

Platform

March 2024 No.10

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 rendered in a flat, graphic style with some shading to suggest form and movement.



Contents

Work	The Proletarian Revolution And The Renegade Kautsky 02 V.I. Lenin
Article	Zionism—a racist, anti-semitic and reactionary tool of imperialism 07 Chapter 3. Genesis of Zionism Harpal Brar Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)
	The political stance of the Communist Party of Greece... a communist stance? · 18 Chilean Communist Party (Proletarian Action)
	Renegades drifting towards the Symplegades of opportunism, shipwrecked between Scylla and Charybdis (dogmatism & revisionism). Part 1 23 Dimitrios Patelis Revolutionary Unification (Greece)
	Why is Manchester in poverty? Workers need socialism! 32 Joti Brar, Alexander Mckay Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)
	The DPRK’s “declaration of subjugation” and revolution in South Korea 34 Stephen Cho Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

The Proletarian Revolution And The Renegade Kautsky

V.I. Lenin

October 1918

This is the title of a pamphlet I have begun to write in criticism of Kautsky's pamphlet, *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, which has just appeared in Vienna. But as this work is taking longer than I had anticipated, I have decided to ask Pravda to find space for a short article on the subject.

Over four years of a most exhausting and reactionary war have done their work. One can feel the impending proletarian revolution in Europe—in Austria, Italy, Germany, France and even in Britain (very significant, for example, is the article "Confessions of a Capitalist" in the July number of the arch-opportunist *Socialist Review*, edited by the semi-liberal Ramsay MacDonald).

And at a time like this, Mr. Kautsky, leader of the Second International, comes out with a book on the dictatorship of the proletariat—in other words, on the proletarian revolution—that is a hundred times more disgraceful, outrageous and renegade than Bernstein's notorious *Premises of Socialism*. Nearly twenty years have elapsed since the appearance of that renegade book, and now Kautsky repeats this renegacy in an even grosser form!

Only a very small part of the book deals with the Russian Bolshevik revolution as such. Kautsky repeats every one of the Mensheviks' pearls of wisdom in a way that would make the Russian worker split his sides laughing. Just imagine, for example, what goes by the name of "Marxism": the argument—peppered with quotations from the semi-liberal works by the semi-liberal Maslov—that the rich peasants are trying to appropriate the land (novel!), that they find high grain prices profitable, and so on. Then our "Marxist" makes the following contemptuous, and utterly liberal, statement: "The poor peasant is recognised here [that is, by the Bolsheviks in the Soviet Republic]

to be a permanent and wholesale product of the socialist agrarian reform under the 'dictatorship of the proletariat.'" (P. 48 of Kautsky's pamphlet.)

Fine. Here is a socialist, a Marxist, who tries to prove to us the bourgeois nature of the revolution, and who at the same time scoffs at the organisation of the poor peasants, quite in the spirit of Maslov, Potresov and the Cadets.

"The expropriation of the rich peasants only introduces a new element of unrest and civil war into the production process, which urgently needs peace and security for its recovery." (P. 49.)

Incredible, but there we are. These are the very words, not of Savinkov or Milyukov, but of Kautsky!

Kautsky does not surprise us since we in Russia have seen so many cases of "Marxism" being used as a screen by defenders of the kulaks. For the benefit of the European reader, I should perhaps dwell in greater detail on this despicable kowtowing to the bourgeoisie and the liberal fear of civil war. But for the Russian worker and peasant it is enough to point one's finger at Kautsky's renegacy—and pass on.

* * *

Nearly nine-tenths of Kautsky's book is devoted to a general theoretical question of the utmost importance, the question of the relation between the dictatorship of the proletariat and "democracy". And it is here that Kautsky's complete break with Marxism is particularly evident.

Kautsky assures his reader—in a perfectly serious and extremely "learned" tone—that what Marx meant by "revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat" was not a "form of governing" that precludes democracy, but, a state, namely, "a state of rule". And the rule of the proletariat, as the majority of the population, is possible with

the strictest observance of democracy, and, for instance, the Paris Commune, which was in fact a dictatorship of the proletariat, was elected by universal suffrage. "The fact that Marx thought that in England and America the transition [to communism] might take place peacefully, i.e., in a democratic way, proves" that when he spoke of the dictatorship of the proletariat Marx did not have in mind a "form of governing" (or a form of government, *Regierungsform*) (pp. 20-21).

Incredible, but there we are! That is exactly the way Kautsky argues and he angrily accuses the Bolsheviks of violating "democracy" in their Constitution and throughout their policy; and he takes every opportunity to energetically preach "the democratic instead of the dictatorial method".

This is a complete desertion to the opportunists (those like David, Kolb and other pillars of German social-chauvinism, or the English Fabians and Independents, or the French and Italian reformists), who have declared more frankly and honestly that they do not accept Marx's doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat on the ground that it runs counter to democracy.

It is a complete reversion to the views of the pre-Marxist German socialists, who used to claim they wanted a "free people's state", to the views of the petty-bourgeois democrats, who did not understand that every state is a machine for the suppression of one class by another.

It is a complete renunciation of the proletarian revolution, which is replaced by the liberal theory of "winning a majority" and "utilising democracy"! Kautsky the renegade has completely forgotten, distorted and thrown overboard everything Marx and Engels taught for forty years, from 1852 to 1891, demonstrating the need for the proletariat to "smash" the bourgeois state machine.

To analyse Kautsky's theoretical mistakes in detail would mean repeating what I have said in *The State and Revolution*. There is no need for that. I shall only say briefly:

Kautsky has renounced Marxism by forgetting that every state is a machine for the suppression of

one class by another, and that the most democratic bourgeois republic is a machine for the oppression of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie.

The dictatorship of the proletariat, the proletarian state, which is a machine for the suppression of the bourgeoisie by the proletariat, is not a "form of governing", but a state of a different type. Suppression is necessary because the bourgeoisie will always furiously resist being expropriated.

(The argument that Marx in the seventies allowed for the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism in England and America^[1] is completely fallacious, or, to put it bluntly, dishonest in that it is juggling with quotations and references. Firstly, Marx regarded it as an exception even then. Secondly, in those days monopoly capitalism, i.e., imperialism, did not exist. Thirdly, in England and America there was no militarist clique then—as there is now—serving as the chief apparatus of the bourgeois state machine.)

You cannot have liberty, equality and so on where there is suppression. That is why Engels said: "So long as the proletariat still needs the state, it does not need it in the interests of freedom but in order to hold down its adversaries, and as soon as it becomes possible to speak of freedom the state as such ceases to exist."^[2]

Bourgeois democracy, which is invaluable in educating the proletariat and training it for the struggle, is always narrow, hypocritical, spurious and false; it always remains democracy for the rich and a swindle for the poor.

Proletarian democracy suppresses the exploiters, the bourgeoisie—and is therefore not hypocritical, does not promise them freedom and democracy—and gives the working people genuine democracy. Only Soviet Russia has given the proletariat and the whole vast labouring majority of Russia a freedom and democracy unprecedented, impossible and inconceivable in any bourgeois democratic republic, by, for example, taking the palaces and mansions away from the bourgeoisie (without which freedom of assembly is sheer hypocrisy), by taking the print-shops and stocks of paper away

from the capitalists (without which freedom of the press for the nation's labouring majority is a lie), and by replacing bourgeois parliamentarism by the democratic organisation of the Soviets, which are a thousand times nearer to the people and more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois parliament. And on.

Kautsky has thrown overboard... the "class struggle" as applied to democracy! Kautsky has become a downright renegade and a lackey of the bourgeoisie.

I must mention, in passing, a few gems of his renegacy.

Kautsky has to admit that the Soviet form of organisation is of world-wide, and not only of Russian significance, that it is one of the "most important phenomena of our times", and that it promises to acquire "decisive significance" in the future great "battles between capital and labour". But, imitating the wisdom of the Mensheviks, who have happily sided with the bourgeoisie against the proletariat, Kautsky "deduces" that the Soviets are all right as "battle organisations", but not as "state organisations".

Marvellous! Form up in Soviets, you proletarians and poor peasants! But, for God's sake, don't you dare win! Don't even think of winning! The moment you will and vanquish the bourgeoisie, that will be the end of you; for you must not be "state" organisations in a proletarian state. In fact, as soon as you have won you must break up!

What a marvellous Marxist this man Kautsky is! What an inimitable "theoretician" of renegacy!

Gem No. 2. Civil war is the "mortal enemy" of "social revolution", for, as we have already heard, the latter "needs peace [for I lie rich?] and security" (for the capitalists?).

Workers of Europe, don't think of revolution until you have found a bourgeoisie who will not hire Savinkov and Dan, Dutov and Krasnov, Czechs and kulaks to wage civil war on you!

Marx wrote in 1870 that the chief hope lay in the practice in arms that the war had given the French

workers.^[3] What Kautsky the "Marxist" expects of four years of war is not the use of arms by the workers against the bourgeoisie (Heaven forbid, that wouldn't really be "democratic"!), but... the conclusion of a nice little peace by the nice little capitalists!

Gem No. 3. Civil war has another unpleasant side to it: whereas "democracy" provides for the "protection of the minority" (as—we might note in parenthesis—those in France who stood up for Dreyfus, and people like Liebknecht, Maclean or Debs in more recent times, have learned so well from their own experience), civil war (mark that!) "threatens the vanquished with complete annihilation".

Well, isn't this man Kautsky a real revolutionary? He is heart and soul for revolution... provided there is no serious struggle threatening annihilation! He has completely "overcome" the old errors of old Engels, who so enthusiastically lauded the educational value of violent revolutions.^[4] Like the "serious" historian he is, he has completely renounced the delusions of those who said that civil war steels the exploited and teaches them to build a new society without exploiters.

Gem No. 4. Viewed historically, was the dictatorship of the workers and petty bourgeoisie in the 1789 Revolution great and beneficial? Certainly not. For along came Napoleon. "The dictatorship of the lower sections of the population paves the way for the dictatorship of the sword" (p. 26). Like all liberals, to whose camp lie has deserted, our "serious" historian is firmly convinced that in countries which have not known the "dictatorship of the lower sections"—Germany, for example—there has never been a dictatorship of the sword. Germany has never been distinguished from France by a grosser and viler dictatorship of the sword—that is all slander thought up by Marx and Engels, who brazenly lied when they said that there have so far been a greater love of freedom and a greater pride of the oppressed among the "people" in France than in England or Germany, and that it was precisely her revolutions that France has to thank

for this.

But enough! One would have to write a whole pamphlet to enumerate all the gems of renegacy of that despicable renegade Kautsky.

I must say a word or two about Mr. Kautsky's "internationalism". He inadvertently cast light upon it himself by his most sympathetic way of portraying the internationalism of the Mensheviks, who, dear Mr. Kautsky assures us, were also Zimmerwaldists and, if you please, are "brothers" of the Bolsheviks!

Here is his lovely little picture of the "Zimmerwaldism" of the Mensheviks

"The Mensheviks wanted universal peace. They wanted all those in the war to accept the slogan: no annexations or indemnities. Until this would have been achieved, the Russian army, in their opinion, should have maintained itself in a state of fighting readiness But! the wretched Bolsheviks "disorganised" the army and concluded the wretched Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty... And Kautsky says as clear as clear can be that the Constituent Assembly should have been preserved, and the Bolsheviks should not have taken power.

So internationalism means supporting one's "own" imperialist government, as the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries supported Kerensky, it means concealing its secret treaties, hoodwinking the people with fancy phrases, such as that we "demand" the savage beasts be tame, we "demand" the imperialist governments "accept the slogan of no annexations or indemnities".

That, in Kautsky's opinion, is internationalism.

In our opinion it is sheer renegacy.

Internationalism means breaking with one's own social chauvinists (i.e., defence advocates) and with one's own imperialist government; it means waging a revolutionary struggle against that government and overthrowing it, and being ready to make the greatest national sacrifices (even down to a Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty), if it should benefit the

development of the world workers' revolution.

We all know very well that Kautsky and his friends (Strobel, Bernstein, and the rest) were greatly "put out" by the Brest-Litovsk Peace: they would have liked us to have made a "gesture"... that would at once have turned over power in Russia to the bourgeoisie! These dim-witted but all too nice and kind German petty bourgeois were not interested in the proletarian Soviet Republic—the first country in the world to overthrow its imperialism by revolutionary means—maintaining itself until the revolution took place in Europe, fanning the flames of the conflagration in other countries (the petty bourgeoisie dread a conflagration in Europe, they dread civil war, which would disturb "peace and security"). No, what interested them was to maintain in all countries the petty-bourgeois nationalism which calls itself "internationalism" because of its "moderation and propriety". If only the Russian Republic had remained bourgeois and... had waited... then everybody on earth would have been a good, moderate, non-predatory, petty-bourgeois nationalist—and that, in fact, would have been internationalism!

That is the line of thought of the Kautskyites in Germany, the Longuetists in France, the Independents (I.L.P.) in England, Turati and his "comrades" in renegacy in Italy, and the rest of the crowd.

