism

The aim of this article is to present in a short way the historical aspects of the relationship between imperialism and the fascist phenomenon that are important for the anti-imperialist movement.

What is fascism and how did it emerge historically?

Fascism (Italian *fascismo*, from *fascio* = bundle, a sheaf, league) is an ideological and political trend and system of government that emerged during the period of the general crisis of capitalism (after the victory of the first early socialist revolution, the Great October Revolution). It represents the interests of the most reactionary and aggressive forces of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Fascist regimes were established in European countries during the inter-war period, notably in Italy, Spain and Germany. According to Georgi Dimitrov, “Fascism is not a form of state power ‘standing above both classes—the proletariat and the bourgeoisie,’ as Otto Bauer, for instance, has asserted. It is not ‘the revolt of the petty bourgeoisie

which has captured the machinery of the state,’ as the British Socialist Brailsford declares. No, fascism is not a power standing above class, nor government of the petty bourgeoisie or the lumpen-proletariat over finance capital. Fascism is the power of finance capital itself. It is the organization of terrorist vengeance against the working class and the revolutionary section of the peasantry and intelligentsia. In foreign policy, fascism is jingoism in its most brutal form, fomenting bestial hatred of other nations.... The development of fascism, and the fascist dictatorship itself, assume different forms in different countries, according to historical, social, and economic conditions and to the national peculiarities, and the international position of the given country.”

Wherever it comes to power, fascism imposes the terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary and aggressive forces of monopoly capital, for the preservation of the capitalist regime, for the strengthening of the forces of imperialist reaction and counter-revolution, against the popular democratic forces of anti-imperialism, social progress, revolution and socialism/communism.

Fascist ideology and practice are characterised by extremely aggressive anti-communism, claims to subjugate the working class, intolerance, nationalism, chauvinism, and racism.

The fascist mode of organising and exercising power involves the large-scale use of mechanisms of aggressive mass propaganda/manipulation, the most stringent control and repression of all aspects and manifestations of people’s social and personal life, extreme forms of violence and police repression for the subjugation of the working class and of the people as a whole.

Historically, it emerged as an expedient set of methods and means for the ruling class to manage structural crises and to tame and oppress the labour movement, popular discontent, as a form of legitimisation of the aggressive use of state-monopoly methods of regulating the economy. It constitutes an effective form of militarisation of the capitalist economy and society as a whole, as a preparation for the effective involvement in aggressive war, for the achievement of imperialist grabs and conquests at the expense of rival imperialist powers, for the colonisation of countries and populations, for the crushing of anti-imperialist movements and of socialism.

Fascism rises and establishes itself by achieving, on the one hand, the pacification and subjugation of the people through terrorism and, on the other hand, the manipulation, political activation and mobilisation of significant sections of the popular masses, practising nationalist, xenophobic, racist and social demagoguery in order to achieve the urgent strategic goals of the capitalist regime. The primary initial mass base of fascism is mainly the middle strata of capitalist society affected by the crisis, while it then recruits and enlists wider popular masses and even a section of the working class.

Fascist “movements” and regimes, despite their common characteristics, present certain differentiations and variations depending on the national and other historical peculiarities of their fields of application. A common feature is the association of fascism with the secret services of the bourgeois state, with the deep state, with paramilitary, organisations adjacent to the church, etc.

On the ideology of fascism

What fascism projects as an ideological frame of reference is a system of irrational beliefs (fascist ideology), which eclectically extracts from various earlier reactionary ideological constructions and

ideologies, such as colonial racism, irrational views (of the type of Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, Oswald Spengler and Giovanni Gentile), anti-Semitism, geopolitics, pan-Germanism, and so on.

Fascist ideology focuses on ideas of the “greatness of the race”, the mystification of “land and blood” ties, military expansionism, racial inequality, “class harmony”, concepts of “popular community” and “corporatism”, leadership (“the principle of the natural leader”, the “furer”, etc.). These ideas found formal expression in Nazism, as set out in Adolf Hitler’s book ‘Mein Kampf’ (1925). The pompous demagoguery of fascism adopted elements of populism in order to capitalise on the popularity of socialist ideas among the masses and to turn them towards anti-socialism, anti-Sovietism and anti-communism.

Fascism as a form of state-monopoly imposition during the interwar period and WWII

Fascism appeared as a counter-revolutionary reaction to the rise of the revolutionary movement after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Precursors of fascist regimes were the formations that emerged after the October Revolution, during the class “civil” war and foreign imperialist intervention in the territory that came under the control of the imperialist invaders and their local “white” collaborators and subordinates, until the latter were crushed by the revolutionary Red Army. Similar formations emerged during the invasion of the Japanese militarist regime in China, Korea, Indochina, etc.

The aggressive foreign policy of the fascist regimes established in a number of countries of capitalist Europe (Germany, Italy, Spain, etc.) eventually led to the Second World War (WWII). The fascist (anti-Soviet-anti-communist) aggressive “anti-Comintern” axis was formed under Nazi Germany, fascist Italy, militarist monarcho-fascist Japan and their allies. This axis, through the war it waged,

became the mortal enemy not only of the USSR but of the whole of progressive humanity and, in particular, of the international revolutionary workers' movement. The fascist axis was crushed mainly by the Red Army of the Soviet Union, the People's Liberation Army of China, the Korean People's Army and the whole anti-fascist front movements led by the communists.