By now only an utter idiot can fail to see that we were not only right in overthrowing our bourgeoisie (and their lackeys, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries), but also in concluding the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty after our open appeal for universal peace, backed by the publication and annulment of the secret treaties, had been rejected by the bourgeoisie of the Entente. In the first place, if we had not concluded the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty, we would at once have surrendered power to the Russian bourgeoisie and thus have done untold damage to the world socialist revolution. In the second place, at the cost of national sacrifices, we preserved such an international revolutionary influence that today we have Bulgaria directly

imitating us, Austria and Germany in a state of ferment, both imperialist systems weakened, while we have grown stronger and begun to create a real proletarian army.

From the tactics of Kautsky the renegade it follows that the German workers should now defend their homeland together with the bourgeoisie and dread a German revolution most of all, for the British might impose a new edition of the Brest-Litovsk Peace on it. There's renegacy for you. There's petty-bourgeois nationalism.

We, however, say that while the loss of the Ukraine was a grave national sacrifice, it helped to steel and strengthen the workers and poor peasants of the Ukraine as revolutionary fighters for the world workers' revolution. The Ukraine's suffering was the world revolution's gain, for the German troops were corrupted, German imperialism was weakened, and the German, Ukrainian and Russian revolutionary workers were drawn closer together.

It would of course be "nicer" if we could overthrow both Wilhelm and Wilson simply by war. But that is utter nonsense. We cannot overthrow them by a war from without. But we can speed up their internal disintegration. We have achieved that on an immense scale by the Soviet, proletarian revolution.

The German workers would do it even more successfully if they began a revolution disregarding national sacrifices (that alone is internationalism), if they said (and backed their word by actions) that they prize the interests of the world workers' revolution higher than the integrity, security and peace of any national state, and of their own in particular.

* * *

Europe's greatest misfortune and danger is that it has no revolutionary party. It has parties of traitors like the Scheidemanns, Henaudels, Hendersons, Webbs and Co., and of servile souls like Kautsky. But it has no revolutionary party.

Of course, a mighty, popular revolutionary movement may rectify this deficiency, but it is nevertheless a serious misfortune and a grave

danger.

That is why we must do our utmost to expose renegades like Kautsky, thereby supporting the revolutionary groups of genuine internationalist workers, who are to be found in all countries. The proletariat will very soon turn away from the traitors and renegades and follow these groups, drawing and training leaders from their midst. No wonder the bourgeoisie of all countries are howling about "world Bolshevism".

World Bolshevism will conquer the world bourgeoisie.

Notes

[1] Marx referred to this possibility in his letter to Kugelmann of April 12, 1871 (Marx and Engels, Selected Correspondence, Moscow, 1955, pp. 318-19), and in his speech on the Hague Congress delivered at a meeting in Amsterdam on September 8, 1872 (Marx/Engels, Werke, Pd. 18, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1962, p. 160). See also Engels's preface to the English edition of Volume I of Capital (Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1959, p. 6). p. 107

[2] Man and Engels, Selected Correspondence, Moscow, 1955, p. 357.

[3] Ibid., p. 307.

[4] Engels, Anti-Duhring, Moscow, 1959, pp. 253-54. p. 109.

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

Chapter 3. Genesis of Zionism

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

published in the January/February 2017 issue of LALKAR

The Zionist state of Israel, and its imperialist backers, make three assertions: first, that Jews invented Zionism; second, that Jews are a Semitic people; and third, that the state of Israel ought to be, and will remain, an exclusively Jewish state. This article deals with the first of these assertions alone, leaving the other two for subsequent treatment.

Far from being a "national liberation movement" for the "re-establishment of the Jewish people" in "their homeland and the assumption of Jewish sovereignty in the land of Israel", as is claimed by Israel's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Zionism is much more the product of European geopolitics than the legitimate child of European Jewry.

Far from being an answer to Jewish "yearning" for Zion (Jerusalem) and a response to anti-Semitism, the Zionist construct dates back to the Reformation and its struggle against the authority of the Catholic Church. Rather than the Jews, it is the British who, more than anyone else, pursued the policy of Zionisation of the Jews and Judaisation of Zionism.

According to the Zionist historiography, the founding fathers of Zionism include the German Moses Hess, the Russian Leon Pinsker, and the Hungarian Theodor Herzl.

The principal claim of the Zionists is that Jews alone invented Zionism.

Bernard Lewis, lionised as the doyen of Middle Eastern Studies, locates Vienna as the birthplace of Zionism, Theodor Herzl as its founding father, and the publication of Herzl's book The Jewish State as

the beginning of the history of Zionism^[1].

Nahum Goldman, founder President of the World Jewish Congress, made the same claim in his 1978 article: 'Zionist ideology and the reality of Israel'^[2].

And this claim continues to be repeated by the Zionists and their imperialist backers and has acquired the force of a public prejudice. Anyone who challenges this narrative faces the charge of anti-Semitism from the camp of Zionism and its powerful supporters. The fear of being characterised as anti-Semitic accounts for a great number of people, who know better, maintaining silence on this question. Yet somehow the truth must be asserted. And the truth is that, beginning with the Reformation various schemes of colonial 'Restoration'—Zionist colonisation of Palestine—were the brainchild of, and developed by, non-Jewish Europeans (religious as well as atheist) long before the time of Theodor Herzl (1860-1904). Herzl's appearance on the scene merely marked the beginning—a small beginning at that—of the Zionisation of the Jews themselves and their participation in what initially and essentially was a non-Jewish idea of Zionism.

The Reformation

The Reformation gave the call for the Bible to replace the Pope as the ultimate spiritual authority. Prior to that the notion of 'Jewish return' to Palestine and the concept of a 'Jewish nation' was alien to conventional Catholic thought. The Reformation invented these ideas and formulated

a theological construct which included Jewish conversion to Christianity as a prelude the Second Coming of Christ. Stressing the Palestinian origins of Christianity, partly as a means of knocking down the pretensions of Roman Catholicism, the Protestants laid greater emphasis on the Old Testament, Biblical Israelites, and Jerusalem, in contradistinction to the New Testament, the Pope and Rome^[3].

At the same time, principal European powers were in competition for the use of Jews and Judaism to provide a religious cover for schemes of colonising the Holy Land, which lay at the heart of the rotting Ottoman Empire and the emerging Arab world.

The founder of the Reformation, Martin Luther (1483-1546), was the first to show political and theological interest in the Jews. In his pamphlet ‘That Jesus Christ was born a Jew’ (1523), he characterised the Jews as the true-blood heirs of the Biblical Israelites and the blood relatives of Jesus. In another act of defiance towards the Pope and the Catholic Church, he caused the removal from the Old Testament of the books (Protestant Apocrypha) which were not accepted by the Jewish canon as part of the Hebrew Scriptures.

Cromwell

Protestant Judeophile tendencies, begun with Luther in Germany in 1523, continued to take root in Anglican England; these tendencies registered a new peak with the emergence of the Puritans. Cromwell’s Republic in 1655 readmitted Jews to England (Edward I had expelled them in 1290 after cancelling all debts owed to them). In inviting the Jews, Cromwell was mainly motivated by his determination to move the Amsterdam Jewish merchants to London to bolster England in her trade war with Portugal, Spain and the Netherlands, whose Jewish community was famed for its wealth, commercial know-how, and business contacts.

French revolution and Napoleon

With the French Revolution of 1789 and the subsequent rise of Napoleon, his invasion of Egypt and Palestine, and his Jewish Proclamation, English and French Zionism entered a new phase of fierce competition over European Jewry. Before Napoleon’s rise, the French Revolution had already emancipated French Jews, with the French National Assembly decreeing on 24 December 1789 that non-Catholics were as eligible for all civil and military positions as were Catholic citizens. This decree forced many European Conservative governments to admit Jews to civil rights—rights which were taken back again after the fall of Napoleon.

Napoleon was determined to use the Jews throughout Europe as a fifth column. During his invasion of Egypt and Palestine (1798-99), and anticipating the capture of Jerusalem (something that did not happen), Napoleon prepared a Proclamation promising the Holy Land to the Jews, whom he characterised as “the rightful heirs of Palestine”. Anglo-French competition for the allegiance of European Jews was clearly at the bottom of this Proclamation. In 1806, Napoleon convoked an Assembly of 111 Jewish notables from the countries of the French Empire and Italy. He then invited all Jewish communities to dispatch representatives to the Great Sanhedron which eventually met in 1807. The clear purpose for gathering these notables was to use European Jews in his war with Russia and his economic battle with Britain. While welcoming his emancipation, the Jews rejected Napoleon’s Zionism. The Great Sanhedrin declared that the Jews did not form a nation and the Jews bluntly told Napoleon: “Paris is our Jerusalem”.

All the same, Napoleon’s endeavours in regard to the Jews were to become blueprints and forerunners of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews (1809), Leo Pinsker’s

ideas of a Jewish National Congress, and Herzl’s schemes for a Society of Jews.

From the time of the Reformation to the rise to power of Napoleon III in France, there were no Jewish leaders in the Zionist movement—all British and French attempts to recruit them were complete failures. The non-Jewish origin of Zionism is further clear from the stark fact that the ideas of the Restoration developed first in Britain (which had hardly any Jewish population) rather than in Germany, Poland or Russia (home to most of European Jewry). Even 100 years after Cromwell, there were only 12,000 Jews in Britain, and it took another 100 years for their number to reach 25,000, whereas the census of 1897 revealed 5,189,401 Jews in the Russian Empire.

British Zionism

In her book Bible and sword, Barbara Tuchman presents a coherent analysis of the interplay between imperial and religious considerations within British Zionism from the time of Cromwell and the Puritans through that of Palmerston and Lord Shaftesbury to that of Balfour and Weizmann. Palmerston worked closely with Lord Shaftesbury (President of the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews) on British Zionist plans at a time when there was no Jewish movement prepared to ‘return’ to Palestine. There being no Protestants in Palestine or any other corner of the Ottoman Empire, Britain was hard at work to bring Ottoman Jews under its ‘protection’ to counter similar Russian and French attempts to place Orthodox and Catholic Ottomans under their respective ‘protections’. In March 1838, Britain appointed a vice-consul to Jerusalem, with jurisdiction over “the whole country within the ancient limits of the Holy Land”. This was the first step of a meticulously worked-out plan by Britain to use Jews for imperial domination.

British Zionism faced a serious problem, namely,

the voice of anti-Zionist Jews, represented in the Cabinet by Edwin Montague, the Secretary of State for India, and expressed in the press by Alexander and Montefiore, respectively the President and Secretary of the Jewish Board of Deputies. British Jewish leaders persisted in considering “Zionism as a mad delusion of an army of beggars and cranks that could only serve to undermine their hard-won rights of citizenship in western countries”^[4].

“With the difficulty of politically persuading the Jews, the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews began to Judaize Zionism and Zionize the Jews, with more focus on Russian and Eastern European Jews”^[5].

The Society aimed to teach “the Jews their own holy books: it had an eye on the world’s entire Jewry, estimated to be around 6 million in 1871.”

George Gawler

Following earlier failures to involve the Jews in the Zionist project, Britain enlisted the services of Lt-Colonel George Gawler (1796-1869), a committed Christian, who had served as Governor of South Australia from 1838 to 1841. During his term, he had settled British convicts to the tune of 180 a month. With his experience in colonial settlement, he was expected to facilitate the establishment of Jewish colonies in Palestine. He visited the Holy Land in 1849, retired from the army in 1850, and founded the Association for Promoting Jewish Settlement in Palestine, which evolved into the Palestine Fund in 1852. Gawler was the first Zionist to articulate the Zionist myth that “Palestine is a land without a people” waiting for “the Jews, a people without a land”^[6]. Great Britain, he said, ought to gain “protection for, and give protection to, all Israelites who desire to establish themselves in depopulated Palestine” and should “prepare the Jews for their future station by political elevation in England”^[7].

“With the advent of steam navigation, dependent

on frequent ports of call for recoaling and the completion of the Suez Canal, Zionism and the interests of world commerce began to link the establishment of depots and settlements along the route to India and China with the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine^[8].

Suez Canal and the security of India

This trend was strengthened still further with the purchase of shares by Britain in the Suez Canal, thanks to deft footwork by the British prime minister, Benjamin Disraeli. British Zionist arguments and Gawler's idea regarding the "political elevation" of the Jews received a boost with the publication by George Eliot of the novel *Daniel Deronda* (1876) which presented the Jews as good and moral nationalist heroes, in contrast with their previous image as "Christ killers, apostates, moneylenders, exotic foreigners and poor immigrants"^[9]. Just like Luther's pamphlet 'That Jesus Christ was born a Jew', *Daniel Deronda* stressed that the Jews were descendants of the Biblical Israelites and that "a whole Christian is three-fourths a Jew". Some even went as far as to claim that *Deronda* created a Jewish nationalist spirit for Zionism and a model of inspiration for Herzl^[10].

Non-Jewish Zionism came into existence in England long before the appearance of Jewish political Zionism. Some of the most ardent supporters of Zionism were Englishmen who visualised the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine as an instrument for serving British geopolitical interests.