Fascism after WWII

The crushing of fascist Germany and its allies by the forces of the anti-Hitler coalition in 1945 was a major defeat for fascism. After the WWII, fascism was temporarily weakened but not completely and permanently uprooted. Fascism reappeared in different historical forms in accordance with the changes in the structure, position and role of imperialism in the world balance of power, in accordance with the strategic and tactical aims of the financial oligarchy of the imperialist countries. These aspirations are connected with the victories and defeats of the early socialist revolutions and the anti-colonial, anti-imperialist movements internationally.

With the emergence of the camp of the early-socialist countries and the countries emerging from the victorious anti-imperialist movements, fascism, fascist-type "movements" and dictatorial regimes of various forms were promoted and imposed by the imperialist countries in collaboration with (or significant sections of) the local subservient ruling classes in the dependent, semi-independent and peripheral countries of the imperialist metropolitan centres. Long-lasting fascist regimes, such as those in the former colonial countries of Portugal and Spain established after the defeat of the democratic forces in the Spanish civil war, eventually collapsed and were replaced by systems of bourgeois parliamentarism—an intermediate form.

After WWII and the defeat of the revolutionary movement in Greece, a monarcho-fascist regime

was imposed by the foreign intervention-occupation of Britain and the USA with their local collaborators, followed by short-lived pseudo-democratic regimes, and then by another openly fascist military junta imposed by the CIA, the USA and NATO (1967-1974). Fascist dictatorships were successively installed in a number of countries through imperialist interventions and coups: South Korea, South Vietnam, Turkey, Iran, Indonesia, Pakistan and a number of other countries in South America, Asia and Africa.

Fascism today as an instrument of transnational-monopoly imposition

We should examine the current forms of instrumentalisation of fascism in relation to the era, the current stage of imperialism, its structural crisis and the context of WWII.

The bourgeois counter-revolutions in the USSR and in the early socialist countries of Europe led to crude imperialist interventions in collaboration with sections of the newly formed local bourgeoisie, to civil wars, separatist nationalist movements, the fragmentation of countries, coups and a series of fascist-style dictatorships. Typical are the cases of the racist regimes of the three Baltic 'democracies', openly led for decades by the descendants and spiritual successors of Nazi collaborators, with the full support of the US-NATO-EU. These regimes have imposed apartheid on the 'non-natives', who are institutionally considered as 'non-citizens'...

Similar coup regimes were imposed in the states that emerged from the US-NATO-EU foreign intervention, the "civil war", the "colour revolutions" and the dissolution of Yugoslavia, but also in the formations that emerged from the counter-revolution and capitalist restoration in the USSR. Such was the "Black October" of 1993 in Russia under B. Yeltsin, the juntas in Georgia and especially the successive coups in Ukraine, culminating in 2014, which led to the imposition of

an openly nazi-racist regime by the Euro-Atlantic axis and the unleashing of a genocidal war against the insubordinate population of south-eastern Ukraine.

Fascism is the spawn of capitalism in the stage of imperialism, it is its aggressive vanguard, especially today in the midst of the escalating WWII.

The world capitalist system today is not in the stage of 20th century imperialism, whose defining feature was state monopoly regulation at the level of the nation state, a particular form of forced militarisation was the “classical” fascism of the inter-war period.

Today, we are in the stage of transnational monopoly imposition. This stage is characterised by the attempt to completely subordinate humanity to the most powerful international multi-branch monopoly groups, to the most powerful in terms of capital, to the imperialist countries and their transnational organs. The sphere of circulation (export of goods and capital) no longer plays an important role in the structure of the relations of production of the present stage of imperialism. This role is now played by the sphere of production itself, distributed on a planetary scale and rooted in the technologies and organisation of this production. At this stage, there are structural changes in the global and regional division of labour, changes in the positions and roles in the global production process, linked to the redefinition of the conditions and limits of the extensive and intensive development of capitalist production and the correlation of forces between imperialism, anti-imperialism and socialism.

The division of the world between the most powerful international multi-branch monopoly groups and between the most powerful imperialist countries in terms of capital (which are the main headquarters of these groups) on the basis of inequality and the extraction of monopoly super-profits on a global scale has been completed, while

a rapid shift of power is taking place with the rapid progress of the PRC and the emergence of a new pole led by the latter and Russia (BRICS, etc.): the pole of the forces of socialism and anti-imperialism.

WWII also escalates the consequent shrinking of the parasitic capacities of the pole of the traditional imperialist centres, which causes the increase of the aggressiveness of the axis of global imperialism led by the USA.

Therefore, today, imperialism under the USA, despite the rampant push towards fascism in the countries of its territory, no longer has the need to establish outright fascist regimes in the frontline imperialist countries (as in inter-war Germany) with the claim to develop a military-industrial complex and armed forces competitive with those of the USA, independent and self-sufficient. This would challenge the de facto US hegemony in this axis.

Moreover, in contrast to the necessity of fascist/counter-revolutionary repression of the then strong revolutionary movement, the regime in the imperialist countries and the satellite countries of its near periphery today—seemingly, in the near future—succeeds in effectively manipulating the working class and the wider popular strata through consensual means and ways. This manipulation has now been consolidated through take-overs, corruption, fraud, demagoguery and the undermining of the workers’ movement by its opportunist agents, but above all through atomisation and patterns of consumerism. The bourgeois regime achieves this by handing out crumbs of its parasitism, using the resources from the siphoning off of monopoly super-profits from around the world. It also achieves this through extreme alienation, individualism and competition, through the undermining of even the biological core of personality and the family, in combination with all the means and ways of undermining and invalidating the constitution of the revolutionary subject and the subject in general.

As the imperialist countries are drastically cut off from their sources of parasitism throughout the world, the ability of the financial oligarchy to buy off, corrupt etc. the domestic working class at the trade union, ideological/political and cultural levels will also decrease. This will lead to a mass organic reintegration of the working class of the imperialist countries into the world revolutionary workers' movement—under conditions of weakening imperialism and strengthening the forces of socialism and anti-imperialism on the planet—and will put the late socialist revolutions in the imperialist metropolises on the agenda.

Fascism as a “tool” of proxy warfare

Fascism instrumentalised, enabled and established by imperialism in the conditions of WWIII has common elements, but is by no means identical with the fascism of the inter-war period, WWII and the 20th century as a whole.

Today's fascism is not “one of the same”. It does not project—as it did in the past—the ideology and practice of guild/corporatism as an organic element of state monopoly regulation and the militarisation of the economy and society with fundamental reference to and application to the imperialist nation-state.

At the stage of transnational-monopoly imperialist imposition, the very instrumental use of fascism is subject to the transnational planning of the aggressor axis led by the USA.

Fascism today is even more deeply linked to the ideology and practices of extreme neo-liberalism, to the cannibalistic individualism of social Darwinism and to the poisonous whims of “desire” of “post-modern” irrationalism. Hence the combination of nationalism/racism and imperialist cosmopolitanism that characterises it.

Today, the US-NATO-EU imperialist axis is instrumentalising and “exporting” fascism and Nazism to install its subordinate regimes in

countries that until the 1980s were part of the USSR, Yugoslavia or other countries that passed through phases of early socialism in Europe, South Korea, etc.

Fascism functions for modern imperialism as an instrumentally useful and expendable “strike force” in proxy wars against those who resist the continuation of its domination, against the forces of anti-imperialism and socialism in WWIII. Entire countries and peoples are placed under brutal and open foreign management, turned into expendable “private military companies” of the aggressor Euro-Atlantic axis.

This is evident in the way the imperialists are treating the people of Ukraine today (as “cannon fodder”) through the Kiev junta regime, against the people of the rebellious Donbass since 2014, and against Russia and its allies since 2022. The same fate awaits tomorrow the peoples of Poland, the Baltic States, South Korea, Taiwan, Greece and other Balkan countries, etc.

This is also evident in the actions of the Zionist racist formation of Israel, the war arm of the US-led Axis, which has been the brutal occupying power in Palestine for 7 decades, launching repeated genocidal operations against the Palestinian people, while acting as an aggressive imperialist bulwark and arm of the Axis in this strategically important region.

However, fascism was and remains the most consistent misanthropism and anti-communism, the most militant fighting force of counter-revolution, of the financial oligarchy of imperialism.

Therefore, as long as the deeper causes, the predatory imperialist interests and the guilty ones, the moral and physical perpetrators, those responsible for the re-emergence, the rise, the financing, the equipping, the training, etc. of today's nazi-fascists and brownshirts are not exposed, the abstract anti-fascism and anti-

capitalism, however strong it may be, lacks a long-term perspective and strategic depth. The struggle against fascism must be consistent, patriotic and internationalist/anti-imperialist, aiming its arrows at the attacking imperialist axis led by the USA and at the reactionary policies of every government that, through NATO-EU, facilitates fascist actions and supports nazi-fascist regimes, such as those of Ukraine and the Zionist state of Israel.

The need to crush imperialism, whose tool is fascism

War and fascism reproduce each other. A necessary condition for the working people's uprising is the destruction of both fascism and the imperialism that instrumentalises it when it's appropriate. They go together, one cannot be done without the other. Imperialism is the matrix that produces and reproduces fascism at every historical stage and in every era.

During WWII, the formation of an anti-fascist front at national and global level to crush the fascist/anti-communist/anti-Comintern axis was a strategic task. The USSR, the Third International and the global communist movement concentrated their forces on this task. The Soviet foreign policy and diplomacy exploited the inter-imperialist contradictions with extraordinary skill in order to divide the imperialist world of that time, to inactivate a significant part of the imperialist powers (M, Great Britain, USA, France, etc.) and to integrate them in the anti-fascist alliance against the axis.

Thus, during WWII, the strategically important frontal policy, the victorious policy of alliances, had to prioritise anti-fascism/anti-nazism and only through this to pursue the anti-imperialist and socialist aims of the communists.

As we have shown in previous writings, the character of the current war has some similarities, but it is qualitatively and essentially different

from the two previous ones, due to the era, the context and the character of the powers that are de facto involved in it. Therefore, the attitude of the progressive, anti-imperialist and communist forces cannot be determined mechanistically, through metaphysical analogies, as if nothing had changed since 1914 or 1940 until today..

During WWIII, inter-imperialist conflicts cannot play an important role due to tectonic rearrangements in the global balance of economic, political and military forces. Any continuation of the parasitic imperialist function of the Euro-Atlantic axis, any prolongation of its declining course requires, for existential reasons, the open consolidation and subordination of the former colonialist and the present neo-colonialist imperialist powers into a unified, united, aggressive axis led by the USA. This is evident in the imposition of ultimatums, the humiliation of the EU and Germany in terms of energy, etc. with new forms of cannibalism, economic and military strangulation and coercion by US imperialism (destruction of gas pipelines, de-industrialisation, subordination of the military-industrial complex to US purposes, increasingly direct involvement and transfer of the costs of supporting the nazi regime in Ukraine to the EU and NATO countries, etc.).