Self interest was combined, at least at the beginning, with religious obscurantism. In this scheme, although religious dogma and commercial profit nestled cheek by jowl, commercial profit took precedence. For instance, in allowing the readmission of Jews, who had been expelled by Edward I, Cromwell was primarily motivated

by self-interest. The English Civil War had adversely affected England's position as a trading and maritime power. The British business and commercial class—almost exclusively Puritan and thus doctrinally very close to Judaism—was especially jealous of the Dutch who had grabbed the opportunity offered by the English Civil War to gain control over the Near and Far Eastern trade routes. And, the Dutch Jews were particularly active in the expansion of Dutch trade during the period of the Civil War. Cromwell agreed to the readmission of the Jews precisely at the time he was busy in a series of trade wars with Portugal, Spain and the Netherlands—a country which had a considerable Jewish community known for its wealth, commercial acumen and international contacts, not to mention considerable amounts of capital that Jews would bring with them.

With British overseas expansion during the following century, the question of Jewish restoration in Palestine became increasingly entwined with imperial considerations, with the religious dogma serving as a screen for British imperial interests in Palestine.

Shaftesbury and Palmerston

At the start of the nineteenth century, Britain underwent an evangelical revival. The British ruling class, shaken to its foundations by the French revolution which it regarded as the result of rationalism, returned to the Bible and its prophecies and acceptance of the Bible as God's word. The chief propagator of this dogma was Lord Shaftesbury who regarded himself as the "Evangelical of the Evangelicals". He was the one who had the vision of a Jewish state in Palestine and occupies a pivotal place in the tradition of non-Jewish Zionism. Although based on alleged Biblical prophecies and their fulfilment, Shaftesbury preached his dogma at a politically convenient time. Jewish settlement in Palestine had become a

desirable goal for Britain. The strategic location of Palestine on the route to India via Syria invested it with the importance that it deservedly received at British hands. Sensing the threat to the security of India from France and Russia, the British ruling class pursued the policy of settling Palestine with people who would look favourably upon British imperial interests. Thus began "the curious union of empire policy with a sort of paternalistic Christian Zionism which is evident in British policy in succeeding generations"^[11].

Lord Palmerston (British Foreign Secretary from 1830 to 1841 and again from 1846 to 1851, and Prime Minister from 1855 to 1865) was an enthusiastic advocate of Shaftesbury's ideas, but purely in terms of British imperial interests. The Eastern question being his principal concern, Palmerston was partial to Shaftesbury's idea to use Jews as a British lever within the Ottoman Empire.

With the advent of steam navigation in 1840, the Near East became very important along the route to India as steam ships required frequent reloading and the British ships used the Mediterranean-Red Sea route with transshipment at Suez rather than the long Cape route. In view of all this, British involvement in the Jewish question was no longer a matter of political option but of political necessity. This is how Colonel George Gawler, the former governor of South Australia, justified the proposal for a Jewish state in Palestine:

"Divine providence has placed Syria and Egypt in the very gap between England and the most important regions of her colonial and foreign trade, India, China ... a foreign power ... would soon endanger British trade ... and it is now for England to set her hand to the renovation of Syria, through the only people whose energies will be extensively and permanently in the work – the real children of the soil, the sons of Israel"^[12].

Another prominent gentile Zionist was Charles Henry Churchill, a grandson of the Duke of

Marlborough and an antecedent of Winston Churchill. It was he, a non-Jew, who called upon the Jews to assert themselves as a nation, four decades before Leo Pinkser, in his *Auto-emancipation*, announced to his Jewish co-religionists: "we must establish ourselves as a living nation".

In 1875, Disraeli facilitated Britain's purchase of the Khedive of Egypt's shares in the Suez Canal Company, followed by Britain's occupation of Egypt in 1882. Its proximity to Egypt gave Palestine added importance, both as a means of strengthening the British position in Egypt and as an overland link with the East. The new political realities brought forth a new generation of non-Jewish Zionists, who were empire builders, fully cognisant of the benefits to be derived from a British sphere of influence in the Middle East.

Pro-Zionist literature from non-Jewish Zionist writers managed to create a wave of public sympathy for a British-sponsored Jewish state in Palestine. As for Jews, it was only in the 1890s that Zionism began to appear as a very small minority movement among European Jews. Jewish Zionists actively lobbied among non-Jews. Joseph Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, and Arthur Balfour, the Prime Minister (1902-05) and later Foreign Secretary (1916-1919), were typical of the new non-Jewish Zionist. Chamberlain's chief concern was the British Empire. Neither Biblical prophecy nor humanitarianism was of any concern to him. Lloyd George, in whose Cabinet Balfour served as Foreign Secretary, was another prominent non-Jewish Zionist, whose part in the Balfour Declaration [2 November 1917] was far greater than that of Balfour. The *Zionist Review*, a semi-official organ of the Zionist movement, assigned to him "the foremost place inside the Cabinet among the architects of this great decision"^[13]. After Lloyd George became prime minister in December 1916, Zionism had nothing to fear. Other Zionists, such

as Mark Sykes, Leopold Amery, Lord Milner, Robert Cecil, Col. R Meinertzhagen, Harold Nicolson, General Smuts and CP Scott also held important positions from which to promote the Zionist cause.

First World War and the Balfour Declaration

As the First World War progressed, British and Zionist interests became increasingly complementary. The Jewish Zionists, Weizmann in particular, identified their own interests with those of Britain. For Britain, the acquisition of Palestine had become a non-negotiable strategic requirement. But this acquisition could not be had through open military conquest. The only choice was for Britain to align its war aims with the principle of self-determination. The Jewish Zionists came in very handy for executing such a plan. For the British, the Zionists were “the guardians in a continuity of religious and racial traditions” and a conservative force in world politics, and thus reliable. British non-Jewish Zionism found it convenient to make its entry into Palestine as a ‘trustee’ for its alleged Old Testament proprietors. Mark Sykes once wrote to Lord Robert Cecil in the following terms: “We should so order our policy that without in any way showing any desire to annex Palestine or to establish a protectorate over it, when the time comes to choose a mandatory power for its control, by consensus of opinion and desire of its inhabitants, we shall be the most likely candidates.”^[14]

With the Balfour Declaration providing the ideological basis, when the Peace Conference following the war, the defeat of Turkey and the disintegration of the Turkish Empire, turned to the question of Mandates, the granting of the Palestine to Britain was a mere formality and a recognition of a fait accompli.

While propagating Zionism, most of the non-Jewish Zionists entertained the same prejudices as their anti-Semitic contemporaries. Both

Chamberlain and Balfour opposed the entry into Britain of east European Jews fleeing persecution—as indeed did their Jewish-Zionist protégés. Balfour introduced and pushed through parliament the Aliens Bill that restricted Jewish immigration from eastern Europe to Britain, for reasons of “undoubted evils that had fallen upon the country from an immigration that was largely Jewish”^[15]. Earlier still, when Jews in England were fighting for their civil emancipation, Lord Shaftesbury spoke against the 1858 Emancipation Act. It can thus clearly be seen that Zionism and anti-Semitism are complementary and reinforce each other. The most glaring example of this cohabitation doubtless remains the Nazi-Zionist collaboration as outlined in a previous LALKAR article.

Official Zionist historiography disseminated by the state of Israel ignores the critical role played by Britain in the rise of Herzlian Zionism. In so doing, Zionist narrative has attempted to get everyone to focus on the state of Israel as a given and to present Herzlian Zionism as a national liberation movement of the Jews, by the Jews and for the Jews. This is clearly not the case.

The British Empire sponsored the political project of Zionism from the early 1800s, if no earlier.

Historic homeland of Jews

The Jewish question (Jews living among non-Jews) arose in Russia at the end of the 18th century consequent upon many geographic, historical and geopolitical factors. The area between the Caspian Sea, the Black Sea and the Baltic Sea has been a meeting place for ancient and medieval Asian and European migrations. It has been the historic homeland for most of the world Jewry for over a thousand years since the centre of gravity of Jews moved from the medieval Khazar Empire to the modern Pale of Settlement following the Mongol invasion of Russia and eastern Europe. The concentration of world Jewry in this area, and

successive partitions of Poland at the end of the 18th century, proved to be significant landmarks in the birth of the Jewish question in Russia and the rest of Europe.

Several medieval geographers and modern historians have studied the rise and fall of the Jewish Khazar Empire (following the mass conversion of Turkic Khazars to Judaism) in southern Russia between the 8th and 10th centuries. The Khazar power went into decline after the defeat of the Khazar army by Sviatoslav, Duke of Kiev, in 960. Whatever remained of the Khazar empire was put an end to by Genghis Khan’s invasion of Russia in 1218, which led to the dispersal of Khazar Jews between the Caspian and Baltic Seas—the actual historical homeland of contemporary Jews. As the Khazar Jews moved out of their shtetls in the Russian and central Asian steppes to the towns and cities of eastern Europe in the process they lost their cohesive identity as Khazar, retaining merely their religion and other traditions.

It must be this historical fact that led Arthur Koestler (a Hungarian Ashkenazi Jew) to argue in his book *The thirteenth tribe: the Khazar Empire and its heritage* that Ashkenazic Jews are the descendants of the Khazars. Equally, it must have led Paul Wexler, Tel Aviv University professor, to write three books namely, *The Ashkenazic Jews: a Slavo-Turkic people in search of a Jewish identity*; *The non-Jewish origins of the Sephardic Jews*; and *Two-tiered relexification in Yiddish: Jews, Sorbs, Khazars and the Kiev-Polessian dialect*. In these he argues that the Ashkenazic Jews are predominantly of Slavo-Turkic stock rather than Palestinian Jewish emigrants, while Sephardic Jews are mainly of Berber and Arab descent.

Be that as it may, the Zionists consider such research as taboo—even anti-Semitic. In this context, the Zionists were instrumental in the establishment in 1980 of the International

Association of Jewish Geneological Societies (AIJGS) to elevate Jewish genealogy among Jewish people and in the academic community, with the aim of containing the increasing global awareness of the non-Semitic origins of contemporary Jews and emerging evidence about their Khazar ancestry.

The Jewish question arose in Russia after many partitions of Poland (in 1772, 1793 and 1795) between the Russian, Prussian and Austrian empires. Having destroyed Poland, the partition resulted in the transfer of the largest Jewish communities to Russian rule—the geographic areas of what came to be known later as the Jewish Pale of Settlement.

According to the 1857 Russian census, 95% of the 5,189,401 Jews of the Russian empire were concentrated in the 25 provinces of the Jewish Pale of Settlement and Russian Poland. Russia’s policy of Russification, which put restrictions on non-Russian languages and cultures, inflicted the worst suffering upon Muslim Tatars and Jewish Khazars. Many of the restrictions—residential and occupational—on the Jews were inspired by prejudice. As a result, leaving aside the wealthy, the highly skilled, and some long-term soldiers, the Russian Jews were confined to the Jewish Pale of Settlement. They were habitually accused of not taking to agriculture, exploiting the peasantry through the practice of moneylending, purveying liquor to drunken peasants, evading military service, and engaging in disaffection.

The Jewish question came to the forefront of Russian politics and geopolitics following the assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881, for which Jews were blamed. The discriminatory nature of the May 1882 laws provided Britain with a kind of moral and political leverage to directly interfere in Russian affairs on behalf of Russian Jews through the organisation of a number of public meetings in London focusing on the Jewish question in Russia. Throughout the 1880s, the

British maintained pressure on the Russians in relation to the Jewish question. In due course, having come into a position to take the debate on the Jewish question into Russia, they shifted the thrust of their diplomatic discourse from simply expressing their views on the May 1882 laws to a direct official representation for the annulment of those laws against the Jews, whom they started calling 'Israelites', in tune with an increasingly aggressive policy of Zionisation of the Jews and Judaisation of Zionism.

British Zionisation of Russian Jews and Judaisation of Zionism

The assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881 and the rumoured 'Russian solution' (one third of the Jews to be converted to Christianity, one third to emigrate, and one third to perish) to the 'Jewish problem', provided the British with a pretext and opportunity to establish closer organisational, missionary, and more significantly political contacts with eastern European and Russian Jewry so as to Zionise the latter's aspirations and redirect their migratory movement away from the Americas to Palestine. (All the same, between 1870 and 1914 about two million east European Jews migrated westward to the Americas).

While the question of using Jews in the interests of the British Empire had been discussed by Lord Palmerston and Queen Victoria as early as 1839, a concrete proposal for a settler colonial movement aimed at making Palestine a British sponsored state for world Jewry only came about with Colonel Gawler's plan. Gawler had experience in settling British convicts in Australia, and his plan called for the Zionisation of Judaism and Judaisation of Zionism. The person chosen by the British establishment to take this mission to the Jews of eastern Europe and Russia was Wilhelm Henry Hechler (1845-1931).

Following the 1881 events in Russia and the 1882

London public meetings in support of Russian Jews, Lord Temple and Lord Shaftesbury sent William Hechler to meet the leaders of eastern European and Russian Jewry in Odessa and propagate Zionism as the only solution to the carefully-engineered problem of 'anti-Semitism' as opposed to the more familiar one of 'Judeophobia' at the time. Hechler met Leo Pinsker and told him that he had forgotten to mention in his pamphlet, *The auto-emancipation*, "God's promise to Abraham and his children". This is how the British establishment began to inject its Zionism into an otherwise local and natural emancipation movement of eastern European Jewry in its own ancestral homeland.