These conditions also radically change the character of today's fascism-nazism, transforming it into an instrument of war, intervention and coups d'état, into an "exportable" model of transnational monopoly imposition of regimes that act as subordinates, outposts and strike forces of the unique and deadly aggressive unified US-NATO-EU axis.

Therefore, in contrast to WWII, today, during WWIII, the strategically important frontal policy, the victorious policy of alliances, must give priority to the consistent and militant anti-imperialism, to the prioritisation of the aggressor united US-NATO-EU axis as the №1 enemy of humanity, whose tool

is the current versions of fascism. Therefore, it is only through the consistent frontal anti-imperialist struggle that anti-fascism/anti-nazism today gains meaning and is organically linked to the socialist aims of the communists. Those who do not put forward consistent anti-imperialism in today's struggle are objectively acting in a disorientating and undermining way.

The theoretical inability to diagnose the present era, the context and the de facto bipolar character of the war does not allow them to prioritise the aims of the movement rationally and effectively, making their—possibly pure—anti-fascist intentions rather fruitless. Behind this weakness lie versions of modern opportunism and the consequent revisionism that conflates the monopoly stage of capitalism with the character of the imperialist state.

The most consistent version of this deception is linked to the irrational metaphysical dogma/ideological construction of the “imperialist pyramid”, which the current leadership of the Communist Party of Greece (KKE) shamelessly promotes. On the basis of this anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist deception, all existing states on the planet are projected as “more or less imperialist”, fully and/or “in the making”. Therefore, according to similar doctrines, today we do not have a singular WWII with many fronts/battlefields on the planet, but a multitude of conflicts of undefined character, “bourgeois settling of accounts between imperialists/ bandits”, so that both anti-fascism and anti-imperialism are practically undermined and devoid of meaning...

Many comrades have great difficulty in understanding the character of the war, comrades who—consciously or subconsciously—consider as “class betrayal” the assumption of the de facto coalescence of the other pole, the opposing pole, against the attacking imperialist axis under the USA, given that the new bourgeoisie of Russia, the

spawn of the predatory capitalist restoration, is also participating in it. As we have shown, the Russian bourgeoisie would naturally want to become an organic part or competitor of the consolidated imperialism of the axis. However, the axis has left it no room for development in this direction, as it wanted and still wants to maintain Russia's position and role as an exporter of energy and raw materials to imperialism. They have been and are openly trying to weaken, disarm, fragment and completely enslave/colonise the territory of the former Soviet Union. Therefore, the Russian bourgeoisie did not declare war because they suddenly became anti-imperialist and pro-socialist. On the contrary, they were drawn into the war for existential reasons, with the well-known criminal ambivalence and bargaining they know from their own comprador service. Therefore, siding with the anti-imperialist and socialist pole in the war does not mean unconditional surrender to the Russian or any other bourgeoisie dragged into the conflict.

Moreover, and only because of certain variations of the specific historical peculiarities of the characteristics of the construction of early socialism (e.g. in China, the DPRK, Cuba, Vietnam, Laos), which do not conform to their preferred stereotype/example of “real socialism” (with some idealised phase of the course of the USSR before the counter-revolution/bourgeois restoration), they practically completely deny the existence of early socialism and imperialism on the planet (in full harmony with the revisionism of the current leadership of the KKE)!

The participation in the anti-fascist alliance of the imperialist frontline countries during WWII (as a result of the masterful policy and diplomacy of the USSR) is generally considered as tactically correct in every way. It is indeed grotesque that the same people, today, as WWII escalates, tremble at the thought of a country that the imperialists want to dismantle, conquer and completely colonise

(for example, Russia) and countries to which their stereotypes do not allow “certificates of socialist purity”..., joining the pole of the forces of anti-imperialism and socialism. What exactly are they afraid of? Not to be slandered by the professional disrupters/saboteurs of the movement, those who, in the name of “equal distances” and the nonsense of the “imperialist pyramid”, justify the aggressor sole imperialist axis USA-NATO-EU?

Therefore, a superficial and ahistorical anti-fascism, detached from a consistent anti-imperialism and from the perspective of socialist revolution and communism, is without perspective during WWII.

There is an urgent need for a great front in which the unity of the people, the youth and the working class is forged against imperialism, for the defeat of NATO, the anti-people and anti-working-class policies of the governments that are the lackeys of imperialism, fascism, the state, deep state and transnational terrorism, with a view to the socialist revolution and the unification of humanity, communism.

During WWII, a coordinated anti-fascist action within the framework of a global militant anti-imperialist front with the communists at the forefront is necessary. Also necessary is the theoretical, ideological and practical struggle against the forces of opportunism and revisionism, which sow confusion and discord, which deny the necessity of a frontal anti-imperialist and anti-fascist struggle, which separate fascism from imperialism.

The mature offspring of this necessity is the World Anti-imperialist Platform, whose actions and influence are constantly increased.

Understand fascism deeply, it will not die on its own, crush it!

DEATH TO FASCISM AND IMPERIALISM!

DEFEAT FOR THE CRIMINAL U.S.-NATO-EU

IMPERIALIST AXIS!

VICTORY TO THE UNITED FORCES OF ANTI-
IMPERIALISM AND SOCIALISM!

Lenin's work remains a guide for our time

Joti Brar | Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)

The following article is a slightly extended version of a speech given by Joti Brar to a symposium that was held in Istanbul, Turkey, on 13 January to mark the centenary of Lenin's death.

There are many aspects of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin's immortal contribution to Marxism that are worthy of focused and detailed attention. Since it is not possible to cover them all in a single article, this piece will focus on just three of them—lessons that have tremendous significance for our work today, when a new wave of anti-imperialist struggle is rising to face the twin threats of imperialist global economic crisis and the imperialist drive into a third world war.

The fight against opportunism

Lenin fought all his life against opportunism in the working-class movement, not only in Russia but throughout the socialist movement. By opportunism, we mean the selling out of the long-term interests of the movement for short-term gains, real or perceived, political or personal. According to Lenin, such manoeuvrings can ultimately be traced back to capitalist influence, ideological or financial. "Opportunism is a manifestation of the bourgeoisie's influence over the proletariat." (Opportunism, and the Collapse of the Second International by VI Lenin, December 1915)

Lenin exposed and fought against both right opportunists, who openly sided with their own ruling classes when the first world war broke out, and also against so-called 'centrists' like Germany's Karl Kautsky, who tried to find a bridge between the revolutionary and opportunist wings of the

working-class movement.

It was in the wake of the betrayal of the 'official' socialist parties of the Second International—and out of the success of the Bolshevik-led socialist revolution in 1917—that the modern communist movement was founded. Out of the confusion and treachery of 1914, there rose like a phoenix from the ashes the Third International, headed by the outstanding Marxist-Leninist leadership of Lenin's CPSU(B), in 1919. The basis for this regrouping had been laid by the Bolsheviks and other members of the Zimmerwald left—that part of the socialist movement that held true to its principles throughout the course of the first world war.

The Zimmerwald conference of 1915 and its subsequent development has great resonance and relevance for communists today. This conference brought together all those who were dismayed by the militarist, pro-imperialist turn taken by the leaders and significant sections of every one of the European socialist parties in 1914—in total contradiction to the resolutions they had all signed up to at a congress in Basel, Switzerland just two years earlier.

The course of the war saw the firm incorporation of the right wing of the socialist movement into bourgeois governments and state machines all over Europe. Social democracy emerged as the fully-fledged instrument of bourgeois influence in the working-class movement. Social-democratic leaders became government ministers, their parliamentarians voted for war credits, and they in every way supported and recruited for the war effort.

Those who attended the Zimmerwald conference protesting this development revealed themselves

to have three tendencies. The first of these was a consistently revolutionary left wing, headed by Lenin, which stuck firmly to the line that had been previously agreed on. In 1912, all the socialist parties in Europe had made a commitment that they would work to mobilise the workers to actively oppose war when it broke out; that they would do everything possible to transform an interimperialist war, in which workers slaughtered their fellow workers in the interests of the financiers, into a civil war, in which the revolutionary workers would turn their guns against their own imperialist rulers.

On the other side was the Zimmerwald right, those who claimed still to support the old antiwar line, but who in practice were afraid to be seen as ‘splitting the movement’ and wanted to conciliate with the open social-chauvinists, hoping to ‘reunite’ the movement as soon as the nasty interruption caused by the war was over. Objectively, this line was a line of capitulation to the bourgeoisie and to the bourgeois-aligned opportunists, who had revealed their loyalties only too clearly. Lenin wrote extensively about the need to expose rather than cover over these important differences—about the need to break cleanly rather than try to mend what could no longer be considered as whole.

Between these two was a centrist position that tried to reconcile the two. Objectively, this section also acted like the petty-bourgeois vacillators in the class struggle—unwilling or unable to take a firm position; afraid to speak out against former friends and comrades; hoping against hope that a way could be found to square the circle with the minimum of unpleasantness.

“Is it worth trying, as Kautsky and co are doing, to force the pus back into the body for the sake of ‘unity’ (with the pus), or should the pus be removed as quickly and thoroughly as possible, regardless of the pang of pain caused by the process, to help bring about the complete recovery of the body of the labour movement?” (Opportunism and the

Collapse of the Second International, January 1916, Collected Works Vol 22, pp108-20)

Further: “The split in the labour and socialist movements throughout the world is a fact. We have two irreconcilable working-class tactics and policies in respect of the war. It is ridiculous to close your eyes to this fact. Any attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable will make all our work futile.” (The tasks of the opposition in France, 10 February 1916)

History has furnished us with ample proof as to which position was correct. The success of Lenin and the Bolsheviks in the October Revolution was based in their firm adherence to a correct line; their willingness to speak uncomfortable truths in order to educate the workers and guide the movement. No doubt many at the time considered Lenin to be ‘harsh’, ‘abrupt’, ‘bad-mannered’, ‘sectarian’ and so on. No doubt many of them asked themselves: ‘Who is this upstart Russian to lecture the German socialists about Marxism? Who is he to tell the biggest working-class party in the world about the correct strategy and tactics for making proletarian revolution?’

Ultimately, his vacillations and attempts to find a ‘peaceful’ way out of the divisions of the movement, along with his attempts to conjure up a ‘peaceful’ future for imperialism and a ‘peaceful’ path to socialism, led Karl Kautsky, who had been considered the theoretical leader of world socialism, into the camp of those who denounced the October Revolution and worked actively to destroy it. (See *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, 1918)

History, of course, we know. Not only did the Bolsheviks, guided by Lenin’s brilliant scientific leadership, prove correct. Not only were they successful in establishing the world’s first socialist state and building the world’s first socialist economy, but they inspired the development of parties of the Bolshevik type all over the world.