The Hechler-Pinsler encounter was instrumental in the founding of the Society for the Promotion of the Love of Zion and the Lovers of Zion movement. Initially Pinsker's auto-emancipation movement was a non-Zionist movement seeking a solution for the Jewish question in Russia through independence of the Jewish Pale of Settlement or mass migration to the Americas—not Palestine. He considered Judeophobia, rather than anti-Semitism, as the problem presented by the Jewish question (Pinsker concluded his pamphlet by emphasising that a Jewish settler state would require a propelling force for migration, a territory to be conquered, and the backing of imperial powers, notably the British to sponsor it).

Pinsker rejected Hechler's Zionism, saying: "The goal of our present endeavours must not be the Holy Land, but a land of our own".

Hechler's visit to Odessa appears to have influenced many Jewish lenders in Russia and eastern Europe to rethink their auto-emancipation as well as their plans for emigration to north America. To carry on his unceasing attempt at impregnating Russian and eastern European Jews with ideas of Zionism, Hechler moved to Vienna, teaching at the University of Vienna and working

in the British Embassy there in 1882. After meeting Hechler in Odessa, Pinsker began to entertain some sympathy for Zionism and became the president of the Lovers of Zion.

Hechler had close connections with Theodor Herzl from 1896, the year Herzl published *Der Judenstaat*, until the latter's death in 1904. Having read Herzl's book, Hechler was ecstatic and hurried to tell the British Ambassador Monson that "the fore-ordained movement is here!" Hechler took an active part in the First Zionist Congress in Basle, Switzerland, in August 1897. He cannot have failed to be disappointed when in 1903 the Sixth World Zionist Congress, under the leadership of Israel Zangwill, backed by Herzl, voted (295-178) against Palestine and in favour of Uganda as a homeland for the Jews. Hechler was one of the last to see Herzl as he was dying at the Sanatorium in Edlach in early July 1904.

Beyond tutoring Herzl on Zionism, Hechler, a British agent motivated by imperial and religious considerations, was indispensable to Herzl politically, for he introduced Herzl and Zionism to the German Emperor, the Russian Tsar, the Ottoman Sultan, the Pope and two Russian ministers (Plehve and Witte), and many other important people.

To secure their support, both Hechler and Herzl were offering the German Kaiser and the Russian tsar the prospect that Zionism would help solve the Jewish question by simultaneously weakening the Jewish-led revolutionary and democratic movements in Europe and Russia as well as the power of international Jewish capital. Herzl wrote thus with regard to the socio-economic position of the Jews in Europe:

"We have attained pre-eminence in finance, because medieval conditions drove us to it. The process is now being repeated. We are again being forced into finance, now it is the stock exchange, by being kept out of other branches of economic

activity. Being on the stock exchange, we are consequently exposed afresh to contempt. At the same time we continue to produce an abundance of mediocre intellects who find no outlet, and this endangers our social position as much as does our increasing wealth. Educated Jews without means are now rapidly becoming Socialists. Hence we are certain to suffer very severely in the struggle between classes, because we stand in the most exposed position in the camps of both Socialists and capitalists"^[16].

A mere two decades later, the ideas expressed by Herzl in the above paragraph appear to have been borrowed by the vile Nazis when they portrayed and stereotyped the Jews as being the dominant force among the 'red' communists and the 'gold' capitalists.

In addition to offering to his would-be sponsors the tantalising prospect of ridding them of the revolutionary menace and competition from Jewish capitalists, Herzl, with barely concealed racism and European chauvinism, stated that the Jewish state would "form a rampart of Europe against Asia, an outpost of civilisation as opposed to barbarism".

Herzl was never a religious person and once said that religion "is a fantasy that holds people in its grip"[17]. He had no preference for a particular territory for the Jews, merely desiring Jewish 'sovereignty' over a portion of the globe, as strip of territory. As to the choice between Palestine and Argentina, Herzl wrote: "We shall take what is given to us".

In the light of the foregoing, we cannot but agree with the following conclusion of Mohameden Ould Mey: "Jews did not invent Zionism. Rather Zionism invented the Jews, though not all Jews are Zionist and not all Zionists are Jews. During the Reformation and mercantilist era, Protestants were interested in Jews as ammunition against the Catholics and leaders of the interest-based rising capitalist sector. Martin Luther's Jewish-

friendly writings in 1523, Oliver Cromwell's readmission of the Jews to England in 1655, and the quasi-Judaization of the Puritans are graphic examples. With the Industrial Revolution and the European Enlightenment, Napoleon boosted the emancipation of the Jews in an attempt to estrange them from their European and Ottoman rulers as part of his unsuccessful plans to destroy the power of England and Russia and dominate Europe. After Napoleon, the British articulated a complex set of imperialist and religious motives designed to make the Eastern Question fit the Jewish Question. Obviously all of this took place before the alleged founder of Zionism (Herzl) was born in 1860, as well as before anti-Semitism was encouraged as a propelling machine for Zionism. With the change of Zionism's guardianship and custody from Britain to the United States in the aftermath of the Second World War, Zionism continues to be a geopolitical configuration (rather than a national reality), which facilitates western multilateral hegemony over the Arab world's strategic location (straits and waterways), cultural heritage (antique and Biblical history), economic resources (oil reserves and business contracts), and possible unification schemes..."^[18].

The continuing imperialist obsession with disarming every Middle Eastern country while preserving Israel's weapons of mass destruction is an illustration of such continuity.

From its inception, Zionism has been a geopolitical construct. Today it presents the 'Nazi Holocaust' against the Jews in Europe as the historical explanation and the moral justification for the 'Zionist Holocaust' against the Palestinians.

If Zionism were a genuine national liberation movement, as is claimed by the Zionists and their imperialist backers, it is pertinent to ask: why did it not seek to liberate the Jewish Pale of Settlement (home to most Jews) in Russia? Likewise the question arises as to why, when contemporary

Zionism claims to be exclusively Jewish, are its origins traceable to non-Jewish debates and writings of late nineteenth century England? What claim can Zionism make to Palestine that the Palestinians can't make with much greater force? In the name of what can Zionism justify the expulsion, dispossession, dispersal, and oppression of millions of Palestinians on the basis of ancient, medieval and modern atrocities inflicted in Europe by some Europeans against their Jewish populations? What are the prospects of Zionism in view of Israel's rejection of the UN-backed Right of Return for the Palestinians while simultaneously justifying its own existence on the arbitrary law of 'Return'?

As things stand, the Zionist state of Israel, through its occupation of territories it captured in the 1967 war, its continued colonisation and settlement building, has to all intents and purposes scuppered the 2-state solution. That being the case, it will either have to impose its rule over the Palestinians through a system of brutal apartheid or grant them rights as equal citizens in a bi-national state. Either way, it puts paid to the Zionist dream of an exclusively Jewish—not to say theocratic and racist—state. Of these two options, the Zionists are likely to choose the former. History provides sufficient proof that such a state of affairs cannot be maintained indefinitely. It must break down in the face of Palestinian resistance and the fatigue of never-ending war between the oppressors and the oppressed.

Notes

[1] see Lewis, *Semites and anti-Semites: an inquiry into conflict and prejudice*, WW

Norton & Company, New York, 1986, pp.68-69.

[2] *Foreign Affairs* (1) 70-82.

[3] see L J Epstein, *Zion's call: Christian contribution to the origins and development of Israel*, University Press of America, New York, 1984.

[4] Tuchman, p.333.

[5] Mohameden Ould-Mey, 'The non-Jewish origins of Zionism', *International Journal of Humanities*, Vol 1, 2003, p.603.

[6] see Mohameden Ould-Mey, *op.cit.*, p.605.

[7] G Gawler, *Organised special constables*, T&W Boone, London, 1848, p.25.

[8] Ould Mey, p.606.

[9] Epstein, *op.cit.*, p.47.

[10] Nahum Sokolow, *History of Zionism 1600-1918 Vol. 1*, Longmans Green & Co., London, 1919, pp.xxvi-xxvii.

[11] William R. Polk, David M. Stamler, and Edmund Asfour, *Backdrop to tragedy*, Beacon, Boston, 1957.

[12] Albert Hyamson, *British projects for the restoration of Jews to Palestine*, American Jewish Historical Society, Philadelphia, 1918, p.37.

[13] Dec. 1917, p. 214.

[14] Shane Leslie, Mark Sykes. *His life and letters*, Cassell, London, 1923.

[15] House of Commons, July 10, 1905, *Official Records*.

[16] Herzl, *The Jewish State*.

[17] Yoram Hazoni, *The Jewish states: the struggle for Israel's soul*, Basic Books, New York, 2000.

[18] *Ibid.* p.607.

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?

Broad background to the current conflict in Ukraine

We would like to outline below the background to the current conflict in Ukraine and demonstrate that Russia has always behaved sensibly and tried to avoid a major conflict. It was the imperialist countries that were never interested in a solution:

What we are experiencing today in Ukraine started 30 years ago. Since then, Russia has been trying to make it clear to NATO countries that it has security interests on its borders that should be respected. Despite Russia's appeals and protests, since 1991, that is, since the dissolution of the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance, NATO has inexorably expanded its infrastructure to Russia's immediate borders^[1]. In six waves of expansion, accompanied by wars against Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya and (albeit covertly) Syria, this war alliance has grown from 16 to 31 countries. The fact that Ukraine was officially recognized as a NATO candidate in March 2018 raised Russia's concerns about its territorial security, something it repeatedly expressed publicly. Considering the war record of NATO and the United States in particular, these concerns can be described as justified. Despite Russian demands, the US signed a military cooperation agreement

with Ukraine in November 2021.

These events were only made possible by the 2014 coup known as the Maidan, whose origins date back to November 2013, after then President Yanukovich refused to sign an association agreement between Ukraine and the EU in September of the same year. The agreement was presented in the Western press as merely economic in nature. However, the reality is different: Article 4, point 1 of Title II of the agreement states that the treaty aims to promote "gradual convergence on foreign and security matters" in order to achieve "Ukraine's ever-deeper involvement in the European security area"^[2]. Thus, it was not primarily economic relations that interested the EU in relation to Ukraine, but above all foreign and security policy issues.

The Maidan coup of 2014, which could only be brought to fruition by neo-fascist forces, not only triggered huge support from Ukrainian society, as portrayed in the Western media, but also enormous resistance in many regions in the south and southeast. In some regions, such as Donetsk and Lugansk, the population even managed to arm itself to defend itself against the paramilitary groups of the neo-fascist "Right Sector" and later also against the regular Ukrainian army. Elsewhere, as in Kharkiv, resistance was brutally crushed. Where protests against the coup government were more peaceful, they ended in massacres^[3]. Following the violent overthrow of elected President Yanukovich, the new coup government signed the political part of the agreement on March 21, 2014 (and it entered into force shortly thereafter, in November 2014). The economic part was not signed until June 2014, which in turn did not enter into force until a year and a half later, on January 1, 2016. This shows that Ukraine's political integration into Western security policy took priority over economic integration.

In a German-Foreign-Policy.com article dated February 21, 2022, i.e. a few days before the start of the Russian Special Military Operation in Ukraine, the following is stated:

"According to New York politics professor Nina

Khrushcheva, the Biden administration has 'far more interest in an invasion than Putin': if it succeeds in enticing Moscow to invade, it can expect President Vladimir Putin to be overthrown."^[4]

The article is able to recognize what the CPG does not: in line with its aggressive doctrine, NATO managed to force Russia's hand by threatening a massacre in the Donbass regions, which, as stated before, would have been similar to what the people of Palestine are experiencing today. Russia was obliged by its own law (the protection of Russians throughout the world is enshrined in the Constitution) to protect Russian minorities in the Donbass. Russia was faced with the dilemma of either allowing the massacre of the Russian-speaking population on its immediate borders or intervening. Since Russia decided to come to the aid of the Russian-speaking population of Ukraine, it has been waging a war against the whole of NATO and the whole world subject to it. For example, mercenaries from all over the world are deployed in Ukraine. Among them are the feared Syrian terrorists. According to Syrian reports, hundreds of mercenaries, mainly Al-Nusra terrorists, have traveled from northern Syria to Ukraine through Turkish territory. But the CPG, which suffers from not inconsiderable myopia, accuses Russia of waging a war of aggression.

Prior to the Russian military operation, Ukraine had systematically violated the Minsk agreements, signed by the governments of Belarus, Russia, Germany, France and Ukraine itself^[5].

However, despite the reluctant attitude of the "West", Russia has shown its willingness to find a peaceful solution. Surely the CPG does not know that, in December 2021, Russia submitted a proposal for a security agreement to the US and the other NATO member states, in which it proposed to prohibit both its own country—i.e. Russia—and NATO member states from conducting military exercises in a strip around the borders of Russia and NATO member states (including the borders

of countries that only have a military alliance with NATO), defined by all parties to the agreement. Russia also proposed that short- and medium-range land-based missiles should not be deployed in areas from which targets on the territory of other states parties could be attacked. In general, nuclear weapons should not be stationed outside their own country. Finally, Russia proposed a return to the NATO-Russia Founding Act, which prohibits the permanent stationing of NATO troops in Eastern Europe. This was Russia's last attempt to build bridges of communication with "the West".

What an imperialism that wants to avoid military conflict, that proposes to demilitarize its borders and that wants to reverse the deployment of nuclear weapons around the world. But surely the CPG would disqualify this with words like: it is not "because they stand with the peoples' just cause but because they want to hinder the US plans".

The context of the war

The strategic objective of the imperialist countries is to prolong their hegemony as much as possible, particularly that of the U.S. In 1997 Brzezinski wrote the following:

"In brief, the U.S. policy goal must be unapologetically twofold: to perpetuate America's own dominant position for at least a generation and preferably longer still; and to create a geopolitical framework that can absorb the inevitable shocks and strains of social-political change while evolving into the geopolitical core of shared responsibility for peaceful global management."^[6]

Twenty-four years later, in 2021, another author wrote:

"Biden and Trump had different positions on many things, but they agreed on one thing, just as REPs and DEMs in Congress have always agreed on this issue, namely, the commitment to maintain or restore U.S. global hegemony."^[7]

From the two quotations above, a central point emerges: the end of US hegemony announced

by Brzezinski^[8] is taking place today. From this realization derives another equally fundamental one, namely, the fact that the US and its subordinate imperialist nations will do the imaginable (and also the unimaginable) to maintain and prolong their hegemony as long as possible—and to prolong they must expand it. The CPG idea that Russia (China and Iran) and the imperialist countries are equally striving to "divide" the world in the style of World War I is a serious misconception. Otherwise, it is imperialism that has reached Russia's borders in its endeavor to maintain and expand its hegemony (the former is not possible without the latter), not the other way around.

Needless to say, the international capitalist economy is irremediably sick, particularly those economies that have based their accumulation of the last 3 decades or so on speculation. Inflation, the energy crisis and stagnant or negative economic growth in the so-called industrialized countries are accompanied by a colossal accumulation of fictitious capital, a financial system based on "toxic" assets and extreme over-indebtedness and a growing dissociation between the speculative economy and the real economy.

At the beginning of 2023, in order to avoid a chain reaction of the financial crisis, the Federal Reserve (Fed) had no choice but to inject dollars back into the banking system of other countries, which in turn meant printing "unhedged" money, or rather, future indebtedness. The Fed thus faced and faces to this day the challenge of record inflation and a banking crisis (bank liquidity crisis) at the same time^[9].

According to Bloomberg and the Wall Street Journal, after the closure and bankruptcy of Silicon Valley Bank (USA) and Signature Bank (USA) and the bailout of Credit Suisse (Switzerland), the US financial authorities (Fed and FDIC) had begun to inject dollars into the central banks of other countries: the Bank of England, the Bank of Japan, the ECB, the Bank of Canada and the Swiss National Bank. These banks thus had access to

hundreds of billions of dollars at the end of April 2023 to help mitigate the banking crisis.

Credit Suisse was bought by UBS for only \$3 billion, even though the Swiss central bank bailout had poured \$100 billion into the bank, making it clear that the bank's "hole" must have been huge and its assets very toxic (derivatives). Credit Suisse was an example of the whole unhealthy structure of finance in the NATO-dominated world^[10].

Over time, these phenomena will repeat themselves cyclically in ever shorter and deeper periods.

Imperialism needs to find a way to avoid the total collapse of its economy in order to maintain its hegemony and conversely it needs to avoid the total collapse of its economy. Which countries are large enough and not subordinate enough to the US to provide it with sufficient quantities of lifeblood to feed the imperialist economies and prolong their lives for a century or two? The answer is quite obvious: the economies that are NATO's ultimate target, namely Russia and China.

This is the central dilemma of the present: Russia and China are the only two countries in the world capable of stopping NATO, and at the same time they constitute its ultimate targets. Anyone who understands this situation will easily realize that an international war is inevitable, that such a war is already in progress and who is (and will be) responsible for it: US imperialism and its criminal instrument, NATO.

To underline the above, let us look at what Brzezinski pointed out:

"Ukraine, a new and important space on the Eurasian chessboard, is a geopolitical pivot because its very existence as an independent country helps to transform Russia. Without Ukraine, Russia ceases to be a Eurasian empire."^[11]

Without Ukraine, Brzezinski teaches us, Russia would cease to be a Eurasian "empire" and become nothing more than an Asian country^[12]. To achieve this goal, imperialism must succeed in "separating"—in political, not geographical terms—

Ukraine from the "Slavic" world, to which it belongs culturally and in which Belarus and Russia should be its natural allies. A possible coordination or alliance between the Slavic countries was successfully prevented by the EU and the US in 2014 with the coup against Yanukovich.

However, despite the coup in Ukraine in 2014, the goal of separating Russia from Europe did not succeed, as Russia managed to secure Crimea and prevent the "secession" of their country from Europe. This was a strategic coup for Russia. Despite the undisputed military power of NATO and its hegemonic country, the USA, it failed to "isolate" Russia from "Europe".

However, this was not Russia's reaction in the Donbass^[13], despite the fact that the population there voted for its independence from Ukraine in 2014^[14]. Great was our joy when the Russian state, under the leadership of President Putin, finally launched the Special Military Operation in Ukraine. In 2022, the same republics voted to join Russia^[15].

Despite the tardiness of the Russian response in the Donbass region, we value it highly and support it because it confronts NATO and its leading country, the U.S., there and because it demonstrates their vulnerability. This gives us hope that the monster can be beaten. Better times await humanity once imperialism is defeated. We know the history of this monster: in its 247 years of existence (since July 4, 1776), the USA went only 16 years without going to war. How much peace the world would have if the US state and the hegemonic countries of the EU lost their imperialist character!

Finally, it remains to analyze Russia's production structure, which we will do in the following publication.

Notes

[1] On February 18, 2022, Der Spiegel published a document confirming the Russian claim that NATO had promised not to expand eastward in 1991. "NATO will not expand eastward, neither formally nor informally", U.S. representative Raymond Seitz is quoted in the document.

Der Spiegel, Author: Klaus Wiegrefe, “Neuer Aktenfund von 1991 stützt russischen Vorwurf” (in English: “Discovery of new 1991 file supports Russian accusation”), 18.02.2022, 13.00 hours, in: <https://www.spiegel.de/ausland/nato-osterweiterung-aktenfund-stuetzt-russische-version-a-1613d467-bd72-4f02-8e16-2cd6d3285295>

[2] EUR-Lex, “ASSOCIATION AGREEMENT between the European Union and its Member States, of the one part, and Ukraine, of the other part”, Document 22014A0529(01), in: [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:22014A0529\(01\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:22014A0529(01))

[3] On May 2, 2014, right-wing groups brought peaceful protesters into a trade union building in Odessa and set them on fire. 42 people burned to death. To this day, Ukrainian state authorities refuse to investigate this mass murder. A war began in the Donetsk and Lugansk regions which, according to UN figures, had caused about 15,000 deaths by the day the Russian military operation began in Ukraine. Five references to the Odessa massacre can be found on the CPG website. One of them reads:

“The heinous crime last Friday in Odessa where neo-Nazis of the “Right Sector” burnt Russian speaking protesters alive and the bloody operation of the coup d’état government of Kiev in the eastern regions are shocking our people and all the conscious people across the planet. The people of Ukraine are being slaughtered by the open intervention of the imperialists of the USA, the EU and NATO that support the government of the nationalists and the fascists of Kiev and come into conflict with Russia over the control of the energy resources, the pipelines and the market shares. Once again it is being proved that the imperialist alliances not only do not safeguard peace for the peoples but on the contrary they lead to war and misery.”

What is really remarkable about the above quote is that the CPG manages to contextualize Russia in a negative way, even though it has nothing to do with the issue. According to the quote, those responsible for the victims in Odessa are the fascists and the US, EU and NATO that support them, but also (guess what): Russia! How can Russia be responsible for the crimes of NATO-backed fascists, according to the CPG? The answer the CPG gives us is: because Russia is in a conflict over “energy resources, pipelines and market share”. Here we see another example of the CPG’s “masterful” ability to “optimally” link cause and effect.

Source of quote: Communist Party of Greece (CPG), “Speech by KKE CC SG Dimitris Koutsoumpas at a roundtable on “The Dangers of Fascism in Europe”” Friday, May 9, 2014, in: <https://inter.kke.gr/en/articles/Speech-of-the-GS-of-the-CC-of-the-KKE-Dimitris-Koutsoumpas-at-the-round-table-on-The-dangers-of-Fascism-in-Europe/>

[4] German-Foreign-Policy.com, “The Ukraine and US Security Guarantees The USA continues to insist that a Russian invasion of Ukraine is ‘imminent.’ Experts repudiate this prediction. US security guarantees are proving ineffective.”, 21.02.2022, in: <https://www.german-foreign-policy.com/en/news/detail/8847>

[5] The cease-fire was not respected by the Ukrainian side.
- Until the Donetsk and Lugansk People’s Republics were recognized by Russia, these regions were not granted the special status to which the Ukrainian central government had committed itself in the Minsk Agreement.
- In addition, an amnesty should have been granted to all population groups in Donbass that participated in the political and military

conflict.

The Normandy format states had committed themselves to implementing the Minsk Agreement when they signed it. However, instead of urging Ukraine to comply with the agreement, Germany and France accused Russia of aggression and fueling the conflict in the Donbass.

[6] Brzezinski, Zbigniew, “The Grand Chessboard—American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives”, p. 215

[7] Elsner, Wolfram, “Die Zeitwende—China, USA und Europa ‘nach Corona’” (in English: “The turning point—China, USA and Europe ‘after Corona’”), p. 45

[8] Zbigniew Brzezinski was security advisor to U.S. President Jimmy Carter.

[9] The economic mechanisms to solve the problem contradict each other: solving the liquidity crisis by injecting money causes inflation, which leads to a rise in interest rates and, therefore, to a worsening of the banks’ liquidity problems.

[10] We are of the opinion that the financial capitalist economic system cannot be reformed. What is needed is an economy that serves the general social welfare and the integral development of all members of society. The basic requirements for such a society are an economy based on real production (and not on speculation), a strong planing state the most important areas of the economy, a fairer distribution of social wealth and aiming at the construction of socialism.

[11] Brzezinski, Zbigniew, “The Grand Chessboard—American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives”, p. 46

[12] All this, of course, regardless of the Russian exclave of Kaliningrad, irrelevant in this respect as it is not a country that can enter into economic and political relations with European countries.

[13] The Russian government justified the years-long delay in rescuing the Donbass population by claiming that in 2014 there was not enough military power and that a military operation in Ukraine had to be militarily secured. We will refrain from assessing these facts here, as we believe that Russia’s decision to conduct the Special Military Operation in Ukraine was ultimately the right one. In this regard, our opinion on the delay of this event is no longer relevant at this point and it is only appropriate to express our sincere support for Russia’s actions.

[14] The results of such voting were:
- Luhansk: 96.2% of voters, considering a voter turnout of 80%, spoke in favor of the independence of the Luhansk People’s Republic.
- Donesk: 89.07% of voters, considering a voter turnout of 74%, supported the Donesk People’s Republic.

[15] The results of the vote were overwhelming:
- Donesk People’s Republic voted in favor of joining the Russian Federation in a referendum with 99.23% of the vote, with 97.51% voter turnout.
- Luhansk People’s Republic—98.42%.
- In the Zaporizhzhya region, 93.11% of voters voted in favor of the region’s accession to Russia, with a voter turnout of 85.4%.
- In Kherson, 87.05% of residents voted in favor of joining the Russian Federation (allegedly occupied by Russia), with a voter turnout of 76.8%.

Renegades drifting towards the Symplegades of opportunism, shipwrecked between Scylla and Charybdis (dogmatism & revisionism). Part 1

Dimitrios Patelis | Revolutionary Unification (Greece)

Contents

Part 1

- Introduction. World War III, crisis and the split of the revolutionary movement.
- Who are you for and against in WWII? Division, polarisation and confusion in between.
- No more illusions. The struggle of the WAP against the imperialist axis of aggression and its opportunist servants.
- The characteristics and the Symplegades of opportunism today.
- On the revolutionary theory of marxism.

Part 2

- The comfort of opportunism lies between Scylla and Charybdis: dogmatism and revisionism.
- 1) Dogmatic certainties.
 - 2) Revisionist uncertainties.
 - 3) How dogmatic practices pave the way for revisionism.
 - 4) Loss and bureaucratic management of the truth.
 - 5) Abuse and destruction of the systematic approach and method.
 - 6) Theory and critique within the whirlwind of hetero-definitions.
 - 7) Entrapment in the present as an escape into the indeterminate future and the opposite... Metaphysics of ends and means: means as ends in themselves.
 - 8) The shared metaphysical methodology as a basis for complementarity, synergy and leaps.
 - 9) Opportunist apostasy, ideological degeneration

and the abandonment of the revolutionary perspective.