That is why almost every country today has an ‘official’ communist party whose establishment dates to the years immediately following the October Revolution and the establishment of the Comintern.

Lenin’s fight against opportunism was key to the Bolsheviks’ success in conditions of global crisis a century ago—and it will be the key to our success in the coming period too.

The insistence on theory

In his 53 years of life, Lenin left us a huge body of work, comprising 45 volumes of investigations, articles, lectures, speeches and letters. And all these writings are permeated with his deep knowledge of and dedication to scientific socialism.

Understanding that Marxism holds the key to the liberation of all humanity, and of the proletariat in particular, Lenin made it a point to conduct all his investigations from the point of view of Marxist science. And just like the founders of that science, Marx and Engels, he never jumped to conclusions based on prejudice, popularity or expedience. Instead, he carefully worked out what was the correct, proletarian viewpoint on any question—and then worked tirelessly to have that viewpoint accepted by his party and by the wider working-class movement.

This scientific approach of sifting all available evidence and examining it through the prism of dialectical and historical materialism before deciding on a conclusion was a key contributing factor in the Bolsheviks’ stunning successes. Lenin’s approach stands out clearly from that many of the supposedly ‘socialist’ (but really bourgeois-liberal) intellectuals who dominated popular left-wing discourse.

These were of a type we are still all too familiar with today, and just as they did then, many of these liberal intelligentsia continue to describe themselves as Marxists. Unlike real Marxists,

however, these individuals start with an ‘idea’ they wish to present as ‘progressive’ (usually something that fits neatly with prevailing bourgeois prejudices and agendas)—and proceed to selectively and eclectically gather ‘evidence’ in support of their preordained conclusion, disregarding anything that does not fit with the chosen narrative.

Not only have the whole of bourgeois academia, polity and media become machines for creating just such ‘narrative-driven’ argumentation, but many in the self-described ‘official’ communist movement have also developed this habit. But no amount of sprinkling the name of Lenin or a few of his phrases, taken out of context and used as Biblical non sequiturs, can transform such spurious argumentation into ‘Leninism’.

All they do is to remind us that our enemies have grasped what too many workers still have not: that Leninism, real Leninism, the science of revolutionary Marxism, holds the keys to success in our struggle for liberation from imperialist and capitalist exploitation.

Only this can explain the great efforts that the ruling classes put into creating a huge variety of fake ‘Marxist’ materials and fake ‘Marxist’ organisations—each aimed at a section of the population that the bourgeoisie recognises as having the potential to make a significant contribution to the struggle for socialism.

Lenin did not only resuscitate and reinvigorate Marxist theory; he also insisted that revolutionaries must translate their theoretical positions into real action. Following the great betrayals of the Second International, Lenin declared that organisations must be judged not only by their grandiose statements, but by the way they translated those declarations into deeds—by the reality of their practice. It was not good enough, he explained, to write articles and sign statements: these words must be turned into real revolutionary action.

Lenin’s insistence on theoretical clarity, and on

the unity of theory and practice, on the necessity of having a thoroughly worked out scientific basis for all points of programmatic action, was key to the Bolsheviks' success in building their party, extending its influence and educating the working class for revolutionary action—and it will be the key to our success in the coming period too.

The unity of the struggle against imperialism

It should never be forgotten that it was Lenin who applied Marxism to the generally ignored question of the colonised peoples in the early twentieth century. During the period of the Second International, the national question had been treated by many Marxists as something that concerned only a few European countries such as Poland, Hungary and Ireland. The huge mass of colonised peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America remained outside their purview.

Lenin broke down the artificial wall that colonialism had constructed between Europeans, Asians, Africans and Latin Americans; between the 'civilised' and 'uncivilised' slaves of imperialism. He thus transformed the national question from being an internal question for a few specific states into a general international one—the question of the liberation of the oppressed peoples in the colonial and dependent countries from the yoke of imperialism through self-determination and complete secession.

With this slogan of self-determination, Leninism educated the masses in the spirit of internationalism. He showed how the two struggles against the same enemy could be practically unified so as to assist and amplify one another. Lenin thus transformed the revolutionary national-liberation movements into a reserve of the revolutionary proletariat.

The Leninist solution, basing itself in the teachings of Marx and Engels, had two distinct sides. On the one hand, it emphasised the importance of the right

to secession: the importance of allowing oppressed nations to determine their own future without economic or military coercion—a right that needed to be stressed particularly by the socialists of the imperialist heartlands, who had to work to help the workers overcome their chauvinistic prejudices, instilled by decades of pro-imperialist brainwashing by media, religion, politics and culture.

On the other hand, Lenin emphasised the ultimate aim of socialist unity between the peoples—a unity based on solidarity and cooperation, while respecting and encouraging the dignity and development of different nationalities and ethnic groups, their languages and cultures. This aspect of the question was particularly important for the socialists of the oppressed countries to highlight—to prevent them from falling into narrow nationalism and allowing the masses to become reserves of the national bourgeoisie.

Taking a consistently dialectical and holistic approach, Lenin also pointed out, as Marx and Engels had done before him, that no national movement should place its own right to self-determination higher than the interests of the anti-imperialist and socialist movement as a whole. For Marxists, every individual national struggle must be evaluated in the context of the wider balance of forces and its place in the global struggle against imperialism and for socialism.

Again and again, Lenin, stressed the importance of the practical unity of the struggles of the socialist revolutionaries in the imperialist heartlands and of those struggling for national liberation from those same imperialist powers abroad. And he repeatedly pointed out that this unity does not depend on the existence of proletarian elements in the national-liberation movements concerned, nor on their having a socialist or republican programme.