10) Healthy elements within the dynamics of the development of knowledge and action and the fall into morbid deadlocks.

- A few conclusions.

Introduction. World War III, crisis and the split of the revolutionary movement.

Every major crisis and conflict in society is born of fundamental unresolved contradictions and their respective unresolved competing social/class interests. The ongoing Third World War (WWIII) is bringing to the surface and highlighting all the contradictions tearing humanity apart, the geotectonic shifts of power on a global scale, the retreat of the frontline countries of imperialism led by the USA and the emergence of the de facto camp of early socialist countries (DPRK, PRC, Vietnam, Laos, Cuba) together with states and coalitions of states emerging from anti-imperialist and national liberation movements^[1].

This war is a conflict between the parasitic imperialist rentier states (dominated by the fictitious capital of the financial oligarchy) and the countries that actually produce (essential goods for humanity). The peoples and governments of the latter are taking steps to drastically reduce or even cut off the imperialist countries from their main parasitic sources of extraction of monopoly super-profits.

This war—especially on the fronts of Ukraine and the post-Soviet space as a whole—also has

characteristics of a civil (political/class) war, with the goal of further division on the basis of the imperialist practice of ‘divide and conquer’ or, on the other hand, the escalation of tendencies of reunification, reconsolidation and reintegration, with the last remaining and relatively recently revitalised state formation, Russia, in which vast natural resources and elements of the main legacies of the USSR are preserved, as its backbone: Military and weapons systems, industrial infrastructure, research and advanced technology and, above all, a people with an education and culture steeped in anti-fascist and socialist traditions. The escalation of the war for the reunification of the Korean nation on the Korean peninsula and the Chinese nation in Taiwan has similar characteristics with a clear anti-imperialist, national liberation and revolutionary character.

This war is also anti-fascist in the sense that the attacking Euro-Atlantic axis, in order to achieve its aims, instrumentalises fascism, establishes fascist/racist or even openly fascist/nazi regimes, transforming or even constructing whole countries and peoples as private war corporations under its own possession as instruments and bases for its aggression. Typical cases are the racist Zionist state of Israel^[2], the Nazi regime of today’s Ukraine and the government of occupied South Korea.

As in the two previous wars, WWII also brought to light deeply degenerative phenomena that have prevailed in a significant part of the formerly revolutionary communist and workers’ parties, anti-imperialist, left-wing and progressive organisations. These phenomena show that even communist parties, even those with a long and glorious tradition, are historical formations. The clash of revolutionary and counter-revolutionary tendencies in the global revolutionary process does not leave the structure and functions of the workers’ and communist parties untouched. On the contrary, these tendencies inevitably permeate these parties,

overtly or covertly. As a result, their revolutionary character is not constant and unchanging over time, however much the leaderships of some of them may proclaim themselves to be the ‘guardians of communist orthodoxy’... As we have shown in previous texts, the revolutionary or counter-revolutionary character of parties, their development in a more consistent revolutionary direction or their degeneration in a pro-regime direction, is not a personal choice, a voluntary subjective act of a leadership—as the proponents of bourgeois subjective idealism and voluntarism claim—but is determined by a complex and multi-layered historically specific matrix of objective and subjective causes. To ignore and disregard the latter, de facto favours the spread and deepening of degenerative counter-revolutionary tendencies.

WWII, like the previous ones, functions in a polarising way, because it bears within it, and reveals the contradictory nature, the accumulated and concentrated dynamic potential of progress and regression, creation and destruction, revolution and counter-revolution of the time and context. This polarisation also contains purifying functions, through which, if used by conscious revolutionaries and directed successfully and intelligently, there will be an unprecedented rebirth, unity and improvement of the revolutionary movement. However, as Lenin once taught, in order to unite we must first distinguish our positions, see who is who, with whom we can safely ally ourselves, and with whom we must part ways in order to protect the movement from toxic apostasy and immersion in opportunist degeneration in the service of the attacking imperialist axis.

Which Side Are You On in WWII? Division, polarisation and confusion in between.

Today, there is a fundamental question on the basis of which we can determine with sufficient certainty and reliability whether and to what extent

certain forces remain actual anti-imperialist parties and organisations with consistent revolutionary communist forces leading the way among them.

This question is quite simple and clear: ‘Which side are you on? Who are you for and against among the opposing parties?’

The answer to this question cannot be given through rhetorical declarations and statements of a leadership (very often hypocritical, deceptive and misleading), but by examining the practical contribution to the wartime balance of forces, at all levels of theory and practice, on all fronts. The answer to this crucial question is linked to an objective assessment of the character of WWII from the point of view of revolutionary theory and methodology, which in turn is linked to the distinction of forces capable of advancing the strategy of socialist revolution and communism during and after the war, with the driving forces of the global revolutionary process clearly positioned

- a) against the imperialist axis of aggression led by the USA, and
- b) in favour of those who—deliberately, consciously or under the pressure of circumstances, out of necessity, de facto—constitute the pole of the forces of socialism and anti-imperialism.

Two groups/tendencies can be clearly identified from the responses to this question:

1. The consistent parties and tendencies that are clearly against the imperialist axis of aggression and in favour of the forces of anti-imperialism and socialism.
2. The former communist, socialist, left-wing, progressive and other parties that are explicitly or implicitly but clearly in favour of the aggressive imperialist axis and against the forces of anti-imperialism and socialism. These are parties that have their origins in the social-democratic, Eurocommunist and Third Communist International traditions (now communist in name only), that have degenerated through long

successive opportunist drifts, that have become integrated in the regime of imperialist domination, organic components of the state and transnational superstructure of capital, servants of the interests and strategy of the most aggressive circles of the financial oligarchy of the Euro-Atlantic axis.

We must now call a spade a spade, without subterfuge and diplomatic obtuseness: the split and conflict in the global revolutionary movement is leading to a polarisation, to an exclusive division:

- On the one hand, we have the revolutionary forces of anti-imperialism and
- on the other hand (under different facades and disguises), the pro-imperialist forces of apostasy, reaction and regression.

Especially over the last two years, the split in the world revolutionary movement, or rather in what is left of it, has become more than obvious. The main abscess of opportunist degeneration has split open and is already multiplying and causing secondary infections.

The long degenerated, deeply pro-establishment forces of social democracy, Eurocommunism, ‘ecology’ and the ‘movements’ for post-modern neo-liberal rights (in the imperialist countries and their subordinates) have openly and unconditionally supported their own camp in favour of the aggressive US-NATO-EU axis, in favour of increased war spending and the development of the military-industrial complex, in favour of intervening by providing weapons systems, munitions, aerospace, telecommunications, espionage, etc., mercenaries, military officials and instructors. These are today’s social chauvinists who defend their ‘transnational imperialist homeland’, the axis of aggression in the imperialist war, vote for war loans, participate in the bourgeois governments of war. Today’s Kautskyism^[3], the ‘orthodoxy’ of the Communist Party of Greece (KKE), while practically supporting the aggressor axis, builds bridges with blatant opportunism, plays the role of the ‘centre’, of ‘equal

distances between imperialists/thieves’, refrains from voting for war loans and adopts in words an ‘anti-imperialist oppositional’ stance.

Thus, although the abscess has been opened, there is still a lot of confusion. This is exacerbated by the rapid developments and the position of some parties that have come under the control of the renegades or are influenced by them. At the forefront of the international apostate flock are the now days renegades, the leaders of the KKE, who are usurping a history of struggle and sacrifice to whitewash their apostasy, marketing themselves as supposedly ‘the only orthodox, consistent communist force’ capable of leading the world movement! These renegades serve up their apostasy as a policy of ‘equal distances’ towards both opposing poles, seeing in WWII merely an ‘inter-imperialist conflict for primacy in the imperialist pyramid’!

Some, irredeemably confused, are still looking for substitutes for solutions and ways out of deadlocks through ‘the beaten track’, idealising phases, relations, and concepts of the past, based on some misplaced and misleading historical analogies^[4], etc., and through their ignorance, bewilderment, force of habit and naivety, they are giving more opportunities to the divisive machinations of unscrupulous renegades to take hold.

Thus, a series of wavering and ambivalent parties, groups and individuals, unable to grasp the stakes that have led to the split in the international movement, accustomed to the long-standing routine of bureaucratic degeneration of international bipartisan/diplomatic relations, ritual conferences and contacts^[5], seem to be drifting or floating erratically between the two poles. People who harbour illusions about the chances of bridging the gap (sometimes claiming for themselves the role of bridge-builders & mediators), people who are wilfully blind to the daunting contradictions they face, while trying to reconcile and/or cover them

up, hiding the disagreements under the carpet, hoping to find shelter from this unfamiliar storm...

No more illusions. The struggle of the WAP against the imperialist axis of aggression and its opportunist servants.

Despite the illusions, confusions and wishful thinking of the in-between sludge, as we have seen above, there are two tendencies, and there cannot be more than two in the polarised conditions of WWII. The actors of the in-between indecisive sludge can imagine what they want for themselves, their position and their role in the conflict, but as in the basic stakes of war, there is no room for ‘equal distances’. What a vague position means, in practice, is alignment with the pole of the forces of apostasy, reaction and regression, at the heel and in the service of the attacking imperialist axis.

Therefore, in the international anti-imperialist movement, we have to expose and unmask both the extremely dangerous hypocrisy of those renegades who hide behind ideological constructions about ‘equal distances’ and the de facto alignment with these renegades of the intermediate sludge of indecisive compromisers.

The struggle for the reconstitution of a victorious anti-imperialist revolutionary movement will be relentless in all areas of confrontation. The consistent anti-imperialist and revolutionary forces do not have the slightest room for defeat in this struggle. Defeat will mean the immeasurable bloodshed of the peoples.

Therefore, we cannot allow the renegades, those who have been playing for years the rigged game of conspiracies, brazen interventions in the internal affairs of fraternal parties and organisations, with their ruthless manipulative practices typical of the degeneration, undermining and disintegration of the movement, to win in this confrontation: blackmail and coercion from above, negotiations behind the back, recruitment, coups, take-overs,

splits, misuse of the parties’ online and financial resources, ultimatums, etc.. Exclusivity in the use of such toxic negativity, such dirty and deplorable means, has been claimed and deservedly captured by the renegades of the KKE, who, with the arrogance of the self-appointed and self-righteous leader/despot that they display, have now lost every trace of comrade morality, respect and credibility among fellow militants and comrades on a global scale, as slimy, repulsive and insolent cynical agents of subversion and disruption, as an example to be avoided.

Marxist science has proven that proper objectives are not arbitrarily imposed, but carried out on the basis of revolutionary theory, which is the only way to provide an accurate diagnosis of the deeper needs and prospects of the working class, society and the movement.

Just as truth cannot be attained through a flawed cognitive process, so the high objectives of the movement cannot be attained through means, ways, paths and subjects that do not measure up to them. Every attempt to pursue a high and true objective by vile, distorted, alien means, and so on, ultimately leads to the abandonment of that objective, to its neglect, to the service of alien objectives and interests. This is what the Marxist approach on the dialectical relationship between ends and means clearly teaches.

Therefore, for us, the vanguard of the movement is sought and positively conquered only on the basis of a scientific prognosis and the setting of objectives that become a revolutionary ideal, a pole of attraction and inspiration with potential, as a documented programme for which it is worth living or giving one’s life. The bearers of this programme, individuals and organisations, personalities organically integrated in conscious collectives of struggle, are inspired by the principles of this programme in every action, interaction and aspect of their lives. They inspire by example,

demonstrating the necessity and feasibility of the revolutionary perspective.

The World Anti-imperialist Platform^[6] deepens and expands its influence, enhances its leading role internationally, precisely by showing a positive and convincing perspective to the peoples and especially to the youth, by contributing decisively and effectively, but always in a subtle and discreet way, as befitting comrades, to the formation, development, coordination, strengthening and elevation of fraternal parties and organisations, while treating the historical specificity, the traditions of the culture of each people and the autonomy of each party or organisation with consideration and respect. With a consciously sober and reasoned discourse, but also with revolutionary consistency, dedication, drive and passion. With heart and mind, as Marx taught from his youth. In this task, the WAP promotes open and principled collective processes among comrades, laying the foundations for the optimal use of everyone’s creative abilities in our common cause.

The characteristics and the Symplegades of opportunism today.

In what follows, I will try to point out, on the basis of the work of the founders of revolutionary theory, the main paths, the destructive Symplegades that fuel the shipwreck of opportunist degeneration. A shipwreck the disintegration of which is inevitably caught in a death spiral between two monsters/substitutes of theory and ideology: between the Scylla of dogmatism and the Charybdis of scepticism/revisionism^[7].

In the sectarian jargon of bureaucratically degenerated parties, the word ‘opportunist’ is simply used as an insult against anyone who does not absolutely, sheepishly and submissively conform to the ‘correct line’ of a certain leadership...

Opportunism (French: opportunisme, from Latin:

opportunus, meaning favourable, advantageous) in the labour movement is that ‘theory’ and practice which contradicts the actual interests of the working class and pushes the labour movement along a path favourable to the bourgeoisie. Opportunism directly or indirectly adjusts and subordinates the labour movement to the interests of the bourgeoisie in various ways: ‘Opportunism in the upper ranks of the working-class movement is bourgeois socialism, not proletarian socialism. It has been shown in practice that working-class activists who follow the opportunist trend are better defenders of the bourgeoisie than the bourgeois themselves. Without their leadership of the workers, the bourgeoisie could not remain in power.’ (July 1920, Lenin’s Collected Works, 4th English Edition, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1965, Volume 31, pages 213-263)

After the victory of Marxism in the labour movement, opportunism, as a rule, appears under the cloak of Marxist phraseology.

In its class nature, opportunism is a manifestation of petit-bourgeois moods and mentality, of petit bourgeois ideology and politics within the labour movement.

In the organisational field, opportunism initially presents itself as sectarianism, only to evolve into practices of subversion and disintegration of the party and the movement (‘liquidarism’). The opportunist does not hesitate, on occasion, to instrumentally manipulate sectarian and disintegrative practices as long as they serve the strategic interests of the ruling class within the movement.

As for the political direction of its influence on the movement, it presents itself with ‘flexibility’: sometimes as ‘left-wing’ and sometimes as right-wing opportunism. In fact, it is common to see opportunist degenerative drifts into deplorable conservative or even reactionary positions, disguised under radical ‘left-wing’ phraseology.

Right-wing opportunism is trapped in a quagmire of reformist practices and tactical positions of compromise that serve the direct subordination of the workers’ movement to the interests of the bourgeoisie, abandoning the fundamental and strategic interests of the working class in the name of temporary and secondary gains. That is why the right-wing opportunists resort to a variety of revisionist dogmas, such as the fatalist conception, which substitutes the sober study of the contradictory nature inherent in the objective conditions of the development of society with the worship of spontaneous and automatic economic evolution (economism, evolutionism), which projects certain minor reforms within the bourgeois system as the ‘gradual realisation of socialism’, effectively rejecting revolution, the great leap of revolutionary transformation, replacing it with mild continuity, gradual evolution, while basking in the expectation of the ‘automatic maturation of conditions’, with the ‘transformation of capitalism into socialism’ in the indefinite future.

The ideological basis of right-wing opportunism is: the principle of ‘collaboration’ between the classes, the renunciation of the idea of the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the rejection of revolutionary forms of struggle and the fetishisation of bourgeois parliamentarism in the spirit of parliamentary cretinism, the devaluation or even total disregard of the role of the subjective factor in the revolutionary process, the gradual abandonment of the preparation itself (theoretical, practical, social, political, ideological, cultural, etc.) of the development of the subject, as history is seen as a ‘process without a subject’ (Second International, L. Althusser, etc.), the alignment with bourgeois nationalism and/or the substitution of communist internationalism with the cosmopolitanism of capital, with the ideologies of imperialist regional integrations (e.g. the EU), the transformation of legitimacy and bourgeois

democracy into a fetish, etc.

More often than not, right-wing opportunism reflects the dispositions of those sections of the petit bourgeoisie or certain groups of the working class—the labour aristocracy, the trade union bureaucracy and the parties, who enjoy relatively tolerable living conditions and privileges.

‘Left-wing’ opportunism is a rather unstable mixture of ultra-revolutionary ideological schemes/dogmas and adventurist tactics that force the revolutionary workers’ movement into unjustified actions, unnecessary sacrifices and defeats. ‘Left-wing’ opportunism is animated by bourgeois concepts that overestimate and/or absolutise the subjective factor (with a corresponding underestimation and/or disregard for the objective conditions) that rely on the revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses. It is one-sidedly oriented towards the fetishisation of ‘revolutionary violence’ as a panacea for all ills. It ignores the contradictory process of socio-economic development in stages, advocating discontinuity, ‘pure strategy’, ‘rupture and overthrow here and now’ regardless of the circumstances, and the hasty acceleration of the revolution, looking forward to immediate conquests resembling a ‘cavalry charge’ in the economic sector, etc.

‘Left-wing’ opportunism usually expresses the psychology and dispositions of those sections of the petit bourgeoisie, the peasantry, the representatives of the middle strata, who, under the pressure of brutal exploitation and insecurity, or faced with the difficulties of socialist construction, drift towards ‘revolutionary zeal’ of the anarchist type.

Right-wing and ‘left-wing’ opportunism are two interrelated degenerative tendencies of the movement, which clash, alternate, complement and reproduce each other in different historical forms, through which the manipulation and subordination of the movement to the interests and strategic objectives of capital and the financial oligarchy is

achieved.

Lenin, in his work ‘Left Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder’ (1920), revealed the essence and the different forms of ‘left wing’ opportunism during the formation of the global communist movement. In his works devoted to the degenerative phenomena of legalism, economism, evolutionism, the fetishisation of parliamentarism and peaceful means of struggle in social democracy and the bankruptcy of the Second International, he thoroughly analysed the characteristics of right-wing opportunism.

On the revolutionary theory of Marxism.

Let us now touch briefly on the relationship between opportunism and revolutionary theory, the science of Marxism-Leninism.

The global situation is of unprecedented complexity. It is impossible to chart a winning strategy and tactics for the movement without a consistent systematic knowledge of Marxist-Leninist science, without a creative development of revolutionary theory and dialectical methodology. For the reasons we in the World Anti-Imperialist Platform have outlined, the chronic degenerative phenomena have led to an addiction to the degradation, neglect and distortion of theory being the norm. Some still perceive theory in the spirit of Anglo-Saxon bourgeois positivism and pragmatism. In English, ‘theory’ in both scientific and colloquial terms includes any kind of speculation or verbalisation of real or imagined accounts.

On the contrary, in Marxism theory has nothing to do with idle chatter. Theory is the scientific, substantiated, systematic and evidence-based dialectical intellectual reconstruction of objective reality, the laws that govern it and its contradictions (which are not empirically visible on the surface), such as the theory of Marxist political economy, the Leninist theory of imperialism and the weak link, and so on.

However, in contrast to the Marxist scientific approach, some on the ‘left’ continue to reduce theory to a phraseological wrapping of preconceived decisions of a certain leadership, to empty rhetoric and void chatter masquerading as scientific and revolutionary, to postmodern ‘narratives’, without any awareness of the catastrophic danger of such revisionist views...

It is rare to find an individual, a party, an organisation that identifies itself as communist, left-wing or generally progressive that denies the importance of Marxism and the need to develop theory. Some advocate the ‘rejuvenation’ of Marxism, others like to pledge their loyalty to Marxism.

The definition of what Marxism is, and our relation to it, is a prerequisite for the development of Marxism. That is to say, it requires a scientific assessment of the law-governed and contradictory process of the emergence of the historical preconditions, primary emergence, formation and development of Marxism, of its theoretical *acquis*.

Marxism is an open and developing scientific system of philosophical, political-economic and socio-political positions, which are mainly focused on the theoretical foundation of the transition of society from capitalism to socialism. ‘It lies within the central artery of the development of the scientific method, the central artery of the development of the sciences on society. It was and remains—despite the apparently paradoxical nature of this statement—in its essence, the culmination of the sciences on method, the culmination of the sciences on society’ [Вазюлин В.А. Логика ‘Капитала’ К. Маркса. 2е издание [V. A. Vaziulin, The Logic of ‘Das Kapital’ by K. Marx, 2nd edition], Москва, СГУ 2002. с. 13]. It emerged at the stage of the maturity of capitalism, when the historical conditions for its revolutionary sublation, which are the historical preconditions for the transition to the most developed society, were maturing at the

same time.

Historically, it emerged through a complex and contradictory creative process of critical/scientific deepening of the study of social becoming (philosophy, religion, the politics of the ‘society of individuals’, relations of production, etc.), in parallel with the critical absorption and dialectical sublation of the higher *acquis* of pre-Marxist thought, which were the sources (Lenin) of Marxism. Classical German philosophy and especially idealist dialectics (Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel and Feuerbach), classical bourgeois political economy (naturalists, A. Smith, D. Ricardo, etc.) and utopian socialist-communist ideas (C. N. Saint-Simon, F. M. Ch. Fourier, R. Owen, E. Cabet, Th. Dezamy, etc.). The emergence, formation and development of Marxism is organically linked to the conscious adoption of the class perspective of the proletariat, without, however, being reduced to it.

Since its emergence, Marxism has served as a dynamic framework for a number of research projects. The attention of its founders was mainly focused on the study of three interrelated but relatively independent disciplines:

1. Human society and its history
2. The relations of production of the capitalist socio-economic formation, and
3. The preconditions of the new (communist) society.

Of course, the founders of Marxism did not limit themselves exclusively to the above fields (see their encyclopaedic interests on the philosophical/methodological foundations of history, science and mathematics, the study of religions, etc.). However, they never considered their work as a claim to a metaphysical, pre-Marxist type of ‘ontology’, to an ‘all-encompassing’ natural philosophy as a set of principles capable of explaining everything.

During the lifetime of the founders of Marxism, but also today, each of these subjects/fields of

research is characterised by a certain specificity and has reached a certain level of development. Accordingly, the ideas, perceptions and scientific knowledge of humanity on these subjects are also at a certain level of development. On this basis, three interrelated but relatively independent scientific theories have been developed within the framework of Marxism:

1. Historical materialism or dialectical historical conception of society,
2. The political economy of capitalism, and
3. Scientific socialism/communism.

The *acquis*, level of development and maturity of these scientific theories, the components of Marxism (according to V.I. Lenin), differ considerably. The most developed among them is the political economy of capitalism.

Notes

[1] See: Stephen Cho. The Character of the War. Platform-Organ-No.4. September 2023, pp. 64-66. <https://waporgan.org/?p=2772>

[2] See also: Harpal Brar. Zionism—A Racist, Anti-semitic and reactionary tool of imperialism (Chapter 5. Nazi-Zionist collaboration). Platform-Organ-No.8-Jan-2024, Pp. 10-26. <https://waporgan.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Platform-Organ-No8.pdf>. From the same author: Zionism—A racist, anti-semitic and reactionary tool of imperialism (Chapter 2. Zionism—a racist ideology) Platform-No.9-Feb-2024, pp. 8-18. <https://waporgan.org/?p=3324>

[3] See: Lenin V. I. The Proletarian Revolution And The Renegade Kautsky. Lenin’s Collected Works, Progress Publishers, Moscow, Volume 28, 1974, pages 227-325.

[4] Today’s renegades, disguised as revolutionaries, arbitrarily project WWII as supposedly identical to the First World War of 1914, in order to shape it in the image of their metaphysical ideologies, according to which all countries today are imperialist, self-existing structures in the pharaonic ‘imperialist pyramid’, and to justify their practically total alignment with the US-NATO-EU imperialist axis of aggression under the veil of ‘equal distances’... Similarly metaphysical and ahistorical was the approach of the theorists of the Second International when they tried to apply the forms they had adopted for the *laissez-faire* stage of capitalism to the new stage, to the new era of imperialism and socialist revolutions...

[5] A clear symptom of the bureaucratic degeneration of internationalism, a consequence of the more generalised degenerative tendencies of the movement, is the spread of a form of activism linked to reducing the international contacts of representatives of parties and organisations to a strange field of ‘public relations’, political lobbying, the search for high-level contacts, acquaintances and connections with

‘V.I.P. individuals’ abroad, in the spirit of bourgeois/petit-bourgeois cosmopolitanism, a peculiar form of narcissism and elitism of the ‘internationalist publicist and mediator’, a travel addiction under the guise of ‘internationalist conference tourism’, etc. See also the chapter: ‘International Meeting of Communist and Workers Parties’ in: ‘Joti Brar. On the current state and problems of the communist movement, Platform-Organ-No8, October 2023, pp. 54-56.

[6] Stephen Cho. The three major goals of the World Anti-Imperialist Platform. Platform-No.3-2, August 2023, pp. 63-66. <https://waporgan.org/?p=2539>

[7] I began my research on the opportunist degeneration of communist parties and its connection with the binary of dogmatism and revisionism as early as the 1980s, in collaboration with and under the guidance of my teacher, the brilliant Soviet revolutionary thinker Victor Alexeyevich Vazyulin. This research is linked to the systematic study of the history and theory of Marxism and the global communist movement.

The object of this study, remarkably rich in empirical data, was the historical course of the Bolshevik Party, the CPSU, the triumph of the October Revolution, the anti-fascist victory and the leaps of socialist construction, and finally the tragedy of the course towards counter-revolution. The escalating degeneration of the party (as a result of which it was transformed from a revolutionary vanguard into a bureaucratic administrative apparatus and finally into a component of the counter-revolution), but also the historic party of the vanguard of the working class of my own people, the KKE.

The historical specificity of Greece’s heroic revolutionary struggles, the country’s position and role in the global division of labour, etc., are reflected in the contradictory history of the escalating degeneration of this party. The frontal national liberation struggle during the Second World War, the tragic ‘civil’ class war, the defeat at the hands of the Anglo-Saxons, the power of the revolutionary traditions, the imposition of a new occupation regime, the foreign bases of the US-NATO, the monarcho-fascist regime, the fascist junta of the CIA, the historical absence of conditions for traditional social democracy and Eurocommunism (a social-democratic type of formation emerged after the collapse of the junta in 1974, while the split of the Eurocommunist group from the KKE took place mainly abroad in 1968), led to ways, rates and paths of contradictory degeneration of this party, atypical for a European country.