In our era, said Lenin, the world is divided into two great camps: the camp of a handful of imperialist exploiting and oppressing nations,

possessors of finance capital which exploit the majority of the population of the globe; and the camp of the oppressed and exploited billions.

The shared interests of the proletarian movement in the developed countries and the national-liberation movement in the colonies call for a union of these two forms of revolutionary movement in a common front against imperialism—against our common enemy. Without such a front, the victory of either is impossible. During wars of national liberation waged by an oppressed people against an imperialist power, it is the duty of the workers within the oppressing country to work for the defeat of their own ruling class and the victory of the liberation fighters.

As Lenin told the second congress of the Comintern: “The revolutionary movement in the advanced countries would in fact be nothing but a sheer fraud if, in their struggle against capital, the workers of Europe and America were not closely and completely united with the hundreds upon hundreds of millions of ‘colonial’ slaves, who are oppressed by that capital.” (August 1920)

By working out in detail the theoretical formulation and the practical programme that could solve the national question in a scientific and revolutionary way, the demands of the oppressed nations were met in the socialists’ programme and the liberation struggles of the peoples of the Russian empire were merged with the socialist struggle of the Russian proletarians and poor peasantry.

This practical union of struggle created a mighty torrent that was able to sweep away Russian imperialism. And this in turn created the foundation for the building of the great Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The collapse of so many formerly harmonious socialist republics into balkanised and fratricidal statelets following the counter-revolutions of 1989-91 clearly revealed the brilliance of the Leninist

approach to the national question, which was one of the great drivers of Soviet development. While the Soviet Union existed, national oppression and conflict between peoples was replaced by fraternal cooperation and mutual assistance. And having unleashed the potential of its large population and diverse resources through the tremendous power of the all-Union planned economy, the USSR was able to grow at a pace unprecedented in human history, replacing exploitation and colonial slavery with peace and prosperity for all.

Lenin’s insistence on forging the closest possible unity between proletarians in the imperialist countries and the oppressed and colonised masses in the rest of the world was vital to the successful overthrow of Russian imperialism and vital to the building of a strong and resilient socialist economy—and it will be equally vital in our struggle against the US-led imperialist bloc in the coming period.

The historical experience of the October Revolution and the factors that will guarantee the victory of the revolution in the 21st century

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

A speech for the International Lenin Century Symposium in Istanbul, 13 January 2024

The Russian October Revolution at the beginning of the 20th century had a major impact on the history of world revolution. Lenin's brilliance is that he creatively applied Marxism to the era of imperialism and led the first socialist revolution to victory. The theory that the contradictions between the imperialist powers, owing to uneven development of capitalism, would lead to interimperialist and colonial wars, and that the weakest link in the imperialist chain would be broken first in the process, has become an important part of Leninism, describing the objective aspects of the revolutionary situation.

Lenin waged a decisive struggle to mature the subjective aspects of the revolutionary situation: the founding of Leninist theory, the strengthening of the Bolshevik organization, and the seizure of power in the Soviets.

The theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat characterizes one of the most important factors in the victory of the October Revolution. The ideological battle against sectarianism and opportunism was crucial in strengthening the Bolsheviks as the revolutionary force of the working class, and the Soviets of workers, peasants, and soldiers played a decisive role in the victory of the revolution as a united front linking the party with the masses.

In order to succeed in a revolution, both the objective and subjective conditions must be ripe, but it is the subjective side that plays the decisive role.

Today, the flames of World War 3 are spreading from Eastern Europe, through Western Asia (the Middle East), and into East Asia. At present, there is a high probability of expansion of war in Eastern Europe and a high probability of the outbreak of war in East Asia.

World War 1 was a war between rival imperialists, while World War 2 was a world antifascist war. World War 3 is relatively closer to World War 2 than World War 1 as a world anti-imperialist war. While in World War 2 the socialist Soviet Union joined hands with the imperialists of the USA and Britain in order to destroy fascism, in World War 3, socialist DPRK and China have joined hands with capitalist Russia against the imperialists.

Succeeding from the world antifascist united front in World War 2, the world anti-imperialist united front is being formed in World War 3. One anti-imperialist front and several anti-imperialist battlefields are being formed on a global scale.

The war in Ukraine began with the Maidan coup in 2014, intensified with the war in the Donbass region, and entered full swing with Russia's special military operation in 2022. World War 3 began with the war in Ukraine and is intensifying with the war in Palestine, the war in the Middle East in 2023. It will enter full swing with the outbreak of war in Taiwan and in South Korea. When we talk about the war entering "full swing", we are referring to a qualitative change in warfare that is objectively recognized as a state of

war.

The ongoing war in Ukraine is an anti-imperialist and anti-fascist war, a war of liberation, and a preventive war from the standpoint of Russia, while the war in Palestine is an anti-Zionist and anti-imperialist war and a war of liberation from the standpoint of Palestine. The impending war in Taiwan is an anti-imperialist war, a national-liberation war, and a unification war of the fatherland from the standpoint of China, while the war in South Korea is an anti-imperialist and anti-fascist war and a national-liberation war from the standpoint of Korea. The DPRK will resolve the national-liberation issue through non-peaceful means, and then peacefully resolve the national reunification issue with the people's democratic regime established in the South. This will involve a process of unification through a federal system.