The late split of the Eurocommunist group, as well as the necessity of ideological and political confrontation with it, kept alive for a long time the consistent revolutionary communist traditions within the party and among the people.

A strong impulse for the opportunist degeneration of the KKE was given on the one hand by the open bourgeois counterrevolution and capitalist restoration in the USSR and the European countries of early socialism, and on the other hand by the participation of the party in bourgeois governments on the basis of Eurocommunist positions imposed by the leadership in a coup d’état, especially since March 1988. The descent into pro-establishment opportunism was not simple, easy or linear. This is why, in the case of the history of the KKE, we can study in relief the complex and contradictory mechanisms of the escalation of the opportunist drift, but also the mechanisms of the consequent ideological manipulation, with the instrumental use of templates from the dogmatism/revisionism dichotomy.

Why is Manchester in poverty? Workers need socialism!

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

What is at the root of the spiral of poverty and decay we are experiencing in towns and cities across Britain?

Labour, Tory, same old story

Sometime this year, working-class people in Manchester will be asked to cast their vote in favour of Labour, Tory or Liberal candidates in a general election. Each will claim to be for policies that they claim could help improve the living conditions of everyday people—and each of them will be lying.

The record of the Tories is well known to every Mancunian: they are the enemy, the party of the rich, and it is clear they always will be, while the LibDems and Greens are just Tory-lite. But it is now equally clear that the Labour party, whether it is led by Keir Starmer or anyone else, offers no alternative either.

The Labour party runs Manchester city council as its private fiefdom and has done so for decades. In all that time, the conditions for working-class people in the city have got steadily worse. During the long years of so-called ‘Tory cuts’, how did it help Manchester that we had Labour councillors and Labour MPs? Did they put themselves out to defend a single book in a single library, never mind a single job in a single factory?

Right now, a family with two children trying to survive in the Greater Manchester area has to pay at least £35,000 a year for living expenses alone—before any rent or mortgage payments. Even a single person needs around £9,600 plus rent/mortgage just to get by. But the average wage in Greater Manchester, skewed by higher earners, is just £36,000 a year. That means large numbers of Mancunians are earning far less.

Austerity + inflation = poverty

Clearly, in most families, both parents need to be working full time just to make ends meet—leading to further costs in terms of transport and childcare and more strains on an already incredibly tight family budget.

A formerly affordable place to live is becoming more unaffordable for ordinary families with every passing year. Meanwhile, the Labour council and mayoralty carry on rubber-stamping ‘luxury’ housing developments, boosting the coffers of the construction industry and banks while pushing working-class residents ever further to the city margins.

The deep and deepening inflation crisis (dubbed by the press as the ‘cost of living’ crisis and ultimately caused by a global financial crisis of the capitalist system) is making this situation worse by the day. All over the country, families are falling into poverty, homes are going without heating and children are turning up to school hungry. One in three British children now lives in poverty, and this is only expected to get worse.

Nobody in any of the capitalist parties has anything to say about how or why this is happening. None of them is prepared to admit that the obscene inequality in our society, whereby the working class has less and less while the ruling class has more and more, is a direct result of the way the capitalist system works (producing goods for profit rather than according to the needs of the people) and can never be fixed so long as that system remains.

It is clear that Labour not only does not provide any alternatives but is as dedicated to waging a class war upon workers as are the Tories. For both parties, the profits of the billionaires are their

primary concern. Whichever one is in power, the Bank of England will continue to fuel inflation (thereby stealing our savings and our wages) in order to bail out and subsidise big banks and corporations at our expense—and then tell us we need more austerity to pay the bill!

The only interest these careerists have in the rest of us is as a workforce to exploit and a vote-bank to lie to every four or five years. Both Tory and Labour are parties competing to represent the interests of the richest 0.1 percent, feathering their nests out of the kick-backs they get in the process, and they have no interest in taking care of the needs of anyone else.

Divide and rule

That is why, instead of looking for meaningful solutions to our problems, they simply join the chorus of propaganda lies aimed at encouraging us to blame other workers for the problems that have been created by this parasitic system. The capitalist class is tiny, and it maintains its rule by dividing the working class. One day, we are asked to blame ‘single mothers’, another day it’s ‘benefit scroungers’, on the third it’s ‘job-stealing immigrants’ and on the fourth it’s ‘bogus asylum seekers’.

The disgusting hypocrisy of our rulers going around the world looting the wealth of other countries and devastating them with aggressive wars and then asking us to blame the victims of those wars when they are forced to leave their homes in search of a viable living for their families has to be seen to be believed.

As working-class people, we have to understand that all this propaganda is aimed only at keeping us weak and fighting amongst ourselves, while the bosses are laughing all the way to the bank.

The ruling elites put so much effort into pushing this divisive propaganda because they know the truth that too many of us have forgotten: ‘The

workers, united, will never be defeated!’

How can we defend our rights?

It is time for the great majority of us stop being told that turning up on election day to choose between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea is our only ‘choice’. As workers, in Manchester or anywhere else, what we need are towns, cities, schools and hospitals, transport services, utilities and an entire national economy that work in the interests of the majority.

We have the right to expect a life in which we are not being ripped off at every turn; in which we can hold a decent job and have some meaningful say in how our workplaces and communities are run; in which our children go to school to learn what will develop their potential and enrich them (and with them the whole of our society), with shoes on their feet and a good breakfast in their bellies.

In the end, the only way we will get these things is by organising and fighting for a socialist society with a planned economy, where working-class people get to decide what is produced and how much based on the resources and manpower we have available and the things we feel we really need.

This is the real way out of the spiral of decay that the lords of finance capital, the 0.1 percent—supported by their political parties, their media pundits, their civil servants and judges, and their entire rotten system—are condemning us to.

Capitalism isn’t working. Fight for socialism!

The DPRK’s “declaration of subjugation” and revolution in South Korea

Stephen Cho | Coordinator of the Korean International Forum

February 25, 2024

On 15 January 2024, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) made a historic declaration. At the Supreme People’s Assembly (SPA) on this day, the Chairman of the State Affairs Commission, Kim Jong Un, declared that his country would subjugate “the Republic of Korea” (ROK) in case of emergency. Here are the important points of Chairman Kim Jong Un’s speech regarding the situation in Korea.

First, Chairman Kim Jong Un stated: “The frequent remarks made by the U.S. authorities about the ‘end of our regime’, vast nuclear strategic assets constantly stationed in the peripheral area of the DPRK, ceaseless war exercises with its followers staged on the largest scale, the military nexus between Japan and the Republic of Korea boosted at the instigation of the U.S., etc. are seriously threatening the security of our state moment by moment.” And he stressed: “It is our Party’s strategic plan to defend the country and greet a great revolutionary event through all-people resistance.”

The provocateurs of war in today’s world are always imperialism and its puppets. Chairman Kim Jong Un’s speech points to the fact that all armies and people will unite to defend the fatherland and bring about a great revolutionary event if war breaks out as a result of provocative maneuvers aimed at invading North Korea. This great revolutionary event will necessarily involve subjugating the whole territory of the South.

Chairman Kim Jong Un went on to call “the ROK” “a group of outsiders’ top-class stooges”, defining it as an “enemy state”, a “belligerent state” and a “foreign country”. He expressed the DPRK’s

readiness to “completely occupy, subjugate and reclaim the ROK and annex it as a part of the territory of our Republic” in case of the outbreak of war on the peninsula.

Here, “the ROK” becomes both an “enemy state” and “a group of outsiders’ top-class stooges”. This is not a logical contradiction, but a dialectical one: it is both “the ROK” and an enemy state, but it is also “the ROK clan” and puppets. Thus we can see that the DPRK still essentially maintains a one-state policy. In other words, it internally upholds its existing policy that the DPRK is the only state on the Korean peninsula and is prepared to subjugate the ROK as an enemy state in the event of war.

Chairman Kim Jong Un also pointed out: “It is necessary to delete such expressions in the constitution as ‘northern half’ and ‘independence, peaceful reunification and great national unity.’” “We have dismantled all the organizations we established as solidarity bodies for peaceful reunification.” And further: “We should also completely remove the eye-sore ‘Monument to the Three Charters for National Reunification’ standing at the southern gateway to the capital city of Pyongyang.”

These are tactical measures valid only until such a time as subjugation has been achieved. In fact, they outline a peaceful process: subjugation will inevitably lead to the establishment of a military government in the South, ruled by the Korean People’s Army. When revolutionary forces in the South have matured enough and a civil government is established through democratic elections, this people’s democratic government and the socialist government of the North will build a unified

federal state.

In other words, these measures, which seem to deny “peaceful reunification”, are temporary tactical measures to remove the obstacles to reunification, in force only until “an enemy country” and “a group of stooges” called “the ROK” has ceased to exist. Once a people’s democratic government has come into power, then, and only then, can meaningful reunification in an atmosphere of peace and security—ie, federal reunification—be achieved. The policy of peacefully building a unified federal state is still the strategic goal of the DPRK.

To this end, Chairman Kim Jong Un has made it clear that the military force of the North is “not a means of preemptive attack for realizing unilateral ‘reunification by force of arms’”. In other words, the DPRK has no intention of reunifying the country by force—ie, of actively pursuing forceful reunification. If reunification doesn’t take place by force, then it will be a peaceful reunification by means of a federal system.

Chairman Kim Jong Un went on to stress: “The war will terribly destroy the entity called the Republic of Korea and put an end to its existence. And it will inflict an unimaginably crushing defeat upon the U.S.”

Thus he showed that the DPRK has different approaches to “the ROK” and to the USA. Chairman Kim Jong Un has made it clear that if war breaks out as a result of provocations against the DPRK, “the ROK” itself will “be destroyed” while the USA will suffer a significant blow, “a crushing defeat”. This suggests that the DPRK sees the possibility that the USA might not intervene in the war in what the southern puppets refer to as “HanGuk” (abbreviated from “Daehanminguk”, the name given to Korea by the republican movement of 1919, and somewhat ironically adopted by the puppets of the ROK).

The USA today is following a military doctrine of proxy warfare against its peer competitors—as

has been made clear by the way it is prosecuting its wars in Ukraine and Palestine. The same is likely to be true of a possible “war in HanGuk”. If the USA were to engage in a direct war with the DPRK, rather than in a proxy war via the stooge “HanGuk” forces, it would risk a North Korean nuclear attack on the US mainland, which could escalate into mutually assured destruction (MAD) and the annihilation of humanity.

With this “declaration of subjugation” by the DPRK, a possible war in South Korea during this decade, a “war in HanGuk”, would take on the character of an antifascist and anti-imperialist war, a war of subjugation, an internal war. This compares with the Korean War of the 1950s, which was an anti-imperialist and antifascist war, a national-liberation war, and a war for the reunification of the Fatherland. The essence of anti-imperialism, antifascism, and liberation will remain unchanged, but the DPRK’s temporary acceptance of a two-state policy has made a difference.

Once the lower of the two stages of the democratization of South Korea—namely anti-fascist democratization—has been achieved via non-peaceful means of subjugation, then the higher stage, people’s democratization, can be achieved peacefully. The process of making South Korea independent of the USA that must happen in between these two stages could be achieved via peaceful or non-peaceful means, depending on the USA’s reaction.

Under conditions where antifascist democratization and anti-US independence have already been achieved, the process of establishing a unified federal government between the people’s democratic regime in the South and the socialist regime in the North can only be pursued by peaceful means.

The main points of the speech at 14th SPA of the DPRK in January were already contained in the report on 9th Enlarged Plenum of 8th WPK central

committee in December. At the party central committee at the end of last year and at the SPA at the beginning of this year, General Secretary of the WPK and Chairman of the State Affairs Commission, Kim Jong Un, has inherited the ideas and strategies of the revolution and reunification of his predecessors, President Kim Il Sung and Chairman of the National Defence Commission Kim Jong Il, innovating upon them in order to adapt them to today's situation and resolve the long-standing problems of the Korean peninsula. These problems have existed for 78 years since the division of the country by the US imperialists in 1945, and the DPRK has made it clear that it is now prepared to use bold methods of subjugation—to fight a “war in HanGuk”—in case of emergency.

This concept of a war of subjugation to oust the imperialist proxy regime in the South has opened a decisive period for the South Korean revolution.

With the DPRK's willingness to subjugate the South, the likelihood of a “war in HanGuk” has increased. Moreover, the likelihood of war in Taiwan, which is bound to break out at the same time, has also increased. And as the likelihood of war breaking out in East Asia increases, the possibility of war spreading across Eastern Europe is increasing likewise.

Currently, the flames of World War 3 are spreading from Eastern Europe to the Middle East and look likely to ignite in East Asia, too. But once the flames of war have ignited East Asia, World War 3 will be in full swing and the “New Cold War” antagonism facing the anti-imperialist and imperialist camps alike will become clear. Human history will arrive at a great new turning point.

We can expect this great new turn in human history to prove a great new turn for world revolution.