At present, the international communist movement is not fulfilling its historical and political responsibilities. One of the main reasons for this is the revisionist, opportunistic and sectarian behavior of the Communist Party of Greece (KKE) and its satellites. Solidnet, the authoritative solidarity network of the international communist movement, was completely divided at last year's conference in Havana, Cuba, when its organizer, the KKE, declared the war in Ukraine to be an "interimperialist" war. The basis of the KKE's erroneous views, which declare Russia and even China to be "imperialist", is its revisionist theory of the "imperialist pyramid".

As long as there are markets and trade, this theory contends that a society must be described as capitalist. And as long as monopolies dominate on a global scale, every capitalist society must be described as an imperialist one. According to this absurd view that there is only a quantitative difference in a pyramid of imperialists, every

country on earth becomes an imperialist country. Even the DPRK, the most staunch socialist country, has markets and trade, so it is capitalist and therefore imperialist.

The only exception to this theory, according to their argument, is Palestine, which is a logical contradiction in itself, since Palestine has markets and trade, so it is also capitalist and imperialist. This is why Solidnet made a very vague statement on the war in Palestine at this year's conference in Izmir, Turkey.

If we compare the Paris Declaration made by the World Anti-imperialist Platform in October 2022 and the statement on the war in Palestine made in Athens in November 2023 with the statements of Solidnet, the limitations of the latter, which is led by the KKE, become even more glaring. In this context, the recent sectarian recklessness with which the KKE unilaterally dissolved the Communist Initiative in Europe, is not surprising at all.

The victory of the revolution depends on both subjective and objective factors, and the subjective factor plays a decisive role. The analysis of a revolutionary situation consists of a subjective aspect and an objective aspect, and here too, the subjective aspect plays a decisive role. The subjective factors for the victory of the revolution are the guiding idea, the leading nucleus and the mass foundation, while the objective factors are the military and economic material means. The subjective aspect of the revolutionary situation is the military, political and economic capabilities of the revolutionary forces. The objective aspect consists of the military, political and economic capabilities of the domestic counter-revolutionary forces and international variables.

The revolutionary forces work to strengthen their subjective capacities and deepen the military, political and economic crisis of the

domestic counter-revolutionary forces. The international variable is divided into the forces of the dominant powers and the forces of international solidarity: the dominant forces are imperialist and great-power chauvinist forces, while the international solidarity forces are the forces for internationalist unity and the forces for international solidarity.

The problem of great-power chauvinism refers to the error of the big socialist countries in the past in failing to guarantee the independence of smaller socialist countries. The force for internationalist unity refers to the unity of forces that believe in the internationalism of Marxism-Leninism. The fact that China today, along with the most staunch socialist country, the DPRK, is walking a socialist line with Chinese characteristics, and has even gone so far as to wage an anti-imperialist armed struggle along with capitalist Russia on a single anti-imperialist front, is the greatest anti-imperialist and revolutionary change since the destruction of the Soviet Union.

Today, the imperialist camp is plotting World War 3 under cover of its “New Cold War” strategy in order to expropriate its excesses and conceal its own political and economic crisis. Imperialism is the root cause of all wars on a global scale and is solely responsible for provoking them. The imperialist camp is using the tactic of the “New Cold War”, World War 3, in which hot and cold wars coexist, by fabricating the fiction and spreading this lie by means of overwhelming propaganda: World War 3 would be caused by invasions from Russia in Eastern Europe, Palestine in Western Asia, China and the DPRK in East Asia.

However, this is a strategic error that had not only united Russia and China in a single anti-imperialist camp but also is driving two billion Muslims into the anti-imperialist camp, all while

contradicting its own pretext for war owing to the obvious inconsistency between the West’s anti-Russian propaganda and its pro-Israeli propaganda.

We note that Russia, China and the DPRK are all nuclear and missile powers armed with hydrogen bombs and hypersonic missiles, and that South Korea’s Yoon Suk-yeol government is in a very vulnerable state. Like the Zelensky and Netanyahu governments, the Yoon government is notoriously fascist and a steadfast vassal of imperialism. Unlike the fascist forces in World War 2, the fascist forces in World War 3 are all puppets of imperialism, serving merely as storm troops in imperialist proxy wars.

Yoon’s approval rating has plummeted owing to his corruption, incompetence, and pro-US unpatriotic character, and he is now frantically trying to complete the fascistization of South Korea and conduct war maneuvers against North Korea, as he is highly likely to be defeated in the next parliamentary election in April. In South Korea, the People’s Democracy Party (PDP) is the only staunch revolutionary force that calls for the withdrawal of US troops and the overthrow of Yoon Suk-yeol. The PDP has won legitimacy through 30 years of keen antifascist and anti-imperialist struggles and is focusing on strengthening its core competencies and mass base, as well as on strengthening internationalist unity and international solidarity in preparation for the outbreak of war in South Korea.

Founded in Paris in October 2022 by revolutionary parties from around the world, including the People’s Democratic Party, the World Anti-imperialist Platform has set itself three major goals: organizing the worldwide anti-imperialist struggle, waging an ideological struggle against revisionism, and strengthening the international communist forces. In pursuit of these aims, it has held international conferences

and massive demonstrations in Belgrade in December 2022, in Caracas in March 2023, in Seoul in May 2023, and in Athens in November 2023.

We will continue to move forward and struggle for the victory of the Great October Revolution of our era with the scientific convictions of “Proletarians of the world, unite!” and “The people, united, will never be defeated!”

The final victory of the most just anti-imperialist camp is certain.

